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Abstract

As the population in the United States continues to become more diverse, early childhood programs serving our nation’s youngest citizens strive to meet the needs of families from different cultural backgrounds. Despite the established importance of ethnic-racial socialization in the early social and cognitive development of young children, parents and teachers seldom discuss issues related to race and ethnicity with preschool children. Using propositions within the bioecological and developmental niche models, critical race theory, and frameworks that focus on the socialization of children from diverse ethnic-racial backgrounds, the current study examined differences between parents’ and teachers’ use of ethnic-racial socialization and links between match or mismatch and children’s self-regulation. The sample consisted of 63 three- to five-year-old children from diverse ethnic-racial backgrounds, their primary caregivers, and their Head Start teachers, all residing in a mid-sized city in Upstate New York. Results indicate that parents use ethnic-racialization more than teachers, both home and early childhood environments had similar numbers of cultural items, and parents and teachers used egalitarian messages the most compared to other modes of socialization. Bayesian analyses revealed significant ethnic-racial group differences in the utilization of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages. African American parents used preparation for bias and cultural socialization at higher rates than parents of European American children and those in the combined ethnic group. Match in caregivers’ and teachers’ use of egalitarian messages was associated with higher self-regulation. A greater difference between ethnic-racial socialization in home and school physical environments was also surprisingly linked to higher self-regulation scores. Findings highlight the importance of ethnic-racial socialization in Head Start children’s early social development and may be useful in informing early childhood practices relating to cultural continuity.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In 1954, the Brown v. Board of Education case set a precedent for the racial desegregation of American schools. Drs. Kenneth and Mamie Clark gave testimony from their now famous doll studies (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1939, 1950) that Black children’s internalization of the negative connotations of racial segregation impacted their psychological wellbeing. Essentially, the study’s findings and those of several others in the intervening decades (e.g., Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Augoustinos & Rosewarne, 2001; Bagley & Young, 1988; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Doyle, Beaudet, & Aboud, 1988; Glover & Smith, 1997; Neto & Paiva, 1998; Spencer & Horowitz, 1973) suggest the important role the educational system may assume in the ethnic-racial socialization of young children. In 2014, children in the United States under the age of five became majority-minority for the first time, with more than 50% of children identified as a racial or ethnic group other than non-Hispanic White (United States Census Bureau, 2014). In contrast, the majority of the teaching force in American schools remains predominately White (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2013), a racial category defined by the U.S. Census as persons with origins in the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa. While parents of children of color stress the importance of instilling racial pride and knowledge of cultural heritage in their children (Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Priest et al., 2014), studies have found that teachers are often more comfortable promoting equality among groups, thereby discounting the role of group membership in the early socialization of young children (Hollingworth, 2009; Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012; Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001; Walton et al., 2014).

Previous research has shown that ethnic-racial socialization, wherein parents and significant others within the larger community provide children with positive messages about
their ethnic-racial group, is positively linked to racial identity (Barr & Neville, 2008; Hughes, Hagelskamp, Way, & Foust, 2009; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004), better academic adjustment (Baker, 2014; Banerjee, Harrell, & Johnson, 2011; Bowman & Howard, 1985; Neblett, Philip, Cogburn, & Sellers, 2006), and reduced behavior problems (Bennett, 2007; McHale et al., 2006; Stevenson, Reed, Bodison, & Bishop, 1997) in adolescents. Whether these effects hold true for younger children is beginning to garner greater research attention. Studies have shown that children are curious about others at this stage and begin to form opinions (perhaps biases) based upon the subtle clues that surround them (Bigler & Liben, 2006; Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001). Responses from parents and teachers when children express knowledge of differences in phenotypic characteristics as well as the cultural traditions of others are important components of ethnic-racial socialization that imply to young children the value—or lack of—appreciation of cultural differences.

Derman-Sparks and Edwards (2010) contend that as young children begin to explore the concepts of race and ethnicity, educators must pay attention to their comments, questions, and behaviors in order to better understand how children make sense of experiences and begin to construct knowledge related to racial identity of self and others. Preschool children’s curiosity about physical characteristics such as the color of skin, hair texture, and eye shapes provide opportunities for educators to address issues of diversity and create a rich learning environment where children and teachers explore racial and ethnic concepts, focus on any confusion that arises, discuss how people are alike and different, and expand awareness of racial similarities and differences. This can be achieved via “positive and accurate learning experiences about human differences and similarities [that] help to give children a foundation for resisting incorrect and harmful messages about themselves and others. Preschoolers are ready to begin thinking
critically about the accuracy and fairness of the information and images they encounter,” (Derman-Sparks & Edwards, 2010, p. 86).

Whether the benefits children gain from ethnic-racial socialization at home are challenged, interrupted, or promoted when they begin school has not been fully explored. For instance, little is known about the combined influence of home and school ethnic-racial socialization on children’s socioemotional development. To address this gap, the current study sought to a) describe racial and ethnic group differences in parents’ current ethnic-racial socialization practices and beliefs about socialization in the future, b) determine if the majority of children in the study have parents and teachers who match or mismatch on ethnic-racial socialization, c) examine racial and ethnic group differences in match and mismatch of ethnic-racial socialization, and d) examine the relationship between home-school match in ethnic-racial socialization and children’s self-regulation.

Home-school match in ethnic-racial socialization has implications for the advancement of early childhood education practices. Program administrators and policymakers must consider educational and professional development training that includes knowledge of familial cultural practices that enhance the social development of their students. This descriptive study specifically focused on a diverse sample of Head Start children and as such, has implications for addressing early education practices seeking to meet the educational and social needs of children from low income households across racial and ethnic groups (see Campbell, Ramey, Pungello, Sparling, & Miller-Johnson, 2002; Currie, 2001; Howes et al., 2008; Love et al., 2005; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). In particular, Head Start performance standards strive to “provide an environment of acceptance that supports and respects gender, culture, language, ethnicity, and family composition,” and to encourage social and emotional development by “supporting and
respecting the home language, culture, and family composition of each child in ways that support the child’s health and well being” (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2015, p. 124). In the next chapter, a more detailed definition is provided of ethnic-racial socialization, which is followed by a review of the literature on ethnic-racial socialization within families and schools. Literature pertaining to home-school continuity is then discussed.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Despite the assertion of contemporary scientists and scholars that race is socially constructed with no biological basis (e.g., Goodman, Moses, & Jones, 2012; Wallman, Evinger, & Schecter, 2000), racial categories remain salient yet varied among societies throughout the world (Barnard & Spencer, 2002). Bonilla-Silva (2010) posited that race involves the assumption that phenotypic and genotypic differences demarcate individuals into meaningful groups. In the Handbook of Race, Racism, and the Developing Child, Quintana and McKown (2008) argued for using the term race because the idea of race as a separating factor is still widely held, whether or not science validates its nature. The term ethnicity is often used in conjunction and/or confused with race. Ethnicity typically describes national, ancestral, cultural, immigration or religious commonalities among a group of people (Daniel, 2003).

Socialization has been most commonly defined as the process through which beliefs, goals, and behaviors of children are shaped (Parke & Buriel, 1998; Suizzo, Robinson, & Pahlke, 2008); racial socialization has traditionally included a focus on efforts of African American parents (Brown & Lesane-Brown, 2006; Thornton, Chatters, Taylor, & Allen, 1990) to promote self-esteem in children as well as prepare them for racial barriers present within society. Ethnic socialization, as used in previous literature, relates to immigrant Latino/a, Asian, and African Caribbean groups (among others) in the U.S. Studies of ethnic socialization have typically looked at cultural retention, identity achievement, group affiliation, and the assimilation process (e.g., Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & O’Campo, 1993; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Quintana & Vera, 1999). In their review, Hughes and colleagues (2006) acknowledged the differences between racial and ethnic socialization while pointing to the broad use and application of both
terms. In a more recent review, Priest et al. (2014) stated that inconsistent terminology remains prevalent in the literature; they and others have chosen to use the combined term *ethnic-racial socialization*, and I follow their lead on this front.

Ethnic-racial socialization is conceptualized as beliefs and behaviors related to four main themes commonly found in previous studies: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, egalitarianism, and promotion of mistrust (Hughes et al., 2006). A factor representing promotion of mistrust was not found during factorial analysis in the current study, and thus it is not discussed here. *Cultural socialization* involves teaching children about their ethnic-racial heritage and history, including passing on of cultural traditions, creating cultural knowledge, and promotion of cultural pride. Adults’ efforts to prepare children for discrimination and prejudice persistent at the societal level is termed *preparation for bias*. *Egalitarianism* embodies equality among groups and has often been described as dismissive of the importance of racial group membership, instead focusing on individualism (definitions from Hughes et al., 2006). Egalitarian views have been included with strategies that evoke color-blind\(^1\) ideology. As discussed in Pahlke et al. (2012), color-blind ideology promotes meritocracy as ideal and opposes racial distinction in the judgment and treatment of others. These differentiations are defined further in the following sections, along with their frequencies of use by parents of various cultural backgrounds.

Researchers have long been interested in parents’ use of ethnic-racial socialization with children in middle childhood and during the adolescent years. The majority of studies on ethnic-racial socialization have looked at the frequency and types of messages that parents use, as well

---
\(^1\) As others have pointed out, terms that include “blind” and “mute” may create negative correlation with forms of disability and encourage stereotyping of differently-abled groups (Farago, Sanders, & Gaias, 2015; Walton et al., 2014), yet substitutes have not yet been adopted in subsequent literature.
as variation in ethnic-racial socialization by racial or ethnic group membership. Ethnic-racial socialization has often been cited as a protective factor for children and adolescents who are likely to have future experiences with racism (overt and covert), discrimination, and prejudice (Brown, 2008; Bynum, Burton, & Best, 2007; Harris-Britt, Valrie, Kurtz-Costes, & Rowley, 2007; Neblett et al., 2006). Results of empirical studies show that ethnic-racial socialization positively affects ethnic identity in adolescents and adults (O’Connor, Brooks-Gunn, & Graber, 2000; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004), self-esteem in youth (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002), and children’s academic achievement (Smith, Atkins, & Connell, 2003) and social behaviors (Caughy, O’Campo, Randolph, & Nickerson, 2002). Despite these findings, research has primarily been limited to ethnic-racial socialization in home settings and by parents only—typically the mother. Far less attention has been paid to ethnic-racial socialization in early childhood settings or to discrepancies in ethnic-racial socialization between home and early childhood environments.

Developmental theorists argue that socialization is a dynamic process occurring in many contexts and through a variety of mediums (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). While scholars have noted the need to expand the ethnic-racial socialization literature to include school settings (Hamm, 2001; White-Johnson, Ford, & Sellers, 2010) and multidimensional constructs (Hughes et al., 2006), few researchers have taken up the task of incorporating educational settings and multiple informants into their investigations of ethnic-racial socialization. In this chapter, ethnic-racial socialization within home and school settings is discussed, including types and frequencies of parents’ messages to young children, predictors and outcomes of ethnic-racial socialization at home and in school settings, and studies of continuity between the two settings, broadly stated. Only a few studies were found that examined match between home and school ethnic-racial
socialization specifically. The majority of research on ethnic-racial socialization has focused on adolescents (for reviews see Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Priest et al., 2014), but studies on benefits for younger children are emerging. For the purposes of this study, there is a focus on literature primarily pertaining to preschool-aged children.

**Historical Background**

Although research on ethnic-racial socialization emerged in the last thirty years or so, studies pertaining to young children’s understanding of race have a longer history. Kenneth and Mamie Clark showed that young children ascribed meaning to racial categories in studies that began as early as the 1930s (Clark & Clark, 1939, 1950). Though the forced-choice methodology in the Clarks’ doll studies has been criticized (Banks, 1976; Spencer, 1983), social science research with similar methods has continued into the 2000s. For example, Williams and Roberson (1967) adapted the Clarks’ doll procedure to include drawings in the Preschool Racial Attitude Measure [PRAM], but the basic premise remained the same. In the 1990s, the Multi-Response Racial Attitude Measure [MRA] (Doyle & Aboud, 1995) amended the previous limitation of forced-choice methodology. The PRAM, PRAM II, and MRA have been used in numerous studies spanning several decades with fairly consistent evidence of pro-White bias in preschool children across racial and ethnic groups (e.g., Aboud & Doyle, 1993; Augoustinos & Rosewarne, 2001; Bagley & Young, 1988; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Doyle et al., 1988; Glover & Smith, 1997; Neto & Paiva, 1998; Spencer & Horowitz, 1973).

Fifty plus years of research on children’s racial attitudes and the persistence of prejudice at societal levels spawned investigation into methods of counteracting bias in children and preparing youth of color for dealing with the realities of racism. Early in the 1980s, research with
African American parents began to explore strategies parents espouse to prepare children for living in a society still plagued by institutional racism and oppression. It was found that parents primarily encouraged high self-esteem through promotion of racial pride and a positive racial identity (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Peters & Massey, 1983). The following decade produced research that expanded racial socialization to include other ethnic groups and discussion of ethnic socialization (Knight et al., 1993; Ou & McAdoo, 1993; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Quintana & Vera, 1999). As Hughes et al. (2006) found even ten years ago in their review, the literature on ethnic-racial socialization continues to grow. Contemporary studies include large-scale quantitative research that examines not only antecedents of parents’ ethnic-racial socialization with their children, but tests the influences of ethnic-racial socialization on children’s well-being (Baker, 2014; Hughes, Witherspoon, Rivas-Drake, & West-Bey, 2009; Peck, Brodish, Malanchuk, Banerjee, & Eccles, 2014). Whereas a few studies have looked at socializing agents other than parents (Sanders Thompson, 1994; Scottham & Smalls, 2009; Smith et al., 2003; Walton et al., 2014), noticeably absent are studies of contexts outside of children’s homes (exceptions include Aukrust & Rydland, 2009; Priest et al., 2016; Walton et al., 2014).

Around the same time that scholars began to study young children’s learning of racial and ethnic attitudes and identities, ethnic revitalization movements were co-occurring on a global level. Prior to the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s and 1970s in the US, assimilationist ideologies pervaded most Western institutions with a main goal of one shared dominant mainstream culture among all groups (Banks, 2004; Gordon, 1964). Alongside African Americans and Native Americans in the US, groups such as West Indians and Asians in Britain and Aborigines in Australia worked (and continue to work) for institutional responses to their
cultural needs and for representation in educational curricula. The development of multicultural education was a partial response to these concerns from marginalized groups (Banks, 2004).

Even before this time, anthropologists were framing a cultural discontinuity hypothesis that poor performance in schools could be accounted for, to some degree, by differences between students’ cultural backgrounds and the culture of schools (Ogbu, 1982). Ogbu outlines a history of the cultural discontinuity hypothesis that dates back to Edgar Hewett (1905) criticizing American schools in their lack of understanding of the cultural backgrounds of immigrants. However, this research did not shift focus to public school systems and empirical or applied data (in comparison to ethnographic work) until the 1960s. A primary aim of studies conducted during this time was to counteract accusations that poor school performance was due to cultural depravity (Ogbu, 1982; Bloom, Whiteman, & Deutsch, 1965). Despite these early roots, literature on cultural discontinuity, or home-school mismatch, continues to theorize and declare the hypothesis more than actual investigation of its prevalence or effects.

The cultural discontinuity hypothesis has scarcely been applied to early childhood education settings. Nonetheless, stratified belief systems between parents and teachers have gained attention in some areas of research. A review of the history of research in early childhood education during the 20th century found an orientation toward a standard model of ECE with administrators and teachers as the experts who inform parents of best practices and childrearing strategies (Bernhard, Freire, Pacini-Ketchabaw, & Villanueya, 1998). The perspective has persisted, as evidenced by more recent studies that continue to question “novice” and “expert” parent and teacher roles (Doucet & Tudge, 2007). A consequence of this model is that the dominant culture is enforced and there is no reciprocation of cultural values (Bernhard et al., 1998). In the US, this means that schools more commonly reflect beliefs and practices in line
with European American traditions. Children of color are left to navigate differences between what they experience at home and the standards of their school environment. As Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, and Garcia (2009) argue, the early education system continues to focus on getting children ready for school but not getting schools ready for children.

**Ethnic-Racial Socialization at Home**

In as much as schools are increasingly being considered important contexts of socialization, children’s homes are still their primary learning environment and parents their most important source of knowledge. Given this, research on ethnic-racial socialization has almost exclusively focused on parents. Parents’ use of ethnic-racial socialization strategies is influenced by several factors, the most prominent being their own racial or ethnic background. Some studies limit sample populations in order to more clearly define within-group socialization experiences (e.g., Benner & Kim, 2009; Caughy, Nettles, O’Campo, & Lohrfink, 2006; Scottham & Smalls, 2009); others have included multiple racial or ethnic group comparisons (e.g., Csizmadia, Rollins, & Kaneakua, 2014; Hughes, 2003; Tyler et al., 2008). To learn more about parents’ communications to their children with regard to race and ethnicity, researchers have examined the frequency of messages, message content, and correlates and predictors of ethnic-racial socialization. Studies of associations with child outcomes are more recent and have primarily been conducted with families of adolescents.

**Frequency of messages.** The prevalence of ethnic-racial socialization with adolescents and children in middle school is well established. As stated earlier, less is known about parents’ conversations on issues surrounding race with children of younger ages. Research in this area began by asking if parents talk to young children about their race and ethnicity, and if so, how
often. In the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-1999 [ECLS-K] (N = 18,950; 57% White, 16% Black, 19% Hispanic, 3% Asian, 2% Multiracial), parents were asked, “How often does someone in your family talk with {CHILD} about (his/her) ethnic/racial heritage?” Overall, 28% of those in the sample replied that someone in the family talked with their kindergarten-age child about their heritage several times per year; 18% replied that this occurred several times per month; and another 10% answered that someone in the family talked with the child about his or her ethnic/racial heritage several times a week or more (Brown, Tanner-Smith, Lesane-Brown, & Ezell, 2007; Lesane-Brown, Brown, Tanner-Smith, & Bruce, 2010). From these data, the majority of families (56%) had discussions with their young child about his or her heritage. Even though the frequency of conversations may be a bit lower than with older children, this finding suggests that, contrary to previous assumptions, racial conversations with children six years of age and under do occur.

The frequency with which parents talk to children about race appears to be higher among African Americans than among other ethnic-racial groups. On average, studies have reported that around two-thirds of African American participants engaged in some type of ethnic-racial socialization (Barr & Neville, 2008; Peck et al., 2014; Thornton et al., 1990). Reports were as high as 90% (Hughes, 2003; Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002) and as low as 40% in some studies (Anderson et al., 2015). Almost one-third of Black parents in the ECLS-K talked to children about their racial heritage several times per month or more (Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). As with African American children, around one-third of Black-White biracial children in the ECLS-K received messages about racial heritage several times per month (Csizmadia et al., 2014; Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). For Hispanic and Asian children in the study, 27% and 28% heard messages about their heritage bimonthly or more, respectively (Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). An unexpected
finding was that 34% percent of Native American parents reported talking to their children about ancestral heritage several times per week or more, which was higher than percentages obtained for other groups in the study (Lesane-Brown et al., 2010).

Compared to the aforementioned groups, European American families were more likely to exhibit low levels or relatively no discussion of race and ethnicity during childhood socialization. In the ECLS-K, close to 30% of White parents reported never talking to their children about their racial/ethnic heritage (Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). Similarly, in a recent Canadian study (Chakawa & Hoglund, 2016), ratings of cultural socialization were lower for White or Western European parents compared to other groups (e.g., individuals of Latin American and Arab ancestry). European American parents in Pahlke et al.’s (2012) study had subscale mean ratings of cultural socialization that fell between 1.37 and 2.68 out of 5, lower than what has been reported for African Americans (Barbarin & Jean Baptiste, 2013; Hughes, 2003).

In short, research shows that parents of very young children (age 6 and younger) do talk to their children about issues related to race and ethnicity, although less frequently than parents of older children. One study found a curvilinear relationship between ethnic-racial socialization and child age, with peak levels occurring around 10-12 years (Johnston, Swim, Saltsman, Deater-Deckard, & Petrill, 2007). Ethnic and racial groups tended to vary in how often they engaged in ethnic-racial socialization, which is linked to the reasons offered by parents for addressing such topics. Reasons for engaging in ethnic-racial socialization are revealed through an examination of the content of their messages.

**Content of messages.** Just as the frequency with which parents talk to children about race varies, so too do the types of messages they convey. Parents feel a responsibility to teach
children about their ethnic-racial heritage for many different reasons, including being in a context with more exposure to diversity or preparing their child for membership in a marginalized group (Brown et al., 2007; Caughey et al., 2006). In their influential review of studies on ethnic-racial socialization, Hughes and colleagues (2006) found four themes related to ethnic-racial socialization content: (a) promotion of cultural awareness and a sense of racial pride, (b) preparation for experiences of racism and bias, (c) encouragement of an egalitarian perspective of racial and ethnic groups, and (d) emphasis on a need for mistrust in interracial interactions. These typologies have been used consistently in the literature post-2006, as indicated in more recent reviews (Priest et al., 2014; Yasui, 2015).

*Cultural socialization.* Teaching children aspects of their cultural heritage, customs, traditions, and history, as well as promoting ethnic and cultural pride defines cultural socialization (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Thorton et al., 1990), which is the most frequent type of message content used with young children (Hughes et al., 2006). Of studies reviewed pre-2006, 76% included measures of socialization strategies related to cultural awareness (Hughes et al.). A latent profile analysis of types of racial socialization parents used with first graders showed almost half of participants fell into groups that either focused on cultural socialization exclusively or cultural socialization in combination with coping strategies (Caughy, Nettles, & Lima, 2011). To assess parents’ teaching of cultural heritage to their children, studies have asked: “Have you ever said or done things to encourage your child to be proud of his or her culture?” (Hughes, 2003) or “Have you ever taken your daughter to a Black cultural event like Kwanza celebrations, Black expo, or a play about Black Americans or Africans?” (O’Connor et al., 2000).
Rates of parents’ cultural socialization compared to other types of ethnic-racial socialization are relatively high. On a scale reporting how often parents engaged in cultural socialization items during the past year (1 [never] to 5 [very often]), mean frequencies in Hughes’ (2003) study were 3.85 (Puerto Rican), 4.01 (Dominican), and 3.97 (African American). Results were similar for parents of 6- to 10-year-olds who were Mexican-American ($M = 3.4$) (Knight et al., 1993), and for European American ($M = 3.2$), African American ($M = 4.2$), and Latino ($M = 4.1$) parents of four-year-olds in a separate study (Barbarin & Jean-Baptiste, 2013). Parents with internationally adopted children showed a similar level of enculturation beliefs—or belief in providing their child with cultural opportunities that promote ethnic pride—with 5- to 6-year-olds, $M = 3.7$ (Lee, Grotevant, Hellerstedt, & Gunnar, 2006). However, scores on cultural socialization were much lower in a Canadian study, ranging from 1.75$^2$ (Latin American, White/Western European, and Eastern European) to 2.88 (Arab) (Chawaka & Hoglund, 2016).

Qualitative studies have highlighted the importance parents place on cultural socialization through open-ended questions exploring the nature and content of messages to young children. In response to how they might deal with issues of racism, parents across several ethnic groups tended to rely on promoting cultural pride in their children (Anderson et al., 2015; Crolley-Simic & Vonk, 2008). Fourteen of fifteen (93%) African American parents in Coard, Foy-Watson, Zimmer, and Wallace’s (2007) pilot study, 13 of 15 (87%) in Howard, Rose, & Barbarin’s (2013) focus groups, and 9 of 12 (75%) parents in Suizzo et al.’s (2008) study discussed teaching racial and ethnic pride to 4- to 6-year-old children. As an example, a parent in one focus group stated, “I want them to know—you’re black, black is beautiful and it’s nothing wrong with that”

---

$^2$ Studies utilizing scales other than a 5-point scale (which is most common in the ethnic-racial socialization literature) have been converted to an equivalent 5-point range for comparison purposes. For example, 1.4 on a 4-point scale was converted to 1.75.
Similarly, half of White adoptive mothers of children who were Korean, Chinese, or Vietnamese actively sought to instill pride in their child regarding the child’s birth culture and strived to make their birth culture part of the family’s life on a regular basis (Crolley-Simic & Vonk, 2008).

**Preparation for bias.** A second reason parents engage in ethnic-racial socialization of children is to prepare them for experiences of racism or bias. This theme emerged out of concerns African American parents expressed over the institutional and overt racism their children would have to face, and qualitative interviews have revealed the theme remains salient in contemporary families. For example, all parents (African American, Latino, and Korean) in Anderson et al.’s (2015) focus groups talked about how their child would have to deal with racial and ethnic bias at some point, and British Indian, Pakistani and White parents described preparation for bias as an important part of family life (Iqbal, 2014).

Preparation for bias has been operationalized in studies with young children several ways. McHale and colleagues (2006) asked whether parents agreed with the statement, “I’ve talked to my child about racism,” and Caughy et al. (2011) used the statement, “Racism is real and you have to understand it or it will hurt you.” Research has shown that parents of young children do engage in strategies to prepare their children for bias, but less so than other types of strategies. While half of African American parents in Spencer’s (1983) study stated that teaching young children about race (in general) is important, only one-third felt it was important to talk to their children specifically about possible discrimination. In Hughes and Chen’s (1997) study, a majority of parents reported talking to children about racism, but fewer than 15% did so often. Higher numbers have been found more recently. For instance, 67% of African American mothers of preschoolers in Baltimore reported using preparation for bias messages (Caughy, O’Campo, et
al., 2002), and 78% of parents of internationally adopted children reported they had discussed racism and discrimination with their children (Lee et al., 2006).

Clearly, discussing issues of bias is not as common with this age group as is the case with promotion of racial and ethnic pride or cultural socialization. Mean scores of preparation for bias were lower than cultural socialization for all ethnic groups in Hughes’s (2003) study by about half, \( M = 1.47 \) for Puerto Rican, 1.79 for Dominican, and 2.07 for African American compared to 3.85, 4.01, and 3.97, respectively. Mean scores reported by White mothers of transracially adopted Asian children were much lower but showed a similar trend, \( M = .49 \) compared to \( M = 1.24 \) for cultural socialization (Johnston et al., 2007). Lower frequencies of messages preparing for bias are likely due to the age of the child and the negative and complex nature of topics related to racism and discrimination, as exemplified by one father who asked several times during focus group interviews, “Why would I ever teach my child this bad stuff?” (Anderson et al., 2015).

**Egalitarianism.** In contrast—or in addition to—cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages, parents sometimes choose to relate equality among groups to their young children. Terminology used for this type of socialization has been unclear in previous studies, and there has been some confusion in what constitutes egalitarian versus color-blind attitudes or silence about race. Strategies with a goal of developing individual characteristics in order to integrate into the dominant culture have been described as egalitarian (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Hughes et al., 2006). Egalitarianism in this sense appears contradictory to messages that encourage children to embrace their cultural heritage or focus on group identity. In a similar way, color-blind orientations include communications that teach children to dismiss the importance of race through promotion of equality among racial and ethnic groups (Hamm, 2001;
Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000; Pahlke et al., 2012). It is important to point out that the term *color-blind* has roots in broader literature with negative connotations of contributing to the racist status quo; this is further discussed under theoretical frameworks (see Hughey & Embrick, 2015). Research on egalitarianism within an ethnic-racial socialization context has only recently emerged, and it is not clear whether egalitarianism is helpful or harmful to children’s development of racial and ethnic identity or children’s appreciation of cultural diversity. More obviously, *racial silence* is a label applied to parents who do not engage in racial and ethnic discussions with their children at all or do so very minimally. It has been suggested that this silence sends a message as well (Hughes et al., 2006).

Egalitarianism has been operationalized a few different ways, for example with the statement, “We are all equal and no race is greater than the other” (Barr & Neville, 2008; Pahlke et al., 2012). The small number of studies that have examined egalitarianism with young children revealed that both African American and European American parents sometimes embrace egalitarian views. This was clear in the focus groups conducted by Anderson et al. (2015); one African American mother explained, “So [you] definitely have to address it, and let them know there is different cultures. But we’re all equal. You’re not no better than him because you’re black. And they’re no better than you because they’re White.” Thirty-eight percent of parents in another focus group (Coard, Wallace, Stevenson, & Brotman, 2004) and more than half of Black and White mothers in Spencer’s (1983) study discussed equality among groups with their preschool-age children. Mothers of transracial adoptees revealed a socialization pattern of *diverse life* that was characterized by exposure to other cultures and education on equality among groups (Crolley-Simic & Vonk, 2008). It has been mentioned that egalitarianism is most prevalent with European American parents, but research with young children has yet to
thoroughly examine this claim. One study that did provide support for this thesis showed that European American parents showed high rates of egalitarianism in both current practices ($M = 2.61$) and beliefs about future socialization ($M = 4.75$) compared to other types of messages (Pahlke et al., 2012).

*Physical environment.* Beyond looking at direct messages from parents, a few researchers have examined socialization within the physical environment. Caughey, Randolph, and O’Campo (2002) created the Africentric Home Environment Inventory [AHEI] to assess the presence of items such as culturally appropriate toys, pictures of African American family members, and clothing or household items made of African fabric or prints (see Appendix A for list of items). In subsequent studies done by Caughey and colleagues (2002, 2006), scores on the AHEI averaged 4.74 out of 10. Scores were similarly mid-range for 6- to 10-year-old Mexican American children in Knight et al.’s (1993) study of Mexican objects in the home (e.g., pottery, religious figures, wall hangings); the mean score was 11.53 on a scale with 21 items.

This review of the literature on frequency and content of parents’ ethnic-racial socialization has shown parents utilize socialization messages with varying regularity and orientation in order to prepare their young children for living in diverse societies such as the United States and Britain. For the most part, studies have done a good job of outlining profiles of socialization including types of messages deemed cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and egalitarianism. However, types of ethnic-racial socialization messages are not mutually exclusive, and parents often use a combination of messages with their children. Latent class and latent profile analyses have revealed similar parent clusters across studies with socialization content areas that co-occur. White-Johnson et al. (2010) determined a three-cluster model; the largest cluster was labeled *multifaceted* ($n = 124; 58.4\%$). Caughy et al. (2011) similarly found a
four-cluster model to have the best fit, with the largest labeled balanced \( n = 112; 51.3\% \). When statistics from these studies are combined, more than half of all parents interviewed used a moderate, multifaceted, or balanced approach to socialization (53%).

It may be concluded from these findings that parents of children as young as three years of age see necessity in ethnic-racial socialization. Children of color likely encounter barriers and structural discrimination not commonly experienced by European American children. With this in mind, parents of marginalized groups often feel a need to protect their children through promotion of ethnic identity and instilling a sense of racial pride, and they begin this process at an early age. In a related manner, immigrant populations from diverse cultural backgrounds struggle to maintain their natal cultural practices whilst encouraging their children to assimilate into US society. As the US population becomes more diverse, cultural socialization processes may intensify. This is true even for the group who continues to hold a racial majority; European American parents must also consider how to respond to issues of race with their children in increasingly diverse contexts. Accordingly, some studies have shown that White parents endorse a more pluralistic approach that indoctrinates equality among groups (e.g., Pahlke et al., 2012).

Once research began to establish that parents of young children incorporate ethnic and racial socialization into their family lives, as parents of older children do, researchers have asked what might influence their decision to do so.

**Predictors and correlates of parent ethnic-racial socialization.** Reasons why parents choose to engage in ethnic-racial socialization with children are related to their own personal characteristics, as well as characteristics of their children and surrounding contexts. These include parents’ ethnic-racial identity, children’s age and gender, neighborhood and school ethnic-racial composition, and other demographic variables. Parents who identify strongly with
their racial or ethnic background or who have had past experiences with discrimination likely hold ethnic-racial socialization salient within their worldview. These experiences seem to instigate a desire to pass information along to their children in accordance with children’s developmental stages. Less diversity of context may prompt parents to enact cultural pride socialization, whereas diverse contexts could inspire parents to have discussions with children that portray ethnic-racial equality among groups.

Parent characteristics. The most common predictor of parents’ ethnic-racial socialization studied thus far has been their own racial or ethnic group membership and their related ethnic identity. Reviews of studies including children across age groups have found that African American parents tend to engage in higher levels of preparation for bias compared to other groups, Asian and Latino/a parents participate more often in cultural socialization, and European Americans are often lower on all types of ethnic-racial socialization messages (Hughes et al., 2006; Priest et al., 2014). With a few exceptions, studies focusing on younger children provide support for the same trend. African American parents showed consistently higher rates of preparation for bias messages than other groups (Anderson et al., 2015; Caughy & Owen, 2015; Hughes, 2003). Dominican parents engaged in higher rates of cultural socialization than Puerto Rican or African American parents in one study (Hughes, 2003), but African American parents exhibited higher cultural socialization in other studies (Barbarin & Jean-Baptiste, 2013; Caughy & Owen, 2015). In general, European American parents tended to engage in lower levels of cultural socialization than other groups (Barbarin & Jean-Baptiste, 2013; Csizmadia et al., 2014).

Intertwined with racial and ethnic group membership, parents who have had previous experiences with racism, for example workplace discrimination, engage in higher levels of bias preparation with their children (Benner & Kim, 2009; Crouter, Baril, Davis, & McHale, 2008;
Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Iqbal, 2014; White-Johnson et al., 2010). In a study conducted in Britain, bias preparation was highest among Pakistani families (9 out of 12 participants) and lowest among Indian families (2 out of 12) (Iqbal, 2014). This finding was congruent with higher incidences of discrimination experienced by Pakistanis in Britain, and all three groups (Pakistani, Indian and White) acknowledged Muslims likely face more discrimination in their country. White-Johnson et al. (2010) found significant positive correlations between African American mothers’ experiences with racial discrimination and use of all types of socialization messages except promotion of self-worth, and Benner and Kim (2009) discovered parents’ experiences of discrimination were significantly related to their use of racial socialization in Chinese American families. In contrast, Hughes (2003) found parents’ ethnic identity—but not perceived group disadvantage or discrimination experiences—was associated with cultural socialization.

In addition to racial or ethnic group membership and past experiences of racism, several demographic factors have been found to be associated with parents’ ethnic-racial socialization practices. Married couples were more likely to engage in discussions of race or ethnicity with their children (Brown et al., 2007; Thornton et al., 1990), as were older parents (Thornton et al., 1990), parents with higher education attainment (Brown et al., 2007; White-Johnson et al., 2010), and parents with higher socioeconomic status (Csizmadia et al., 2014).

**Child characteristics.** Studies have also looked at child characteristics as predictors of parents’ incorporation of racial and ethnic socialization into their parenting schema. Results have primarily shown that parents are more likely to talk to children about race during middle childhood or adolescence as opposed to at earlier stages of development (Hughes, 2003; Lee et al., 2006; McHale et al., 2006), but others have found child age to be a non-significant correlate.
of ethnic-racial socialization (Brown et al., 2007). These discrepancies appear to be explained by the age ranges represented in corresponding studies; some studies compared age groupings (e.g., 4-8 versus 9-14) (Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Lee et al., 2006), while others entered age continuously with less variation and within a younger cohort (e.g., kindergartners) (Brown et al., 2007; Csizmadia et al., 2014). Interestingly, Johnston et al. (2007) found that whereas preparation for bias messages appeared to steadily increase with child age, cultural socialization had a curvilinear pattern that peaked when children were around 10 years old. A comparable finding had been reported earlier wherein preparation for bias increased with age, but cultural socialization did not (Hughes & Chen, 1997).

Inconsistent trends have also been reported for effects of child gender on parental ethnic-racial socialization. Brown and colleagues (2007) found that boys had fewer racial-ethnic discussions with their parents than did girls in general. Caughy et al. (2011) found that silence about race was more commonly practiced with boys, while girls heard more cultural socialization messages. Inversely, McHale and colleagues (2006) reported that fathers of sons tended to engage in ethnic-racial socialization more often than fathers with daughters. Others have reported non-significant gender effects in terms of ethnic-racial socialization (Csizmadia et al., 2014; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Johnston et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2006).

**Situational characteristics.** Lastly, situational correlates and context were examined in several studies investigating parents’ use of ethnic-racial socialization. Region of the United States in which the family resided was significantly related to racial socialization in several studies (Northeast higher than South [Thornton et al., 1990]; West higher than South [Brown et al., 2007]). Thornton and others found that neighborhood composition mattered for mothers but not fathers and was significant for Black families living in neighborhoods that were only half-
Black in composition. Living in a neighborhood with a negative social climate was highly correlated with preparing children for bias and promoting mistrust; by comparison, neighborhood social capital was significantly correlated with messages promoting racial pride (Caughy et al., 2006). A low percentage of students sharing the child’s racial/ethnic background in kindergarten was related to high levels of parent discussions of cultural heritage with children across ethnic-racial groups in the ECLS-K sample (Brown et al., 2007), with the exception of Black-White biracial kindergarteners (Csizmadia et al., 2014).

To summarize this section, parent, child, and situational correlates have been outlined that relate to parents’ communications to children regarding their racial background and cultural heritage, as well as messages that prepare children for future bias existent within society. Among these were parents’ own racial and ethnic group membership, identity, and previous experiences with discrimination. Parents from backgrounds that have experienced greater systematic oppression have been shown to exhibit higher levels of socialization that prepare young children for such experiences (Benner & Kim, 2009; Crouter et al., 2008; Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Iqbal, 2014; White-Johnson et al., 2010). At the same time, parents with greater sociodemographic resources (married parents, older parents, parents with higher education) showed high levels of engagement in ethnic-racial socialization strategies (Brown et al., 2007; Csizmadia et al., 2014; Thornton et al., 1990; White-Johnson et al., 2010). Child characteristics such as age and gender have shown inconsistent relations with ethnic-racial socialization. Some studies report age and gender differences (Hughes, 2003; Caughy et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2006; McHale et al., 2006), and others do not (Brown et al, 2007; Csizmadia et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2006). One study found a curvilinear relationship between child age and parent ethnic-racial socialization (Johnston et al., 2007). Finally, situational correlates such as geographic region,
ethnic-racial composition of classrooms and neighborhoods, and neighborhood social climate appeared to be related to parents’ ethnic-racial socialization strategies with their children (Brown et al., 2007; Caughey et al., 2006; Csizmadia et al., 2014; Thornton et al., 1990).

**Ethnic-racial socialization and child outcomes.** Unlike research describing how and why parents engage in conversations with children about race and ethnicity, examination of the effects of ethnic-racial socialization messages on young children is scant. Ethnic-racial socialization with older children has been associated with ethnic identity (Knight et al., 1993; Peck et al., 2014; Quintana, Castaneda-English, & Ybarra, 1999), self-esteem (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002), academic achievement (Banerjee et al., 2011; Bowman & Howard, 1985; Neblett et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2003), and social-emotional outcomes (Stevenson et al., 1997; Yasui, Dishion, Stormshak, & Ball, 2015). Fewer studies have examined the same outcomes with young children. What studies exist with preschool-age children have primarily examined relationships between ethnic-racial socialization and school readiness or social-emotional development, and those studies are reviewed here.

**School readiness and academic achievement.** Scholars have suggested that ethnic-racial socialization may influence children’s readiness for school and/or academic achievement via boosts in self-esteem or increased cognitive stimulation that occurs during parent-child interactions (Caughey & Owen, 2015; Caughey, O’Campo, et al., 2002; Hughes et al., 2006). So far, findings on whether this holds true for young children are somewhat inconsistent. Parents across ethnic groups in Anderson et al.’s (2015) qualitative study believed that cultural socialization and preparation for bias were integral parts of getting young children ready to enter school settings, and some empirical evidence supports this belief. Cultural socialization has been shown to increase children’s pre-academic skills in preschool (Caughey & Owen, 2015) and
science and social studies scores in kindergarten (Baker, 2014). A higher number of cultural items in young children’s homes were shown to be associated with greater factual knowledge and problem solving skills (Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002). Nonetheless, Barbarin and Jean-Baptiste (2013) found ethnic socialization was not a significant predictor of 4-year-olds’ cognitive skills, adjustment problems, or social competence, and Caughy, O’Campo, and colleagues (2002) similarly reported non-significant findings of preparation for bias effects on preschoolers’ cognitive scores and behavior problems. Studies of cognitive and academic outcomes related to ethnic-racial socialization in early childhood are only now emerging, and future studies may want to tease out how imparting cultural knowledge to children may improve their cognitive development and success in school.

**Social-Emotional functioning.** Attempts are also being made to examine whether ethnic-racial socialization with young children promotes better social-emotional functioning. As is the case for academic outcomes, social-emotional functioning could increase in children who experience ethnic-racial socialization by means of higher levels of self-esteem (Caughy & Owen, 2015, Hughes et al., 2006), other mediating/moderating relationships yet unstudied, or direct effects. Results from recent studies have found positive links between both cultural socialization and ethnic socialization in home environments and children’s social-emotional development. In a diverse sample of 2- and 3-year-old children (54% African American, 16% Hispanic, 1% Mexican American, 29% biracial), Anton (2009) found a significant negative relationship between socialization measured with the Ethnic Home Environment Inventory (adapted from the AHEI) and child behavior problems. In older children (Mean ages of siblings were 13.9 and 10.3), cultural socialization was associated with lower depression scores (McHale et al., 2006), and younger children who received messages promoting racial pride and cultural heritage had
fewer behavior problems (Caughy & Owen, 2015; Johnston et al., 2007). In a study conducted in the Caribbean, Roopnarine, Krishnakumar, Narine, Logie, and Lape (2013) found that ethnic socialization mediated associations between parenting practices and preschoolers’ prosocial behavior. Others have found that while ethnic environments and cultural socialization seem to positively influence young children’s behavior, preparation for bias messages may be linked to increases in behavioral issues (Caughy et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2007).

In the current study, social-emotional functioning is narrowed to a focus on self-regulation, an important component of development that grows rapidly in preschool-age children. Shonkoff and Phillips (2000) define self-regulation as controlling bodily functions, managing emotions, and maintaining focus and attention. As noted by Florez (2011), self-regulation is not an isolated skill but is used across developmental systems. Because self-regulation is a means through which children translate experiences into information that contributes to their ability to control thoughts and behaviors (Blair & Diamond, 2008), it is central to “understanding processes through which children adapt to and learn in formal school settings” (Blair & Razza, 2007, p. 643). Adults who engage in ethnic-racial socialization likely have complicated conversations with children that involve high-order thinking, thus resulting in increased ability for children to self-regulate.

Research has shown that various forms of self-regulation in young children is linked to academic outcomes and school readiness with preschoolers (Blair & Razza, 2007; Denham, 2006; Morrison, Ponitz, & McClelland, 2010; Ponitz, McClelland, Matthews, & Morrison, 2009; Ursache, Blair, & Raver, 2012). Ethnic-racial socialization has been associated with social-emotional functioning, broadly speaking, but minimal attention has been paid to the relationship between ethnic-racial socialization and self-regulation specifically. In fact, in the only study
found in this area of inquiry, Chen et al. (2015) found that enculturation had a direct negative effect on Chinese American immigrant children’s ($M_{age} = 7.4$) English literacy skills, but effortful control mediated the relationship between parents’ enculturation messages and children’s academic outcomes in a positive direction.

As can be seen from the studies presented here, research carried out with older children and adolescents has shown mostly positive effects of cultural socialization messages (Banerjee et al., 2011; Bowman & Howard, 1985; McHale et al., 2006; Neblett et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2003), but outcomes of preparation for bias messages have received mixed results (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002; Johnson, 2001; McHale et al., 2006). It is unclear whether preparation for bias serves as a protective factor for future incidence of racism and discrimination or if these messages have unintended negative effects on children’s self-esteem and social functioning. Results on the associations between ethnic-racial socialization and social-emotional functioning in younger children were scarce yet appeared to show a similar pattern of positive benefits from cultural socialization (Baker, 2014; Caughy & Owen, 2015; Johnston et al., 2007) but potential negative effects of messages pertaining to discrimination and bias (Caughy et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2007). Egalitarianism was only used as a predictor in one study and did not show a significant association with young children’s racial attitudes (Pahlke et al., 2012).

**Ethnic-Racial Socialization at School**

Young children transitioning from the home context to childcare and school settings are surrounded by new agents of socialization such as teachers, peer groups, classroom materials, and program structural components that may or may not be congruent with their home culture. Research on early childhood programs has focused minimally on racial and ethnic socialization
via teachers and school settings. In addition to the goals of preparing young children for future academic work, preschool programs play an important role in the social and emotional development of young children. A publication from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) addressed racial and ethnic learning within preschool classrooms. The following goals for learning about racial identity and fairness were identified: 1) having accurate information about their physical characteristics, 2) feeling positive (but not superior) about their racial identity, 3) having accurate information about and respect for each other’s physical characteristics, 4) demonstrating appropriate skills for challenging misinformation and stereotypes, and 5) developing nonbiased responses to racial differences (Derman-Sparks & Edwards, 2010). The publication, written for an audience of early childhood educators, made reference to previous research in which learning color names is applied to skin color among toddlers (Ramsey, 2008); three-year-old children question their own and others’ attributes related to racial identity, language, gender, and physical disabilities (Derman-Sparks, Ramsey & Edwards, 2006); and four-year-olds’ acknowledge family structure and economic class differences (Tatum, 2003).

Again, literature on parental ethnic-racial socialization is abundant; research on ethnic-racial socialization in childcare settings is not. Methods proposed and used by parents to communicate racial pride and promote ethnic identity likely also exist to varying degrees in preschool classrooms. Only a handful of studies were found on teachers’ use of ethnic-racial socialization explicitly. Much of the emphasis has been on investigating multicultural curricula and different components within classrooms, including a sizeable body of work on interventions to reduce prejudice and bias in children.
Ethnic-racial socialization by teachers. Some teachers have expressed feeling more comfortable or felt it was more acceptable to discuss culture rather than race or racism with children (Priest et al., 2016). Seventy-one percent of teachers rated “giving students the right to maintain/develop their cultural heritage” as an important goal of multicultural education (Forrest, Lean, & Dunn, 2016). Preparation for bias messages are less frequently used by teachers, and only two research studies were found that included measures reflecting dimensions of preparation for bias. In one study (Smith et al., 2003), fourth grade teachers’ racial attitudes (perception of barriers) were significantly related to their African American students’ racial attitudes (level of mistrust and perception of barriers but not ethnic-racial pride). In turn, children with higher ethnic-racial pride had better grades and scored higher on standardized tests, but racial distrust and perception of barriers was associated with reduced academic performance (Smith et al., 2003). In the second study (Walton et al., 2014), teachers in elementary schools with higher proportions of students of color were found to use socialization messages focusing on preparation for bias with an emphasis on racism.

Of the socialization strategies outlined by Hughes and her colleagues (2006), egalitarian messages appear most frequently in studies of school settings. Much of this work is primarily being piloted in countries outside the US. Consistent with research on parents in the US, terminology and conceptualization of teachers’ use of egalitarianism in other countries has shown tremendous variation. In a study in Australia, Walton and others (2014) differentiated three types of egalitarian approaches witnessed in focus groups and short-term classroom observations. All three types included a focus on shared humanity but differed in their approach to discussions of racial and ethnic differences. A distributive-justice color-blind approach recognized cultural differences and included teachers engaging in conversations related to
racism; procedural-justice color-blindness discounted the relevance of racial and ethnic differences; and a color-mute orientation fostered silence about race. A similar grouping was proffered by Aldana and Byrd (2015): egalitarianism de-emphasizes group membership and promotes value of individual qualities, color-blind messages do the same but deny the relevance of race, and silence about race is avoidance of discussing race and ethnicity altogether.

In Norway, egalitarianism that denies the relevance of race—or procedural-justice color-blindness in Walton et al.’s (2014) terminology—was used in preschool and first grade classrooms (Aukrust & Rydland, 2009). During naturalistic observations of children’s discussions of diversity, teachers responded to child-initiated questions that maintained difference in a manner that suggested it is not something that should be of concern. When children were discussing ethnic differences in one instance, the teacher intervened, “Does it matter?” and followed-up with her own response, “No.” The authors concluded that, overall, teachers seemed to de-emphasize the role of ethnic origin and left it to children to introduce topics of race and ethnicity.

Parents and teachers in Australia also mainly discussed race when children brought up the topic. A common response was to dismiss racism as wrong without explaining why (Priest et al., 2016). Seventy-seven percent of teachers listed developing shared values as most important for multicultural education in contrast to 67% who agreed that racism is a problem in Australian society, and 51% who agreed that racism is a problem in Australian schools (Forrest et al., 2016). Diverting or silencing conversations on race happened more frequently in suburban schools than urban schools (Priest et al., 2016).

**School environments and multicultural curricula.** Just as the home environment is an important component of ethnic-racial socialization within the family context, so too is the
physical environment of the classroom when the child is at school. To aid young children in their learning of racial and ethnic concepts during early school experiences, preschool programs often look to multicultural education materials as a guide (Aboud & Levy, 2000; Bernstein, Zimmerman, Werner-Wilson, & Vosburg, 2000; Perkins & Mebert, 2005; Lee, Ramsey, & Sweeney, 2008). Global rating scales like the ECERS-R (Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2005) assess multicultural education through activities promoting diversity and measure the presence of multicultural materials such as books and dolls present in the classroom. However, reviews of the effectiveness of multicultural curricula (Aboud & Levy, 2000; Bigler, 1999; Short & Carrington, 1996) have been mixed. For example, a meta-analysis of the effects of multicultural education on children’s racial attitudes revealed an effect size of .21 for studies that included children between the ages of 3 and 8 (Okoye-Johnson, 2011). Cohen (1988) classifies this as a small effect. The mean effect size for children ages 9-16 was .75, a medium effect (Cohen). These outcomes are in the opposite direction of earlier findings that claimed multicultural education is more effective with preschool and kindergarten children than with children in older age groups (Banks, 1991).

A few studies have looked at whether introducing multicultural components in classrooms has any effect on children’s knowledge of racial groups and subsequent attitudes. Perkins and Mebert (2005) conducted a comparison of children attending schools with multicultural and emergent curricula versus those in schools without such curricula. They measured domain-specific racial knowledge by assessing racial awareness (i.e., “Which one is the [White, Black, Japanese] boy/girl?”), and racial similarities and differences (i.e., “Can you tell me how these two children are similar/different?”). While they found no center-type differences on the racial awareness task, the authors did find that children in preschools with
multicultural components and emergent curricula gave almost twice as many responses during interviews when asked to generate a list of similarities and differences between racial groups. Bernstein et al. (2000) found similar results when measuring children’s classification skills through photo-sorting tasks administered via pre- and post-tests following an eight-week intervention designed to increase diversity awareness. The intervention consisted of family themes that differed each week (e.g., Asian American Families, Single-Parent Families, Racially Blended Families) and included a family story presented using flannel boards, books, or other storytelling tools. It was discovered that children in the experimental group, when asked to “put people who go together in the same pile” during the post-test, classified photographs of people using three dimensions: gender, age, and race/ethnicity. This was significantly different than children in the control group, who primarily classified photographs only according to race/ethnicity (Bernstein et al., 2000).

Related studies (Houlette et al., 2004; Perkins & Mebert, 2005; Persson & Musher-Eizenman, 2003) have tended to support the notion that specific interventions increase children’s understanding and awareness of issues related to diversity but do not appear to have an impact on children’s expressions of racial attitudes. Five- to six-year-old children in an experimental group who watched a prejudice-prevention television program four times over the course of several weeks continued to exhibit pro-White attitudes during post-tests (Persson & Musher-Eizenman, 2003). Similarly, 6- to 7-year-old children displayed increases in their ability to recognize instances of exclusion after intervention, but there were no significant changes in racial attitudes (Connolly & Hosken, 2006).

To conclude, teachers’ direct messages of ethnic-racial socialization may be more strongly related to children’s racial attitudes and academic and social outcomes than subtle
environmental messages common in multicultural curricula and targeted interventions (Connolly & Hosken, 2006; Persson & Musher-Eizenman, 2003). Although teachers, especially those of young children, may not overtly endorse any one racial or ethnic socialization strategy, their viewpoints and perspectives do influence the preschoolers in their care. Moreover, the physical environment of the preschool classroom plays an important role in how children come to view the world. The importance of these early childhood education components has been acknowledged in recommendations and publications by organizations such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Early Childhood Education International, and the National Association for Multicultural Education. This aside, studies specific to ethnic-racial socialization within early childcare settings are rare. Because young children spend considerable amounts of time with individuals outside of the family, preschool and early childhood education classrooms are important contexts to consider in the study of ethnic-racial socialization.

**Home-School Match**

The crux of this research project was examination of differences between home and school ethnic-racial socialization, a narrowed construct of what has been termed *home-school match* (Barbarin, Downer, Odom, & Head, 2010) or referred to as *cultural discontinuity* (Tyler et al., 2008). The mismatch hypothesis or cultural discontinuity hypothesis references racial, ethnic, or cultural differences between students’ home experiences and experiences within classroom and educational settings as a primary contributor to academic difficulties encountered by students of color (Parsons, 2003; Parsons, Travis, & Simpson, 2005; Tyler et al., 2008). While the hypothesis is well known and cited often, few empirical studies have investigated effects of
mismatch on children’s academic and developmental outcomes. Less research was found that examined ethnic-racial socialization match or mismatch during the preschool years. Taking these limitations into consideration, the following review includes studies that are tangentially related to the overall concept of home-school continuity. Research on differences and similarities of parents’ and teachers’ values, beliefs, and racial or ethnic group membership shows that continuity between the home and school environment is generally related to better outcomes for young children (Arunkumar, Midgley, & Urdan, 1999; Barbarin et al., 2010; Hauser-Cram, Sirin, & Stipek, 2003).

Several theoretical models (e.g., the bioecological model [Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006], the developmental niche [Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002], adaptive socialization [Ogbu, 1988]) stress and accompanying research substantiates the importance of connections between home and school environments for children’s cognitive and social development (Arunkumar et al., 1999; Calabrese & Underwood, 1994; Hauser-Cram et al., 2003, Miller, Hilgendorf, & Dilworth-Bart, 2014). The growing diversity in American school systems has led researchers to explore the impact of cultural differences among teachers, parents, and students on childhood development and school success. It should be noted that while diversity of the student population increases, the teaching workforce remains predominately European American (Barbarin et al., 2010; Clifford et al., 2005; NCES, 2015). Within this climate, scholars have conceived of teachers as cultural mediators (Lovelace & Wheeler, 2006) who have a responsibility to affirm the cultural backgrounds and experiences of students as developmental strengths (Gollnick & Chinn, 2013).

Ostensibly, ethnic dissonance between an adult and an environmental setting likely provides awareness of the need to enact ethnic-racial socialization (Sanders & Downer, 2012). In
other words, when classrooms are diverse, teachers may see more need to talk with children about differences in others compared to teachers in classrooms that are mostly homogeneous. For example, homogenous pre-kindergarten classrooms with teachers and students who were an ethnic match showed lower levels of acceptance of diversity as measured by the ECERS subscale (Sanders & Downer, 2012). Some have argued that studies limited to examining the match/mismatch hypothesis solely in terms of ethnic-racial background overlook that degree of match on culturally rooted beliefs and practices may be more salient in children’s academic progress and that home-school mismatch forces children of color to overcome divergent expectations, rules, values, and styles of discourse (Bandele, 2012; Barbarin et al., 2010; Harvey, Fischer, Wieneth, Hurwitz, & Sayer, 2013). Young children are most likely to encounter this barrier for the first time when entering preschool programs.

Culturally rooted beliefs include collectivistic and individualistic value systems (see Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002 for a detailed discussion of these terms and a meta-analysis of studies on these constructs) that can easily be mapped onto ethnic-racial socialization strategies of egalitarianism and cultural socialization. For example, individualistic societies such as the US tend to promote self-worth, individual achievement and freedom and rights of the individual (Oyserman et al., 2002); egalitarianism has been described similarly in the ethnic-racial socialization literature. Egalitarian beliefs promote individualism through equality in this context. By contrast, collectivist cultures tend to value the needs of the larger unit—families, groups, nations—above the individual (Oyserman et al.). Cultural socialization aligns with collectivism through promotion of cultural pride and a sense of belonging within ethnic and racial groups. Because no studies were found that examined home-school match on ethnic-racial socialization specifically, findings on parent and teacher differences on measures of culturally
rooted beliefs related to individualism and collectivism are presented to help provide a foundation for the current study.

In the Bridging Cultures Project, teachers who initially responded to immigrant Latino parents and children in ways characteristic of individualism showed evidence of a move toward understanding, awareness, and even inclusion of collectivist goals at the end of the project (Rothstein-Fisch et al., 2009). Through observations and workshops, changes were recorded in teachers’ thinking and practice as teachers started to make their implicit assumptions about the immigrant families in their classrooms explicit. Teachers first acknowledged and then confronted their own beliefs that parents of children in their classrooms were wrong in their childrearing practices. A similar theme was found in a study of teacher candidates participating in a short-term cultural immersion (Addleman, Brazo, Dixon, Cevallos, & Wortman, 2014). Through discussions, teacher candidates acknowledged their unconscious assumptions about cultural differences. Whereas one group tended to engage in value judgments that were mostly negative, other groups moved beyond value judgments to critical reflection, reexamination of their own beliefs, and willingness to consider other perspectives (Addleman et al., 2014). Linking cultural beliefs to child outcomes, Sirin, Ryce, and Mir (2009) found that when teachers perceived parents as having discrepant education-related values (discipline, parent’s role in child’s education, teaching math, literacy and writing), their reports of children’s internalizing and externalizing behavior problems were more negative and children performed more poorly on academic measures.

A second study linking match or mismatch of parent and teacher beliefs to child outcomes included children transitioning from a publicly sponsored Pre-k program to kindergarten (Barbarin et al., 2010). Findings revealed absolute differences between parents’ and
teachers’ socialization beliefs and practices for authoritarianism, support, and control. Categorical match-mismatch (i.e., parent-teacher pairs of low-low, high-low, high-high or low-high) but not absolute measures were associated with children’s receptive and expressive vocabulary skills (for authoritarian beliefs), social competence and problem behaviors (support practices), and all child cognitive and social outcomes except math skills (control practices). Future studies may want to replicate these findings by employing a directional approach in examining the home-school mismatch hypothesis. As shown in the few studies that were found on cultural discontinuity and child outcomes, effects of mismatch on children’s development signal the need for collaboration between teachers and parents.

Summary

What Sirin et al. (2009) have described as an “impoverished mesosystem” with little congruence between home and school settings appears to affect children’s academic skills and socioemotional development. Since the 1980s, the mismatch phenomenon has been discussed in the education literature, but empirical studies are only now beginning to address this concern. The small number of studies reviewed here revealed that convergence between settings has benefits for children, but it has yet to be determined if the opposite is true. In other words, does mismatch indeed have the hypothesized adverse effects on children? Some have postulated that mismatch—dependent upon the area of investigation—could instead have positive effects vis-à-vis children gaining in one context what is lacking in the other (Barbarin et al., 2010). There is a dire need for investigations to parse out directional influences of divergence or convergence in ethnic-racial socialization between children’s home and school settings.
In all, the literature reviewed here has shown that ethnic-racial socialization influences different aspects of the development of children from diverse backgrounds. Parents’ use of ethnic-racial socialization strategies has shown positive associations with children’s cognitive and socioemotional development (Anglin & Wade, 2007; Barr & Neville, 2008; Bennett, 2007; Caughey et al., 2006; Neblett et al., 2008; Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002), but the lack of empirical evidence that children’s racial attitudes are a direct reflection of parent attitudes provides support for the possibility of other factors at work in shoring up children’s understanding about their heritage (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Castelli, Zogmaister, & Tomelleri, 2009). Many researchers (Hamm, 2001; Hughes et al., 2006; White-Johnson et al., 2010) have stated the need to examine school settings, but research on this important context for racial-ethnic socialization is limited. The small number of studies that have looked at ethnic-racial socialization within school settings have found that preschools with multicultural curricula tend to have children who are more aware of diversity and open to others from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds (Bernstein et al., 2000), that teachers have an important role in ethnic-racial socialization (Smith et al., 2003; Walton et al., 2014), and that home-school continuity has positive effects on children’s development (Arunkumar et al., 1999; Hauser-Cram et al., 2003). Previous studies have paved the way for future research to fill in the gaps of how homes and schools interact to influence young children’s development as they recognize differences among groups within their social worlds.

Having said that, there are a number of limitations to studies on ethnic-racial socialization. Key among them is a lack of clear theoretical and conceptual models regarding the complex set of factors associated with processes of ethnic-racial socialization and early childhood development. This is further complicated by a continued lack of consensus on
terminology within the ethnic-racial socialization literature and streams of research that branch into separate areas divided by the ethnic and racial groups under study. It is acknowledged that parents and caregivers embrace ethnic-racial socialization to differing degrees and for different reasons, and that all families socialize children with regard to race and ethnicity, either explicitly or implicitly. It is important to determine the effects of parents’ and teachers’ beliefs and behaviors on young children’s developmental progress.

As suggested above, another limitation of prior work in this area is the primary focus on adolescents and young adults. Some studies have included children in middle childhood, but few have assessed racial-ethnic socialization with children during the preschool years, a developmental period that has been credited for laying the foundation for children’s cognitive and social development and for the transition to formal schooling (see Brown & Jernigan, 2012; Burchinal, Peisner-Feinberg, Pianta, & Howes, 2002). Although a common misconception exists that preschool children are too young to notice racial differences or ascribe meaning to social constructs, research has shown otherwise (Aboud, 2003; Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001). Because increasing numbers of young children are spending greater amounts of time in childcare settings and with caregivers other than parents, studies on ethnic-racial socialization in early childhood settings take on greater meaning in terms of addressing the care and education of our nation’s diverse preschool population in a culturally-developmentally appropriate manner (see Derman-Sparks & Edwards, 2010).

The present study builds on previous work on ethnic-racial socialization in two key ways. First, by including parents from differing ethnic and racial backgrounds, it broadened the focus to include multi-racial children, a growing group in the US. Using the combined concept _ethnic-racial socialization_, rather than racial socialization, it sought to investigate practices that occur in
families across racial and ethnic groups, including European American families. Comparisons among different ethnic and racial groups permitted the delineation of emphasis placed on particular modes of ethnic-racial socialization in different groups. It would be a mistake to assume that all ethnic and racial groups place similar emphasis on the same focus (e.g., bias) in discussions about race and ethnicity with young children.

The inclusion of early childhood teachers and the examination of parent-teacher differences considers the recommendations by theorists (e.g., Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006, Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002) and researchers (e.g., Johnson, Jaeger, Randolph, Cauce, & Ward, 2003; Priest et al., 2014) to focus on diverse factors within families, schools, and neighborhoods that instigate developmental processes. Increasingly, researchers are moving away from deficit models toward more resilient-adaptive approaches to studying children and families across cultural settings and groups (see Clauss-Ehlers, 2008; Yoo & Lee, 2005). In the current study, racial-ethnic socialization is viewed as an asset in early childhood socialization in home and school contexts. Furthermore, this study provides a test of the cultural mismatch hypothesis that calls attention to potential discontinuity between the home and early childhood environments, a major concern in appropriately attending to the developmental needs of young children, not to mention implications for children’s social development. No other studies were found that specifically addressed this aim. Therefore, this study adds an important piece to the puzzle of complex interactions that contribute to the early social development of children—self-regulation. In the following chapter, the major tenets of some salient conceptual models that guided the present work are discussed.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

A number of theoretical and conceptual frameworks have been used to examine child development in context and culture-specific processes as they influence and shape early socialization across ethnic and cultural groups. These primarily include theoretical orientations and models with dimensions of interactions among contexts and the distal and proximal processes that influence them—the primary focus of the current study. Among them are the bioecological model of human development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), the developmental niche model (Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002), and the conceptual model for the study of child development in minority populations (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). Broader frameworks that posit the influence of race within society hold some relevance to the current study as well, for example, critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), discussions of egalitarian versus colorblind ideologies (Hughes et al., 2006; Pahlke et al., 2012; Schofield, 2001; Ullucci & Battey, 2011; Walton et al., 2014), and cultural discontinuity in schooling (Ogbu, 1982). Other conceptualizations of childhood development (e.g., anti-colonial theory) have incorporated oppression by dominant groups as affecting the cultural psyche of individuals and their identity development (Sefa Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001). This chapter discusses some of the major tenets of the bioecological model, the developmental niche framework, the conceptual model of minority child development, and critical race theory. Ogbu’s (1988) view of primary and secondary cultural differences in child development is discussed when pertinent. The role of these models and theory in the selection of the measures used and the construction of the research questions and hypotheses are then considered.

3 The term minority is used here in keeping with terminology of the original model, although it is acknowledged that current literature has moved away from usage of the term.
Bioecological Model of Development

The major tenets of the bioecological model of human development served as a foundation for the current study. However, only the basic outlines of the “mature” state of the theory are presented here (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). As Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield, and Karnik (2009) emphasized, Urie Bronfenbrenner repeatedly referred to the changing nature of the model and engaged in self-criticism of previous versions, therefore it is crucial that empirical studies utilizing the model be explicit with reference to which version—and whether the complete model or partial model—is employed. In this study, I incorporated the first three aspects of the process-person-context-time [PPCT] model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006); as the study is cross-sectional, investigation of time did not occur. More detailed discussion of the bioecological model and elements of other parenting frameworks are presented in Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006), Belsky (1984), and Darling and Steinberg (1993).

The bioecological model proposes that child development is the result of both direct and indirect influences and defines development as “a phenomenon of continuity and change in the biopsychological characteristics of humans, both as individuals and as groups” (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006, p. 793). Key properties in the consideration of growth and development in this model include process, person, context, and time. The primary mechanisms for producing human development are processes, or interactions occurring on a regular basis between an organism and different facets of the environment (e.g., feeding routines, solitary and peer play, learning new skills). Proximal processes are direct interactions in which humans engage, and distal processes are those outside of the immediate external environment that impose indirect influences on development. In the current study, ethnic-racial socialization practices (communications) of
parents and teachers toward preschool-aged children were the proximal processes under investigation.

The importance of ethnic-racial socialization in child development has been established in a body of work that involves imbuing children with knowledge about their ancestral ties/heritage (see reviews by Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Priest et al., 2014) and subsequent contributions to racial and ethnic identity (Branch & Newcombe, 1986; Knight et al., 1993; O’Connor et al., 2000; Peck et al., 2004; Quintana et al., 1999), academic achievement (Banerjee et al., 2011; Caughy & Owen, 2015; Neblett et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2003) and social-emotional outcomes (Bennett, 2007; Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002; Caughy & Owen, 2015; Johnston et al., 2007; McHale et al., 2006; Yasui et al., 2015). Ethnic-racial socialization can buffer the impact of racism and negative stereotypes on child and adolescent development via promotion of self-esteem and ethnic or racial pride (Brown, 2008; Bynum et al., 2007; Harris-Britt et al., 2007; Neblett et al., 2006).

In the bioecological model, proximal processes such as parent and teacher ethnic-racial socialization that affect child development vary according to characteristics of the developing person and of the environment (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Demand characteristics are those that represent immediate stimulus and invite or discourage reactions from the surrounding environment, compared to resource (ability, experience, knowledge, skill) or force (behavioral dispositions, temperament) characteristics. Demand characteristics are represented in the current study by ethnic-racial group membership. In line with previous research (for reviews see Phinney, 1990; Phinney & Ong, 2007), group membership is related to ethnic and racial identity, which in turn influences ethnic-racial socialization interactions between parents and children (Benner & Kim, 2009; Hughes, 2003; Scottham & Smalls, 2009; White-Johnson et al., 2010).
Characteristics of the environment influencing development are represented by context in the PPCT model and include four interrelated systems. The innermost settings include home and classroom environments, among others, in which interactions with parents, teachers, and other family members are paramount in aiding or assuaging human developmental processes. These processes occur within the microsystem. Microsystem context was explored in the current study via two settings: homes and early childhood classrooms. Because the microsystem is not limited to interactions with people but should also take into consideration symbols and objects within environments (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), the study also included measures of cultural objects and artifacts within children’s homes and classrooms.

Early childhood development primarily takes place within the context of children’s homes, and parents are viewed as children’s first teachers. Yet young children are increasingly spending larger amounts of time in childcare settings. More than a quarter of children under the age of 5 were in organized childcare centers in 2011 (US Census), and Head Start programs currently serve more than 1 million children every year (http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/about/head-start). Low-income children from challenging home and neighborhood environments have been shown to benefit from early childhood programs that are structured to meet their developmental needs by incorporating cultural practices and beliefs within the home environment and community in early childhood curricula (Currie, 2001; Howes et al., 2008; Love et al., 2005; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). For instance, the HighScope program (Schweinhart, 2007), the Abecedarian Project (Campbell, Ramey, et al., 2002; Campbell et al., 2008), and the Chicago Child-Parent Center and Expansion Program (Reynolds, Englund, Ou, Schweinhart, & Campbell, 2010; Reynolds & Temple, 1998) have shown fairly consistent positive longitudinal effects on children’s cognitive and social outcomes.
While some have found that positive effects gained from participation in Head Start and Early Head Start programs may fade out during elementary school and later years (Aughinbaugh, 2001; Lee, Brooks-Gunn, Schnur, & Liaw, 1990), others have suggested this may be due to low quality of schools attended by previous enrollees (Lee & Loeb, 1995; Lipsey, Farran, & Hofer, 2015).

Interconnections between environments (e.g., home and school) constitute the mesosystem within the bioecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and have the potential to be more important for encouraging or suppressing development than direct influences (e.g., parent-teacher relationships). As with many studies that have employed propositions from the bioecological model, the current study focuses on these interconnections within the mesosystem. Differences in ethnic-racial socialization between parents and preschool teachers represent mesosystem level influences through the study of continuity between contexts. Issues of continuity and discontinuity in socialization practices have been addressed by developmentalists for decades (e.g., Caspi & Roberts, 2001; Ho, 1989; Roberts, Block, & Block, 1984; Schulenberg, Maggs, & O’Malley, 2003). Conceptual exploration of discontinuity continues in contemporary literature (Cartledge & Loe, 2001; Foster, Lewis, & Onafowora, 2003; Howard, 2001; Tyler et al., 2008), but a few empirical studies have found divergence of socialization beliefs and practices between the home and school environments can lead to poor academic skills (Arunkumar et al., 1999; Barbarin et al., 2010; Hauser-Cram et al., 2003) and emotional well-being (Arunkumar et al., 1999) in children. The current study investigates discontinuity by including a measure of the difference between parent and teacher socialization.

The final two systems within the bioecological model include the exosystem and macrosystem. The exosystem links two or more contexts, one of them being a context that does
not directly include the developing person (e.g., the family system of peers). The *macrosystem* includes ideologies of the larger culture or society. A final dimension is that developmental processes unfold within these systems over time.

Propositions within the bioecological model have been widely used in developmental literature and tested in diverse cultural communities around the world. Collectively, publications of bioecological models during various stages of development have been cited more than 5,000 times. Of these, many studies have examined processes within one or more of the nested systems and developmental outcomes in children and adolescents (e.g., Adamsons, O’Brien, & Pasley, 2007; Campbell, Pungello, & Miller-Johnson, 2002; Mashburn et al., 2008; Riggins-Caspers, Cadoret, Knutson, & Langbehn, 2003; Tudge, Odero, Hogan, & Etz, 2003). Other parenting conceptual frameworks, such as the parenting process model (Belsky, 1984), that are based in part on the bioecological model have delineated socialization processes within and external to families. For instance, the parenting process model has been instrumental in guiding the detailed work of the Fragile Families study (McLanahan et al., 2003) on high-risk, low-income families from diverse cultural backgrounds.

**Cultural Models of Development**

After acknowledging that consideration of development-in-context in the bioecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) was a major advance in moving existing theories toward understanding the complex set of forces that influence childhood development, Super and Harkness (1986, 1997, 2002) opined the model lacked a cultural structuring. Having roots in the cultural ecological model (Whiting and Whiting, 1975), the ‘developmental niche’ is a framework that bridges anthropological and psychological theoretical lenses for study of “the
cultural regulation of the micro-environment of the child” (Super & Harknes, 1986, p. 552). The developmental niche includes three primary components: physical and social settings, customs of childcare, and psychology of caretakers. In line with this framework, children learn through daily interactions within physical and social settings first. This includes their home environment and socialization by parents, and for many young children, the physical environment of early childhood classrooms and socialization via ECE teachers. The customs of childcare within each of these niches may differ depending upon the psychology of caretakers present, for instance, at what age both parents and teachers believe it is appropriate to talk to young children about issues of race. It is from this standpoint that the current study included what Super and Harkness (1986) described as “thematic continuities and progressions across niches of childhood that provide material from which the child abstracts social, affective, and cognitive rules of the culture” (p. 552). For example, if young children have conversations about the importance of their cultural background at home but at school are taught not to notice or discuss racial and ethnic differences in others, a developmental disequilibrium may result. This is similar to what was discussed previously as child development at the mesosystem level (the interaction between microsystems) in the bioecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006).

The developmental niche has primarily been used to examine parental childrearing beliefs that originate from cultural ethnotheories and subsequent effects on children’s development (e.g., Dumka, Roosa, & Jackson, 1997; Gfellner, 1990; Hill & Bush, 2001; Narvaez et al., 2013; Penderi & Petrogiannis, 2011). It is a useful model for the conceptualization of socialization patterns as emanating from beliefs about childrearing and for reaching common developmental goals in children that are accepted by cultural communities. In view of the importance of ethnic-racial socialization for children from non-dominant groups, the
developmental niche provides an additional lens for further understanding the content of socialization messages that may protect children from negative effects related to racial and ethnic adversity (see Neblett, Rivas-Drake, & Umaña-Taylor, 2012).

As research with families continued in the decade following the introduction of the developmental niche framework (Super and Harkness, 1986), several theorists pointed to a need within developmental research to embrace an integrative approach to the study of families of color. One such framework with wide influence was proposed by García Coll and her colleagues (1996). The conceptual model for the study of child development in minority populations is grounded in social stratification theory; the model emphasizes social stratification and social position factors as core components of developmental processes. It urges movement away from traditional pitfalls such as blaming “cultural deficiency” for achievement gaps, for example. Instead, the model encourages researchers to consider constructs salient to children of color that contribute to unique variance in developmental processes, one of which is parents’ ethnic-racial socialization and children’s resulting racial or ethnic identity (García Coll et al.). It is further argued that racism affects children’s experiences through interactions in specific inhibiting and promoting environments. This is interpreted in the current study through examination of the context of early childhood education as an environment that can either prohibit or promote cultural learning. While cultural socialization likely promotes positive identities and multicultural attitudes, it may be the case that egalitarianism prohibits such development.

In their discussion of an inclusive research agenda for studying effects of early child care experiences on the development of children of color, Johnson and her colleagues (2003) posited similar ideas as they mapped García Coll et al.’s (1996) model onto early childhood education. A few seminal points from that discussion are of significance to the current study. First, these
researchers highlighted the importance of considering whether parents prefer cultural continuity between the home and childcare centers or would have early childhood settings prepare their child for success in mainstream America. It was also pointed out that childcare settings may either undermine or support parents’ efforts to develop racial coping skills and to build a healthy racial or ethnic identity in their children. The focus of this study aligns well with Johnson et al.’s (2003) proposed research agenda in very obvious ways. Although parental ideas about cultural continuity expectations were not assessed, the construct of continuity is examined via differences between parent and teacher (explicit)—and home and school environment (implicit)—ethnic-racial socialization.

Another conceptual piece that informed the current study was conceived by Ogbu (1982), who argued that cultural competencies acquired by children in their communities are often different from the competencies they are required to demonstrate at school. Ogbu sought to refine the cultural discontinuity hypothesis by distinguishing between those that are universal, primary and secondary. Universal discontinuities result from transition between home and school contexts and are experienced by all children, to some degree. Primary cultural differences are those that existed before two cultural backgrounds came into contact, such as differences that result from immigration. Secondary cultural differences occur as a result of contact, often under conditions of subordination. Ogbu describes secondary cultural differences in the US that are experienced by “involuntary minorities” who were forced into American society via slavery (African Americans) or conquest (Native Americans, Mexican Americans) and have since been denied true assimilation through structural and institutional oppression. Cultural differences in this context are often formed in opposition to White American culture and serve as coping mechanisms under instances of subordination. A consequence of an oppositional social identity
is that differences are not interpreted as barriers but as components of identity that must be maintained, resulting in greater difficulty crossing cultural boundaries. By including multiple racial and ethnic groups in this study as one dimension of cultural discontinuity, it was possible to describe whether differences between parents and teachers in the sample appear to be universal—experienced by all children—or if there is evidence of primary and secondary differences in accordance with Ogbu’s postulation.

**Critical Race Theory and Colorblind Ideology**

Critical race theory (CRT) was first developed within legal frameworks to call attention to the prevalence of racism, discrimination, and oppression within US culture and institutions and the subsequent need to first acknowledge the power of race before attempting to determine its effects on individuals and society (Delgado & Stefanicic, 2001). It has since expanded to academic disciplines including sociology and education to delineate the impact of racial inequalities in our society (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Basic principles of CRT include: a) race as a central component of social networks, b) racism is institutionalized, c) racialized social systems are reproduced by those within the system, and d) racial and ethnic identities are not fixed (Burton, Bonilla-Silva, Ray, Buckelew, & Hordge Freeman, 2010). Although there are research studies that have explored the impact of racism and discrimination on mental health (Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Pieterse, Todd, Neville, & Carter, 2012; Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000), school performance (Ogbo, 2003; Stone & Han, 2005; Wayman, 2002), and social adjustment (Brody et al., 2006; Neblett et al., 2008; Priest et al., 2013), the factors within home environments that would help to stave off the pernicious effects of racism and discrimination have received limited attention.
Of pertinence here is CRT’s connection to the concept of egalitarianism, a component of ethnic-racial socialization. As discussed previously, egalitarianism is conceptually based upon the premise of equal value of humans and the subsequent approach to equality within social systems (Hughes et al., 2006; Pahlke et al., 2012; Schofield, 2001; Ullucci & Battey, 2011; Walton et al., 2014). In previous literature, egalitarianism has sometimes been equated with colorblindness, yet colorblindness has been critiqued for failing to acknowledge racial differences and the existing institutional racism within societies, thereby contributing to the ‘status quo’ (Schofield, 2001; Ullucci & Battey, 2011). In attempts to differentiate what constitutes egalitarianism versus colorblind ideologies, scholars have introduced procedural-justice and distributive-justice demarcation (e.g., Aveling, 2007; Knowles et al., 2009; Walton et al., 2014). Procedural-justice has a focus on equal processes and meritocracy; this concept is more closely aligned with colorblind definitions. Proponents of procedural-justice might argue that by not seeing color or race, there is no basis for racist actions and discriminations. By comparison, distributive-justice implores a focus on equal outcomes, sometimes necessary through unequal means (e.g., affirmative action) (Walton et al., 2014). To further clarify, the two dimensions differentiate a focus on treating people equally versus a focus on ensuring that people of different groups have equal opportunities and equivalent outcomes. Parent and teacher messages in the current study could be akin to a procedural-justice approach if equality among groups is discussed in the absence of other racial and ethnic issues. Alternatively, a distributive-justice approach may include teaching children about human equality while at the same time promoting value of cultural differences. In classrooms, this could mean the difference between teachers who act as if they do not “see” color, thereby avoiding racial discussion and those who
strive for equal outcomes of all children by acknowledging and incorporating cultural backgrounds and beliefs into the classroom community.

Researchers have begun to conceptualize ways that colorblind and/or egalitarian ideologies operate within classrooms, but empirical studies are lacking on this topic. It is possible that teachers avoid discussing racial and ethnic differences in classrooms out of fear that such conversations invite prejudice into young children’s minds, what has been referred to as the “race talk dilemma” (Pauker, Apfelbaum, & Spitzer, 2015). Research has not substantiated such claims. In the meantime, teachers’ colorblind attitudes have been shown to be negatively associated with multicultural teaching competence (Spanierman & Soble, 2010) and low levels of diversity awareness (Wang, Castro, & Cunningham, 2014). This study contributes to the body of work seeking to address teachers’ use of egalitarian messages with young children and adds questions on whether teachers’ beliefs and practices align with messages that children receive from parents.

Summary

The models and theoretical orientations discussed above stress cultural and developmental considerations in understanding factors that aid and abet children’s social and cognitive competence within and across socialization systems. Some (Caughy et al., 2006; Hughes, 2003; Pahlke et al., 2012) underline the centrality of race in US society and illuminate the importance of ethnic-racial socialization in the lives of young children at a critical period of development—the preschool years. Given that research findings (see Neblett et al., 2012) demonstrate the need to consider protective factors within the home environment and relations to the social and cognitive development of children of color, ethnic-racial socialization was selected
as the major predictor of children’s social development. Previous studies have confirmed the salience of ethnic-racial socialization in the lives of children from marginalized groups (for reviews see Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown et al., 2006, Priest et al., 2014). Drawing from the body of work discussed in Chapter 3, ethnic-racial socialization has been related to higher self-esteem (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002), positive racial and ethnic identity (O’Connor et al., 2000; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004), academic (Smith et al., 2003) and social behaviors (Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002). It has also been demonstrated that ethnic-racial socialization acts as a buffer to experiences of racism and discrimination at later ages (Bynum et al., 2007; Harris-Britt et al., 2007).

Because family socialization practices are culturally situated (Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002) and vary across ethnic and cultural groups, it is important to examine racial and ethnic differences in parents’ use of ethnic-racial socialization with children. It appears that ethnic-racial socialization is dependent upon sociodemographic characteristics of parents as well as their previous experiences with racism and discrimination (Benner & Kim, 2009; Crouter et al., 2008; Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Iqbal, 2014; White-Johnson et al., 2010). Bronfenbrenner proposed the need for studying interactions between contexts (the mesosystem), Super and Harkness (1986) emphasized the relevance of thematic continuity across childhood niches, and Ogbu (1982) extended differentiation of types of cultural discontinuity in schooling. Thus, the current study examined differences in ethnic-racial socialization between home and early childhood education contexts and between parents and teachers, two major sources of socialization for children in the US.

In an effort to examine a distributive-justice approach—or equal outcomes as opposed to equal treatment—to ethnic-racial socialization in educational settings (Walton et al., 2014),
Children’s self-regulation was introduced into the model as an outcome measure. Children’s self-regulatory skills were chosen because of associations with later social adjustment and their implication for the transition to formal schooling (Blair & Razza, 2007; Bulotsky-Shearer & Fantuzzo, 2011; Sektnan, McClelland, Acock, & Morrison, 2010; Ursache et al., 2012; Zimmerman, 1994). Furthermore, studies have found lower income children exhibit less self-regulation than children from higher income households (Evans & Rosenbaum, 2008; Galindo & Fuller, 2010; Sektnan, McClelland, Acock & Morrison, 2010), perhaps due to poverty-related stressors that may compromise children’s social-emotional development (Evans, 2003). Thus, using self-regulation as an outcome measure provides much needed information on the social functioning of low-income children that can be of use to school personnel.

**Research Questions**

Relying on propositions within the bioecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), developmental niche (Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002), critical race theory, the conceptual model for the study of child development in minority populations (García Coll et al., 1996), and discussions of cultural discontinuity in schooling (Ogbu, 1982), this study sought answers to the following questions regarding divergence or convergence of home and school ethnic-racial socialization in Head Start programs and links to children’s social skills:

1. Are there ethnic-racial group differences in caregivers’ beliefs and practices of ethnic-racial socialization?

2. Does home and school ethnic-racial socialization tend to match or mismatch? Are there ethnic-racial group differences in match between home and school?
3. Is match between home and school socialization associated with children’s self-regulation? Is there a difference in results when match is measured dichotomously, categorically, or continuously?
Chapter 4: Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited from 12 center-based Head Start programs in Upstate New York. The research project gained approval from the Institutional Review Board at Syracuse University (see Appendix A) and from the Head Start Executive Director for the area (see Appendix B). Teachers in classrooms with children between the ages of 3 and 5 were contacted through email, which was accompanied by a brief description of the study (see Appendix C for recruitment materials). Subsequently, meetings were held with interested teachers individually to provide further information about the general goals of the study and the teacher’s role in it. After gaining teacher consent (see Appendix D for informed consent forms), research team members visited classrooms to solicit parent participation in the study. Parents and caregivers were approached during child drop-off/pick-up times, and flyers with a brief description of the study were distributed. Those who showed an interest in participating were asked to provide their contact information on a sign-up sheet. Those who agreed to participate were then sent survey packets via the postal mail system. Parents were given the option to complete paper forms and return the material in a postage-paid envelope or complete the survey online. Teachers who participated received a gift card of $50, and parents or caregivers who participated received a gift card of $25.

A total of 476 surveys were mailed to families over the course of one year and six months; reminder flyers were sent home with children at three different time points. Thirty-two surveys were returned by the post office as undeliverable. Sixty-three parents/caregivers completed the survey instruments, constituting a response rate of 14%. Teachers in the study
explained that low levels of participation were common among parent activities at the Head Start Centers where the study took place. Because those who did participate were dispersed among racial and ethnic groups, as well as Head Start centers and classrooms, there was no basis for further investigation of response bias.

Respondents in the current study were primarily birth mothers (87%) or grandmothers (6.5%) that ranged between 20 to 68 years of age ($\text{Md}n = 33$ years). Around one-third of caregivers had attained a high school diploma or GED; 21% had completed some university coursework. Close to half of caregivers in the sample stated their marital status as single; one-third were married. A slight majority of children in the study were female (56%), and 43% were first-born children. The average age of children in the study was 45.8 months. Because the study was situated within Head Start programs, household income and levels of socioeconomic status tended to be similar among respondents. Eligibility to participate in Head Start requires that family income be below poverty level or that families be otherwise eligible for public assistance, with a few exceptions (https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/standards/law/headstartact.html#645).

In 2014, the poverty level was $23,650 for a family of four and $31,970 for a six-member family (https://aspe.hhs.gov/2014-poverty-guidelines#guidelines).

Parents and caregivers furnished information about the ethnic-racial background of their children and themselves. Racial and ethnic categories listed in the survey mirrored those in the U.S. Census. The Census defines *White* as persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa. Provided that categories of race also include sociocultural groups and that many who identify as White co-identify as European American, these terms were listed simultaneously. Children in the study were primarily African American/Black (25.4%), European American/White (25.4%), or biracial/multiracial (20.6%),
with smaller percentages from Asian (9.5%), Hispanic (9.5%), Native American (4.8%), and Arab/Middle Eastern (4.8%) racial and ethnic backgrounds. The ethnic-racial group composition in the current study matches some aspects of the larger, national Head Start population (https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/factsheets/2015-hs-program-factsheet.html). Exceptions were that the current study included a smaller number of European American children (25% compared to 43% nationally) and a correspondingly larger number of children who were biracial or multiracial (21% compared to 10% nationally). The percentage of respondents who were Hispanic was lower than in the national Head Start population (10% compared to 38% nationally).

Of the 28 preschool teachers from Head Start programs in the area, 12 consented to participate in the study, and they worked at eight different locations. The majority of teachers self-identified as European American/White (92%); one teacher identified as African American/Black. All of the teachers were female and ranged in age from 28 to 60 years ($Mdn = 34$ years). The educational attainment of teachers varied: two had an associate degree in early childhood education or related field, three had a bachelor’s degree in early childhood education or related field, two had some postgraduate education, three had a master’s degree in early childhood education, and two had a master’s degree in a field other than early childhood education. A third of the teachers were single; another third were married. Two teachers were divorced, and two reported being in common-law/cohabiting relationships.

Children were fairly evenly distributed among the 12 classrooms participating in the study. Table 1 shows the number of children in each classroom by racial and ethnic group. Based on Census tract data, six of the eight Head Start centers were located in neighborhoods with a White population greater than 75%. Two centers were in neighborhoods with higher numbers of
African American residents (44.6% and 79.2%). The number of Hispanic residents ranged from 0-11.5%, and the number of residents who were Asian ranged from 0-10.9%. Two centers were located in areas with more than 10% American Indian residents; the largest representation of people who identified as two or more races was 5.4%.

Table 1

*Distribution of Children Among Classrooms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>European American</th>
<th>Biracial/Multiracial</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent and Teacher Measures

Parents and teachers were asked to complete sociodemographic questionnaires and a racial ethnic socialization scale that tapped into information about cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and egalitarianism (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001). Parents were also asked to fill out a home inventory scale that cataloged items and objects within the home environment that promote their racial and ethnic heritage (AHEI; Caughy, Randolph, et al., 2002). Parents filled out the questionnaires in the comfort of their homes. All scales were completed in English, and questionnaire items were constructed so that adults with a high school level education could complete them with ease.

Sociodemographic questionnaire. The parent sociodemographic questionnaire asked for basic information on parent/caregiver age, marital status, educational attainment, household composition, race/ethnicity, employment, and household income. Child information was reported for: age, gender, race/ethnicity, birth order and length of time spent in Head Start. The teacher sociodemographic questionnaire asked for information on teachers’ age, marital status, highest level of education completed, and racial/ethnic background. With respect to racial-ethnic group, both parents and teachers were asked to choose from categories that mirror census groupings with write-in options. Parents reported on the race and ethnicity of their child. Parent and teacher sociodemographic questionnaires are presented in Appendix E.

Parental Ethnic-Racial Socialization. Each parent/caregiver was asked to complete a version of the Parental Ethnic-Racial Socialization scale (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001) that was modified by Pahlke et al. (2012) for their study with preschool-age children. The scale was conceptualized on the basis of research that revealed specific dimensions of parental behaviors when communicating racial attitudes, values and information to children.
(Hughes & Chen, 1997). The scale consists of 20 items measuring how often parents communicate ethnic-racial socialization messages to children (see Appendix E). Likert-type response categories were: 1 (never), 2 (rarely), 3 (sometimes), 4 (often) and 5 (very often). Respondents also answered how important they believed talking to their child about each item would be at some point in the future, ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important). Teachers in the study completed identical versions of the measure, one for each racial or ethnic group represented in their classroom. Previous studies have used variations of this measure with African American (McHale et al., 2006; O’Connor et al., 2000), European American (Pahlke et al., 2012), Chinese American (Benner & Kim, 2009), and Latino (Hughes, 2003) samples. For this study, the scale was modified to include wording appropriate for multiple racial and ethnic groups (modified versions are presented in Appendix E).

Subscales in previous studies have included Egalitarianism ($\alpha = .89$; Pahlke et al., 2012), Cultural Socialization ($\alpha = .80$; McHale et al., 2006), Preparation for Bias ($\alpha = .80$; Benner & Kim, 2009), and Promotion of Mistrust ($\alpha = .86$; Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002). Confirmatory factor analysis of the scale is presented in the results section. Cronbach alpha scores in the current study were .91 for egalitarianism, .87 for cultural socialization, and .93 for preparation for bias. Promotion of mistrust was dropped during CFA procedures. Cronbach alphas for factors relating to the importance of future socialization were .88, .83, and .88, respectively.

Africentric Home Environment Inventory (Caughy, Randolph, et al., 2002). Ten binary items were used to measure ethnic-racial socialization via the physical environment of the home. Examples include toys, pictures, and household items promoting the family’s cultural heritage. Similar to the Parental Ethnic-Racial Socialization measure, the AHEI was developed for use with African American families and was modified for the present study to include
language and items applicable to all racial and ethnic groups (e.g., “child has culturally appropriate toys [dolls or action figures that represent his/her racial or ethnic group(s)]”). Teachers completed one AHEI for each racial or ethnic group represented in their classroom. For European American families in the study, wording referred to multicultural items in the home (e.g., “child has culturally appropriate toys [multicultural dolls or action figures]”). Modified and original scales are included in Appendix E. Authors of the measure reported internal reliability of the scale at .88; confirmatory factor analysis revealed excellent model fit ($\chi^2[27, n = 198] = 35.82, p = .12; \text{RMSEA} = .04$) (Caughey, Randolph, et al., 2002). Internal reliability in the current study was comparable, $\alpha = .82$.

**Devereux Early Childhood Assessment** (LeBuffe & Naglieri, 1999). Teachers reported on children’s social-emotional development by using the DECA, a widely used strength-based assessment of behaviors in young children that serve as protective factors. For the purposes of this study, the factor representing self-regulation (9 items; e.g., “chooses to do tasks that are challenging for him/her,” “shows patience,” “asks adults to play with or read to him/her”) was used. The assessment takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. The DECA was standardized using a nationally representative sample of 2,000 children between the ages of 2 – 5 years (LeBuffe & Naglieri, 1999). Sample characteristics were comparable to the larger US population at the time of standardization (1998). For example, 51.3% were males, and 25.4% were receiving subsidized day care. Racial and ethnic backgrounds of children in the sample very closely resembled the population at that time: 9.2% Hispanic, 73.3% White, 15.7% Black, 1.9% Asian, and 0.9% Native American. Internal consistency was assessed via teacher ratings that ranged from Cronbach alphas of .85 (attachment) to .90 (initiative and self-regulation). Teachers rated the same child on two different occasions to examine test-retest reliability of the scale;
correlations ranged from .55 - .94 and were significant at $p < .01$. Teacher pairs correlations ranged from .57 - .77 and were significantly correlated in assessment of interrater reliability, $p < .01$ (LeBuffé & Naglieri, 1999). Further examination of the psychometric properties of the DECA has produced similar results as those found in the standard sample (Crane, Mincic, & Winsler, 2011; Jaberg, Dixon, & Weis, 2009), including one study conducted with a large sample of children in Head Start ($N = 1,208$) (Lien & Carlson, 2009). DECA scores have been shown to predict elements of academic success (Dobbs, Doctoroff, Fisher, & Arnold, 2006; Fuccillo, 2008) and lower behavioral problems in later childhood (Lebuffé, Hughes, & Sperry, 2009; Sawyer, Miller-Lewis, Searle, Sawyer, & Lynch, 2015). Because DECA factors were highly correlated in the current sample, only self-regulation was used in the analyses (see Appendix E for DECA items).

**Procedures**

**Missing data.** Three families who responded had data that were missing on the ethnic-racial socialization questionnaire. Of these, one omitted the back page entirely (questions 8-20). Two respondents had only a few questions with missing scores, and these appeared to be random. For these two families, questions without a score were entered as 3, which equates to “sometimes” on the scale of current practices and “somewhat important” on the scale of beliefs regarding future socialization. For the respondent with 12 missing answers, mean scores on each of the socialization factors were substituted. One respondent failed to answer all items on the Africentric Home Environment Inventory; the mean score was substituted instead. Overall, only four of the 63 participants had missing data, and this was not deemed necessary of further analysis of effect on research design or survey results.
Analytic strategies. Analyses in the current study were completed using Bayesian techniques, chosen for several reasons. For one, small samples can run into problems with maximum likelihood [ML] estimations (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2012). ML estimations assume a normal distribution based on large-sample theory, and the relatively small sample size of the current study included several variables with skewed distributions. For example, the absolute difference scores between parents and teachers showed a positive skew. This was expected given the nature of the construct, in that the majority of scores were low values. The same is true for many variables within social sciences that are not expected to have symmetric distributions, such as depression scales. Bayesian credibility intervals are based upon percentiles of the posterior distribution and therefore allow for asymmetric distribution (Muthén, 2010).

Bayesian analytic techniques are becoming increasingly popular within social science disciplines, as evidenced by van de Schoot et al.’s (2013) report of articles published in Child Development, Developmental Psychology, and Development and Psychopathology. A primary benefit of utilizing Bayesian techniques is the inclusion of prior information. Rather than testing hypotheses that compare parameters to zero, Bayesian analyses examine probability of a model given the data, with prior knowledge. In other words, if assumptions concerning parameters can be reliably determined based upon findings in previous studies, the priors can be used in model testing and parameter estimation. This avoids subsequent researchers continually testing against null hypotheses. Rather, research can build upon previous studies to further expand knowledge of the topic of interest.

In A Gentle Introduction to Bayesian Analysis, van de Schoot and colleagues (2013) outline the three essential ingredients in Bayesian statistics: background knowledge/prior
distribution, the likelihood function (“Given a set of parameters, what is the likelihood or probability of the data in hand?”), and the posterior inference, which combines the first two.

A model parameter $\theta$ is quantified through first defining a prior distribution $p(\theta \mid M)$, where $M$ represents the statistical model, and then comparing the difference between the prior distribution and a posterior distribution that is $p(\theta \mid Y, M)$, or the probability of the parameter given the model and the data (Wetzels, Grasman, & Wagenmakers, 2012). While Bayesian estimations are concerned with the posterior distribution of model parameters, Bayesian model selection compares one model, $M_1$, with another, $M_2$, using the ratio of posterior model probabilities. The Bayes factor quantifies the change from prior to posterior odds for each model given the data (Wetzels, Grasman, & Wagenmakers) and can be utilized in T-test, ANOVA, and linear regression designs.

To answer whether racial and ethnic group differences were evident in the ethnic-racial socialization practices of the current sample, Bayesian ANOVA and contingency tables were estimated using JASP software (JASP Team, 2016). A Bayes factor greater than one indicates the model has a higher probability of being true than the null model, given the data. The most commonly cited guidelines for interpreting Bayes factor evidence are: 1-3 is not worth more than a mention, 3-20 shows positive evidence, 20-150 equates strong evidence, and $>150$ provides very strong evidence (Kass & Raftery, 1995). To answer whether home and school match was associated with children’s development of self-regulation, Bayesian path analysis was conducted using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method and Mplus statistical software (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2015). No previous studies have examined mismatch of home and school ethnic-racial socialization, therefore non-informative priors were used in the model. Model fit was assessed via the Posterior Predictive P-value (PPP) and a 95% confidence interval for
difference between the observed and replicated chi-square values. Model fit is deemed good when the confidence interval includes zero and the PPP value is around .50 (Muthén, 2010).
Chapter 5: Results

This chapter first presents results of Bayesian confirmatory factor analyses as a precursor to statistical tests related to the study’s research questions. CFA was used to determine whether the factor structure of the ethnic-racial socialization scale remained the same in the current study as those in which it has previously been employed. Next, descriptive statistics outline overall patterns of ethnic-racial socialization used by participants in the current study. Bayes factor ANOVA and contingency results are presented that address ethnic-racial group differences in parents’ ethnic-racial socialization (research question 1), and match or mismatch of parent and teacher socialization strategies are described using frequencies (research question 2a). Ethnic-racial differences in match or mismatch are presented via Bayes factor ANOVA results (research question 2b). Finally, results of Bayesian path analyses are used to determine the relationship between mismatch and children’s self-regulation (research question 3). To aid interpretation and readability of results, posterior predictive checking scatterplots and distribution plots are presented in the text, and parameter posterior distribution plots and trace plots are located in Appendix D.

Bayesian Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The ethnic-racial socialization scale developed by Hughes and colleagues (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001) has produced varying subscales in studies that included individuals from diverse backgrounds; therefore it was necessary to conduct a factor analysis of the scale. Previous studies (Caughy & Owen, 2015; Chawaka & Hoglund, 2016; Johnston et al., 2007; McHale et al., 2006; Pahlke et al., 2012) have used four subscales: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust, and egalitarianism, with slightly different
Bayesian CFA was conducted using a four-factor solution initially: four items assessed cultural socialization, seven items assessed preparation for bias, two items assessed promotion of mistrust, and seven items assessed egalitarianism. Given the similarities among measured constructs, it was not assumed that items would load onto one factor solely. Thus, priors for cross-loadings were set to allow for small variances rather than zero. Variance priors of .01 were chosen based upon comparisons of other priors detailed in Muthén’s (2010) paper.

The four factors showed very good model fit with a 95% confidence interval of the difference between observed and expected chi-square values that covered zero [-91.28, 362.24] and a posterior predictive p-value equal to .76. However, only one item loaded onto the promotion of mistrust scale (i.e., “It is best to have friends who are the same racial or ethnic group as you are”). This item was not correlated with other subscales and was therefore dropped. A second item hypothesized as promotion of mistrust loaded onto the preparation for bias scale (e.g., “One racial or ethnic group has better opportunities than other groups”) and was therefore included with this factor instead. The subscale promotion of mistrust was not included in the second model. Additionally, one item (e.g., “American society is fair to all races”) had a lower loading in comparison to other items on the egalitarianism scale (.54); this item was also dropped.

The revised model included a three-factor structure and had excellent model fit, as shown by a more narrow chi-square confidence interval that covered zero [-75.82, 39.87] and a posterior predictive p-value that was slightly lower but remained high, ppp = .73. All item loadings in the second model were equal to or above .70. Standardized factor loadings and 95% credibility indices of items in the revised model are shown in Table 2. Results from the initial
solution are shown in Appendix C. The posterior predictive checking scatterplot in Figure 1 shows good model fit, with only slight deviation from centering on the 45-degree line. Figure 2 shows the posterior predictive checking distribution of the three-factor model.

Table 2

*Bayesian Confirmatory Factor Analysis of 3-Factor Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Std ( \lambda )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egalitarianism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are equal, regardless of race or ethnic background</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to make friends with people of all backgrounds</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups just as trustworthy as own group</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all races have equal chance in life</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to appreciate people of all backgrounds</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to get along with people all races/ethnicities</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/look at books include history/traditions own group</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about history/traditions own group</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different races/ethnicities have different values/beliefs</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important people in history of own group</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation for Bias</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something unfair witnessed was due to discrimination</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People still discriminated against because race/ethnicity</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One race or ethnic group has better opportunities</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes people treated badly because of race/ethnicity</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past, people discriminated because race/ethnicity</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility might treat him/her badly due to race/ethnicity</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination or prejudice against his/her group</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination or prejudice against other groups</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All p-values < .001.
Figure 1. Posterior predictive checking scatterplot of 3-factor CFA model.

Figure 2. Posterior predictive checking distribution of 3-factor CFA model.
Descriptive Statistics

Overall, parents and caregivers in the study most often spoke to children about equality among groups, with a mean rating of 3.5 out of 5. They also ranked this as most important for socialization at later ages ($M = 4.3$). Teachers expressed similar views; they rated egalitarian messages highest in their current practice ($M = 3.4$) and highest in beliefs about the future ($M = 4.4$). Teacher reports of egalitarian messages to preschool children were slightly lower than those of parents, but teachers were higher in their beliefs about the importance of egalitarian messages at later ages.

By contrast, cultural socialization was used occasionally with an average parent rating of 3.0. Teachers engaged in cultural socialization about the same as parents ($M = 2.9$). Beliefs about the importance of imparting cultural heritage to children at some point in the future were rated as “somewhat important” by parents ($M = 4.0$) and a bit higher by teachers ($M = 4.2$). Parents and caregivers spoke to children the least about preparation for bias, with an average rating of 2.4. Teachers gave these messages even more rarely ($M = 1.9$). Yet parents saw preparation for bias as important for future socialization ($M = 3.8$). Teachers’ beliefs about the importance of preparing children for bias were lower than parent reports ($M = 3.7$).

A majority of parents reported they had items in the home pertaining to ethnic-racial socialization ($M = 13.02$, $SD = 2.08$). Seventy-three percent of families had culturally appropriate toys (i.e., toys representing the child’s ethnic-racial group or for European American children, multicultural toys), 70% had at least three children’s books that showed representation of their child’s ethnic-racial group (or multicultural books for European American children), and
73% had pictures of family members or other pictures of persons from the child’s ethnic-racial group displayed in the home. There was only one exception to this pattern; 43% of caregivers did not have 10 or more multicultural books in their home.

As with the home environment, classrooms had many items that mirrored children’s cultural backgrounds ($M = 13.58$, $SD = 1.08$). All teachers reported they had multicultural dolls and books representing the ethnic-racial groups of children in the classroom, and 75% of classrooms had photos of family members or others with similar ethnic-racial backgrounds as the students in the classrooms. However, most classrooms (58%) did not have 10 or more multicultural books, and 48% reported that they did not have toys that facilitate the learning of cultural histories of students.

To recap: parent and caregiver ethnic-racial socialization scores were typically higher than those of teachers with respect to current practices with children. But, on average, teachers rated the importance of socialization at some point in the future higher than did parents. Mean scores on the Africentric Home Environment Inventory were similar for homes and classrooms; classrooms had a bit more socialization items than did homes ($M = 13.58$ and $M =13.02$, respectively). Both parents and teachers indicated they used egalitarian messages most frequently, cultural socialization sometimes, and preparation for bias the least. This was also the case for beliefs about socialization in the future.

**Research Question 1: Are there ethnic-racial group differences in caregivers’ beliefs and practices of ethnic-racial socialization?**

Previous research has suggested ethnic-racial group differences exist in parental ethnic-racial socialization behaviors and beliefs (Hughes et al., 2006; Priest et al., 2014). In the current
study, there is some evidence for this claim. Table 3 displays mean ratings and standard
deviations for the three ethnic-racial socialization constructs that reflect parents’ current
practices, by ethnic-racial group. Table 4 presents the same information for parent beliefs
regarding future socialization.

Table 3

*Mean Ratings of Current Socialization Scores by Ethnic-Racial Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Egalitarian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Preparation for Bias</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American/White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial or Multiracial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Ethnic Group</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $M =$ Mean rating (overall mean divided by number of items in each scale).

Table 4

*Mean Ratings on Beliefs Regarding Future Socialization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Egalitarian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Preparation for Bias</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American/White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial or Multiracial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Ethnic Group</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Bayes Factor ANOVAs, model comparisons examined evidence of ethnic and racial group differences in parental ethnic-racial socialization messages. For cultural socialization, ethnic-racial group differences were not supported, as evidenced by a higher Bayes factor for the null model ($\text{BF}_{10} = 1.00$) compared to the model portraying group differences ($\text{BF}_{10} = 0.44$). African Americans engaged in cultural socialization the most ($M = 3.4$) and European American caregivers the least ($M = 2.6$). Similar findings emerged for beliefs related to future cultural socialization, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.83$ for the model including group differences. African American parents remained highest in beliefs about future cultural socialization ($M = 4.4$) with European Americans ranking lowest ($M = 3.7$).

The data favored the alternative hypothesis in a Bayes factor ANOVA of differences between ethnic-racial groups in parents’ use of messages preparing for bias, $\text{BF}_{10} = 1.70$. Although, this would be classified as barely worth mentioning by Kass and Raftery (1995). African American caregivers again recorded a higher mean ($M = 3.1$) than other groups. Bayes factor T-Tests showed African American parents engaged in preparation for bias more often than European American parents ($\text{BF}_{0} = 4.31$) and those in the combined ethnic group ($\text{BF}_{0} = 10.31$). Results were similar on beliefs regarding the importance of preparing children for bias at some point in the future, $\text{BF}_{10} = 2.24$ for the model with ethnic-racial group differences. A Bayes factor T-Test confirmed that the African American group was higher than the combined group in preparing children for bias in the future ($\text{BF}_{0} = 22.79$).

Ethnic-racial group differences in egalitarian messages were slightly less likely than the null model, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.88$. Biracial or multiracial children had caregivers who utilized egalitarian
messages more often than did the other groups. The largest difference was between biracial/multiracial families and those in the combined ethnic group (Native American, Asian, Hispanic, and Arab/Middle Eastern); mean values were 4.1 versus 3.1. Differences in beliefs on the importance of imparting egalitarian principles to children at some point in the future were not apparent, BF\textsubscript{10} = 0.51. Caregivers of children who were biracial or multiracial again had the highest scores (M = 4.7).

Regarding the home environment, a Bayes factor ANOVA showed group differences were not evident (BF\textsubscript{10} = 0.26) in the number of items in children’s homes that reflected their ethnic-racial or cultural background. Table 5 presents results from the four Bayes factor ANOVAs testing the likelihood of group differences in parents’ ethnic-racial socialization strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Bayes factor ANOVAs for Ethnic-Racial Group Differences in E/R Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null Model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Differences Model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null Model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Differences Model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Differences Model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Differences Model</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note.} P(M) = prior model probabilities. P(M|data) = posterior model probabilities. BF\textsubscript{M} = change from prior to posterior model odds. BF\textsubscript{10} = Bayes factor.
Research Question 2a: Does home and school ethnic-racial socialization tend to match or mismatch?

To further explore Barbarin and colleagues’ (2010) finding that statistical analyses of home-school match showed different results dependent upon how the construct was operationalized, match was examined three ways: a dichotomous match/mismatch variable, a categorical variable created using median splits, and a continuous difference score created by taking the absolute value of parent minus teacher scores. Previous methods of looking at absolute differences between home and school may omit effects related to which respondent is higher. In analyses with absolute differences, the magnitude of separation is the focus; with categorical divisions, analyses can examine directional effects, for example combinations of parent scores that are high in socialization paired with teacher scores that are low.

To create the three variables, each respondent was first given a score of 0 if below the median and 1 if above the median. If the parent and teacher (or home and classroom) were paired as 0,0 or 1,1, this was entered as 1 on a new “match” variable. Pairs of 0,1 or 1,0 were entered as 0, or “mismatch.” Because the direction of difference was of interest, a categorical variable was created that included four groups instead of two. These corresponded to low parent-low teacher (i.e., both scored below the median), low parent-high teacher, high parent-low teacher, and high parent-high teacher.

Most children in the study had parent-teacher pairs that matched on each of the socialization types. Fifty-two percent of parents and teachers matched on levels of current cultural socialization practices as well as beliefs about cultural socialization at later ages. Of the
four categorical groups, pairings were most likely to be in the high parent-high teacher category in both current and future cultural socialization (37% and 41%, respectively). Fifty-six percent of parents and teachers matched in their uses of preparation for bias; 51% percent matched on the importance of these messages at some point in the future. One-third of parent-teacher pairs were classified as low parent-low teacher. Slightly less than one-third were in the high parent-low teacher group for current practices. Beliefs about the importance of preparation for bias in the future were likely to have high parent-low teacher ratings (30%) or high parent-high teacher ratings (27%).

Fifty-four percent of parents and teachers matched on levels of egalitarianism. Broken down, levels of egalitarianism were somewhat evenly spread among the four categorical groups. Twenty-nine percent of parent-teacher pairs exhibited low levels, while 27% of pairs were in the high parent-low teacher category. Parents and teachers also matched (56%) on their beliefs about the importance of future egalitarianism. Categorically, the most common pairing on future egalitarianism was high parent-high teacher (32%), with around 20-24% in each of the remaining three categories. The physical environment of homes and classrooms in the study showed similar numbers of items that represented ethnic-racial or cultural backgrounds. Fifty-six percent of children had physical environments that were either both high or both low on AHEI scores. Of those, 51% were both high on the environment scale. However, one-third of children lived in home environments with low socialization items paired with classrooms that had above the median scores on environment socialization.
Research Question 2b: Are there ethnic-racial group differences in match between home and school?

It was also of interest to know whether match/mismatch in the study differed according to the ethnic and racial group of the child. There was positive evidence of differences between groups on parent-teacher dichotomous match of cultural socialization according to a Bayes factor contingency table, BF\textsubscript{10} = 6.87. Seventy-five percent of African American children were in the mismatch category compared to 28% of the combined minority group. Categorically, high-low pairings differed according to ethnic-racial group to a much stronger degree, BF\textsubscript{10} = 106.9. Yet a Bayes factor ANOVA for group differences on the continuous measure of cultural socialization revealed no differences, BF\textsubscript{10} = 0.65. Results for model comparisons of beliefs about the importance of cultural socialization in the future mimicked those of current practices. Dichotomous match showed positive evidence of group differences, BF\textsubscript{10} = 4.32; categorical match showed very strong evidence, BF\textsubscript{10} = 543; and the continuous measure showed no evidence, BF\textsubscript{10} = 0.27.

Ethnic-racial group differences were most likely in parent-teacher match on preparation for bias, BF\textsubscript{10} = 47.35. Seventy-five percent of African American children had parents and teachers who did not match on their preparation for bias messages, compared to 19% of European American children. Categorical differences showed stronger evidence of group differences than binary match, BF\textsubscript{10} = 111.3. As was true for cultural socialization messages, the continuous measure of preparation for bias did not support group differences, BF\textsubscript{10} = 0.63. Ethnic-racial group differences on dichotomous match/mismatch of beliefs about future socialization were unlikely for preparation for bias (BF\textsubscript{10} = 0.72), but high-low categories revealed strong differences in beliefs by racial or ethnic group membership (BF\textsubscript{10} = 45.51).
Again, there was a lack of evidence for differences on the continuous measure for future preparation for bias socialization, $BF_{10} = 0.28$.

A Bayes factor contingency table showed no evidence of group differences on dichotomous match of egalitarian messages, $BF_{10} = 0.23$, but there was strong support for differences when considering categorical match, $BF_{10} = 32.43$. Children who were biracial or multiracial were most likely to have parent-teacher disagreement on levels of egalitarian socialization (54%). Groups did not appear to differ on the continuous measure of egalitarian differences, $BF_{10} = 0.10$. Ethnic-racial group differences on match/mismatch of beliefs about future socialization were unlikely for egalitarian messages, $BF_{10} = 0.30$. Minimal support was found for group differences of directional match, $BF_{10} = 1.81$, and there was no evidence for differences between groups via the continuous measure, $BF_{10} = 0.15$.

Similarly, a Bayes factor ANOVA did not show ethnic-racial group differences on the absolute measure of physical environment difference, $BF_{10} = 0.27$. There was little support for differences on dichotomous match, $BF_{10} = 1.41$, and differences on high-low categories were less likely, $BF_{10} = 0.94$. Sixty-nine percent of children who were biracial or multiracial had homes and classrooms that did not match on the AHEI scale; 38% were in the high home-low school category. While the majority of both African American and European American children were both high in levels of home-school environment socialization, less than half of children in the combined group were in this category. Thirty-nine percent of the combined ethnic group was low on levels of home environment socialization but high in levels at school. Frequencies for each group as well as results of Bayes factor ANOVAs and contingency tables for each socialization type are presented in Table 6.
Table 6

Ethnic-Racial Group Differences on Three Measures of Home-School Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dichotomous</th>
<th>Categorical</th>
<th>Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BF₁₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Egalitarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Egalitarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Prep for Bias</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Prep for Bias</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multiracial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Numbers represent frequencies in each group for dichotomous and categorical variables. Dichotomous heading 0 = mismatch, 1 = match. Bolded numbers show BF10 > 1, providing evidence of group differences compared to null model.

Overall, parents and teachers in the study mostly matched in their ethnic-racial socialization beliefs and practices, though not overwhelmingly so. Cultural socialization, for instance, only had a slight majority of matched pairs (52%), and all factors had majorities that were below 60%. When considering high-low pairs of parents and teachers, racial and ethnic groups were fairly evenly spread among the four categories. Analyses of ethnic-racial group differences varied depending upon the measure that was used. Match of egalitarianism and future preparation for bias showed group differences categorically but not dichotomously; for environmental match, it was the reverse. However, group differences were found on match of current and future cultural socialization as well as match of current preparation for bias when measured both dichotomously and categorically. Ethnic-racial group differences were not evident on any of the factors for the continuous measure of absolute difference between home and school.

Research Question 3: Is match between home and school socialization associated with children’s self-regulation? Is there a difference in results when match is measured dichotomously, categorically, or continuously?

Bayesian path analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between home-school match and children’s self-regulation. Due to lack of previous research on home-school mismatch as a measure of ethnic-racial socialization, non-informative (default) priors were used in the analyses. In the first model, home-school mismatch was entered using the dichotomous match or mismatch variable, and racial-ethnic group was entered as a dummy-coded control variable with
European Americans as the reference group. Results showed the model fit the data well, as evidenced by a 95% Confidence Interval of the difference in observed and replicated chi-square values that included zero [CI = -12.35, 13.23] and a posterior predictive p-value of .47. The model showed quick MCMC convergence, reached at 200 iterations (PSR < 1.01). A posterior predictive checking scatterplot (Figure 3) and distribution (Figure 4) also supported that the model fit the data well. Match of parent and teacher egalitarian messages was associated with children’s self-regulation scores, as evidenced by a 95% credibility index that did not include zero [.51, 9.03]. Model estimates are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Bayesian Path Analysis Results of Self-regulation on Dichotomous Match of E/R Socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>95% Credibility Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>[-7.41, 4.94]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>[-5.69, 6.71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Group</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-9.74, 1.37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>[-4.57, 4.67]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>[-7.65, 1.96]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td><strong>4.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.51</strong>, <strong>9.03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>-3.44</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-7.55, 0.73]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Bolded lines show significant predictors.*
A second model was constructed to look at home-school differences operationalized as categorical and directional: low parent-low teacher, low parent-high teacher, high parent-low teacher, and high parent-high teacher. Dummy variables for each of the parent-teacher pairings were created, and low parent-low teacher was used as the reference category. Model fit was comparable to the previous model; the 95% confidence interval of replicated and observed chi-square values included zero [-14.58, 15.88], and the posterior predictive p-value was .47. The model converged after 500 iterations (PSR < 1.01). Results from this analysis showed children
with parents who engaged in high levels of egalitarian messages paired with teachers who engaged in lower levels fared more poorly on self-regulatory skills than children whose parents and teachers both communicated equality messages less often. The accompanying posterior predictive checking scatterplot and distribution are presented in Figure 5 and Figure 6. Results from the model are shown in Table 8.

![Posterior predictive checking scatterplot for model with categorical mismatch.](image)

*Figure 5. Posterior predictive checking scatterplot for model with categorical mismatch.*
Figure 6. Posterior predictive checking distribution for model with categorical mismatch.

Table 8
Bayesian Path Analysis of Self-regulation on Categorical Match of E/R Socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>95% Credibility Index</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-10.09</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-7.95</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>-4.66</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-11.67</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low parent-High teacher</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-10.99</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-Low teacher</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-5.75</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-High teacher</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-8.23</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low parent-High teacher</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-8.86</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-Low teacher</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-6.25</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-High teacher</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-11.23</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Egalitarianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low parent-High teacher</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-15.07</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-Low teacher</td>
<td><strong>-6.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.34</strong></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td><strong>-13.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-High teacher</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-13.63</td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low parent-High teacher</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-Low teacher</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>24.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High parent-High teacher</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-4.89</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bolded lines show significant predictors.

In the final model, mismatch was operationalized using centered absolute difference scores (parent minus teacher) on each of the four socialization measures. Ethnic-racial categories were again entered as control variables. Model 3 showed almost identical model fit to Model 1, with a 95% confidence interval of the difference in observed and replicated chi-square values that included zero [CI = -12.32, 13.33], and a posterior predictive p-value of .47. The model reached convergence at 200 iterations (PSR < 1.01). Interestingly, in this model, absolute difference on the physical environment measure—and not egalitarian messages—was associated with children’s self-regulation [CI = .11, 2.64], and this relationship was in a positive direction. Other types of socialization did not predict children’s levels of self-regulation. A scatterplot for posterior predictive checking is shown in Figure 7, and the posterior predictive checking distribution is presented in Figure 8. Model results are displayed in Table 9.
Figure 7. Posterior predictive checking scatterplot for model with continuous difference measure.

Figure 8. Posterior predictive checking distribution for model with continuous difference measure.
Table 9
*Bayesian Path Analysis of Self-regulation on Continuous Difference of E/R Socialization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-4.68</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-4.36</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-9.19</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td><strong>1.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bolded lines show significance.
Chapter 6: Discussion

Many in the public sphere operate under the assumption that preschool-aged children are too young to engage in discussions of race and ethnicity, yet research has begun to show that ethnic-racial socialization may provide similar benefits to younger children as those established for children in middle childhood and adolescence (Baker, 2014; Caughy et al., 2011; Caughy & Owen, 2015; Johnston et al., 2007). At the same time, with an increasingly diverse population in the US, scholars have raised questions about whether racial, ethnic and cultural differences between home and school environments affect children’s academic and social development—the cultural mismatch hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that children from marginalized groups may face unique challenges in that their home culture misaligns with the culture of American schools, creating discontinuity with potentially negative effects on children’s wellbeing. In view of the changing ethos of childhood in the US today where most young children are enrolled in some form of early childhood or other caregiving programs geared to attending to early cognitive and social needs, it becomes necessary to study the multiplicity of sources from which ethnic-racial socialization emanate during early childhood. Moreover, research suggests that young children begin to notice and form opinions related to race and ethnicity during the preschool years (Doyle & Aboud, 1995; Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001). A primary goal of the current study was to address ethnic and racial group differences along major constructs of ethnic-racial socialization and the cultural mismatch hypothesis with regard to ethnic-racial socialization in Head Start programs and implications for children’s social development.

As outlined in the conceptual model conceived by García Coll and colleagues (1996), ethnic-racial socialization plays a vital role in the developmental trajectories of children of color. Relatedly, critical race theory proposes that the existent racism within US society must be
acknowledged and taken into account in studies of the educational system, including discussion of colorblind ideologies that deny the continued existence of racism. Researchers have firmly established that ethnic-racial socialization provides positive benefits to African American youth in the cognitive and social domains (see Neblett et al., 2012), but it is less clear how such messages affect children from other cultural backgrounds or influence preschool-aged children’s social development. Thus, a basic goal of this study was to describe racial and ethnic group differences in parent practices and beliefs related to ethnic-racial socialization. Further guided by tenets within the bioecological (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and developmental niche models (Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002), both of which underscore the importance of interactions between developmental contexts with cultural structuring, a second aim was to determine the degree of match/mismatch between parents and teachers in their messages about race and ethnicity to Head Start children. Because the above-mentioned theoretical frameworks articulate a connection between ethnic-racial socialization and child development (García Coll et al., 1996), as well as contextual influences on developmental outcomes (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002), a final aim was to examine the relation between home-school match and children’s self-regulation. Results indicate that parents of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds approach cultural topics with their children in differing ways. Even though parents and teachers in this study tended to match in their ethnic-racial socialization practices overall, findings varied according to children’s racial and ethnic group membership. Finally, these data provide some evidence that divergence in parent-teacher communications regarding race and ethnicity may impact children’s social-emotional functioning.
Group Differences in Ethnic-Racial Socialization

Previous research on ethnic-racial socialization has maintained an underlying focus on African American families (Benner & Kim, 2009; Caughy et al., 2006; Scottham & Smalls, 2009). In view of the history of oppression and continued discrimination that African Americans in the US face, research on protective factors such as racial socialization and their benefits in inoculating young children from social and educational inequalities can be of use to parenting and other social service programs that address the needs of African American families. But, it is quite clear that ethnic-racial socialization occurs in parent-child relationships in other racial and ethnic groups as well (Caughy & Owen, 2015; Hagelskamp & Hughes, 2014; Knight et al., 1993; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004), and information on ethnic-racial socialization can benefit early childhood and parenting programs that serve an increasingly broader range of children in the US. Findings reveal that, across groups, parents were comparable in their efforts to teach young children about race and ethnicity in their everyday childrearing practices, but there was evidence of between-group differences in messages that prepare children for future bias.

Results suggest that African American parents had the highest overall rates of ethnic-racial socialization, which is similar to what has been found in previous studies that employed multiple groups in their investigations (Barbarin & Jean-Baptiste, 2013; Caughy & Owen, 2015; Hagelskamp & Hughes, 2014; Hughes, 2003). African American parents used more messages involving preparation for bias than European Americans and the combined ethnic group made up of Native American, Asian, Hispanic, and Arab American children. High engagement in the different modes of ethnic-racial socialization by African American parents assessed herein were also seen among participants in Caughy et al.’s (2011) study in which a balanced racial
socialization profile was developed that was characterized by high mean scores on both cultural pride and preparation for bias. It appears that African American parents and parents of multiracial/biracial children may see more merit in socializing children toward the realities of particular disadvantages within their immediate environment while simultaneously utilizing a strength-based approach that emphasizes cultural heritage. This stance may be more functionally adaptive in coping with social and educational inequalities and racism that low-income African American and multiracial/biracial children encounter as they move through the educational system and navigate their way through harsh neighborhood environments and economic circumstances (see Coard et al., 2004). Remember that the families and children in this study lived below the poverty line and some parents were in unstable relationships or in no relationship union. These social and economic conditions compound the challenges that families face in rearing young children of color (see Bratter & Damaske, 2013; McLanahan, & Percheski, 2008;).

As with African Americans, parents of children who were biracial or multiracial utilized socialization strategies that resembled a balanced (Caughy et al., 2011) or multifaceted approach (White-Johnson et al., 2010) with high scores across socialization subscales of egalitarianism, bias, and cultural socialization. There were no significant differences in socialization strategies between African Americans and the biracial/multiracial group. However, biracial/multiracial children received more egalitarian messages than children in other groups and ranked second highest in their receipt of preparation for bias and cultural socialization. This pattern is in agreement with what has been found in other studies that similarly indicate biracial/multiracial children receive more messages about race and ethnicity than other groups (Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). Perhaps a pattern of high rates across subscales within this group is related to diversity within the family unit. For instance, in Snyder’s (2012) qualitative study with multiracial adults
of African descent who were asked about their experiences growing up, results were somewhat divided according to parent race/ethnicity. Those with at least one black parent reported receiving messages that acknowledged the reality of racism; their parent(s) thereby made attempts to prepare them for bias while at the same time promoting racial and cultural pride. In contrast, multiracial adults adopted into White families heard very little talk of race or racism from their parents. White parents instead emphasized colorblind or egalitarian approaches or avoided conversations of race altogether (Snyder, 2012).

To speculate, parents of biracial/multiracial children may place greater stock in sending egalitarian messages because they face the challenge of blending and integrating practices and belief systems from multiple cultural heritages into childrearing. Because a mother and father of a child who is biracial or multiracial may come from different cultural backgrounds, they may impart to children a need to appreciate similarities across racial and ethnic groups rather than to focus on any particular group identity. The finding that parents of children who were biracial or multiracial engaged in higher rates of egalitarian messages than other groups indicates that ideals of equality are especially salient, though not dismissive of the reality of bias and discrimination that children who are biracial or multiracial will likely encounter.

Children in the combined group (Asian, Native American, Arab/Middle Eastern, and Hispanic) resembled what White-Johnson et al. (2010) categorized as unengaged (2010), falling below the mean on all socialization subscales. In general, children in this group had parents who engaged in socialization the least, with the exception of cultural socialization (European American was lower). The same was true for both current practices and beliefs regarding ethnic-racial socialization in the future. This is a peculiar finding given that others have found high rates of ethnic socialization among similar groups. For example, Latino and Chinese parents in the
Hagelskamp and Hughes (2014) study engaged in moderate to high rates of preparation for bias and cultural socialization. A possible reason for the inconsistency in results is the makeup of this group. It consisted of individuals with diverse ethnic and cultural heritage—from individuals with long histories of oppression (e.g., Native Americans) to those with more recent histories of arrival in the United States. Alternatively, these groups could have internalized oppression as a part of life in the US and find other mechanisms to fight it (e.g. immigrant groups believe in the immigrant drive hypothesis of working toward a better day ignoring challenges on the journey to that end).

It is interesting that both biracial/multiracial and African American families communicated messages from all three socialization content areas at relatively high rates. On the surface, egalitarian messages are counterintuitive to discussions of racial and ethnic pride and/or conversations related to societal bias. This does not seem to be the case with some parents in this study. Likely, there is a difference between parents who teach children that people are equal regardless of race because they believe it is currently true versus parents who convey such messages because they want it to be true and therefore instill such ideals within young children with the aspiration of changing future generations. It seems that because parents of African American and biracial/multiracial children conveyed egalitarianism to children in combination with messages that encouraged them to be proud of their heritage and also aware of the inequalities they will likely someday face, these parents engage in a type of egalitarianism with the goal of someday making such statements a reality rather than believing it is part of the current reality. This may portray an egalitarian view that promotes the equal outcome of groups (distributive justice) because the unequal treatment based upon race and ethnicity is still acknowledged (Walton et al., 2014). The interesting finding that the combined group had
significantly lower levels of preparation for bias is somewhat confounding. It is possible that the racial and ethnic groups represented have differing experiences with bias and face less discrimination or other forms of discrimination and prejudice (e.g., linguistic profiling) on a routine basis. Simply put, African Americans may experience higher levels of racism and oppression than other groups (Hughes et al., 2006), and consequently the need to prepare young children for such experiences is more prevalent in their child rearing strategies.

European American parents communicated messages to children about equality among groups at similar levels as biracial/multiracial and African American parents but without the accompanying discussions related to culture or societal bias. European American parents in this study used preparation for bias messages infrequently and significantly less than African American parents and appeared somewhat ambivalent about the importance of both cultural socialization and preparing children for bias in the future. Their socialization practices exhibited low race salience (White-Johnson et al., 2010), which included above the mean scores on egalitarianism but scores that fell below the mean on other factors. Because the scale was developed for use with African American parents and was modified to refer to “[the child’s] racial or ethnic group,” a few of the items were simply less relevant (or irrelevant) to European American children who experience a background of racial privilege. Put differently, there is a very low probability in general that White children might be treated badly due to their race or ethnicity, and as such, parents would not be driven to prepare them for bias. However, this was only so for two of the eight items on the preparation for bias subscale. The remaining items referred to discrimination and bias toward racial and ethnic groups broadly. This could imply that European American parents potentially state egalitarian ideals from a belief that equality is the current racial reality, more closely aligned with what others have termed procedural-justice
Colorblind ideology is similar in so much as the lack of discussion of discrimination discounts the experiences of those from other racial or ethnic backgrounds, failing to see the existing racism within our society’s structure and institutions. To wit: the recent spate of violence related to race in different communities in the US.

Despite the differences outlined above, parents shared some commonalities on a number of factors of ethnic-racial socialization. For instance, children from all groups lived in homes that were high in the number of items representing their cultural background; no significant group differences were evident. Across ethnic/racial groups, parents placed greater emphasis on ethnic-racial socialization in the future compared to what they were doing at the time of the study. There were no significant differences across the four groups on opinions of egalitarianism and cultural socialization in the future—a somewhat hopeful view that all groups see some importance in talking to children about prevailing issues surrounding race. African American parents, however, placed more importance on preparing children for bias in the future than other groups, especially those in the combined group. Variation in beliefs about socialization in the future may indicate differences in whether parents’ communications to children about discrimination go beyond disagreements about age-appropriateness. This leads to the question of whether beliefs are shared among parents and teachers, as the majority of teachers in the study identified as European American and may have cultural belief systems that diverge from parents of children in their classrooms.
Home-School Match on Ethnic-Racial Socialization

In an attempt to merge streams of research that have examined ethnic-racial socialization and the cultural mismatch hypothesis, the second aim of this study was to address to what degree parents and teachers of young children in Head Start match or mismatch in their messages about issues surrounding race and ethnicity. Discontinuity in socialization practices can lead to confusing messages relayed to young children, which then has implications for childhood development (Parsons, 2003; Parsons et al., 2005; Tyler et al., 2008). Reviews of the literature on parents’ engagement in ethnic-racial socialization revealed that parents of young children report moderate or high communication of bias to children (e.g., Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002; Chakawa & Hoglund, 2016; Pahlke et al., 2012). By comparison, studies have reported that teachers commonly either ignore topics of race within their classrooms or utilize egalitarian or colorblind ideologies (Aukrust & Rydland, 2009; Walton et al., 2014). Thus, it was important to apply the cultural mismatch hypothesis to issues of ethnic-racial socialization within the home environment and early childhood settings. The mismatch hypothesis has primarily been examined via absolute difference scores, but Barbarin and colleagues (2010) argued that direction of difference, measured categorically, plays an important role in the interpretation of results in this area of inquiry. Their findings showed effects of categorical mismatch indicators that were not apparent in predictions using absolute differences. To assess directional differences in home-school mismatch, the construct was operationalized three ways in the current study: dichotomously, categorically, and continuously.

As was found in Barbarin et al.’s (2010) study, it was encouraging that a higher percentage of parent-teacher pairs matched (51 to 56%) than mismatched on each of the
socialization subscales. In the Barbarin et al. study, percentages of match ranged from 50 - 64% among parents and teachers, whereas 36 - 50% showed a mismatch. This bodes well for children’s development in that continuity between contexts reinforces socialization patterns between the home and early childhood environments. The bioecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) highlights the importance of interactions between contexts for positive development, and this study provides evidence that most children in the sample experienced congruence with regard to communications from parents and teachers to preschoolers regarding race and ethnicity. This is crucial as children at this developmental stage are beginning to form ideas about racial and ethnic identity.

With respect to specific socialization constructs, the greatest agreement was in current practices of preparation for bias (56%) and beliefs regarding the importance of future egalitarian messages (56%). Parents and teachers were more likely to engage in high rates of cultural socialization combined with low rates of preparation for bias. This is consistent with previous findings that cultural socialization is more common with this age group than preparation for bias messages (Caughy, O’Campo, et al., 2002; Hughes, 2003; Johnston et al., 2007). Preparation for bias with younger children has sometimes shown adverse effects (Caughy et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2007), and so it might be that lower rates are more appropriate for preschool-age children. Because cultural socialization has been linked to many positive outcomes in children, it is promising that parents and teachers incorporated cultural conversations to similar degrees. There was also good agreement on use of egalitarianism; however, pairs were closely divided among low-low (29%) and high-high (27%). This might imply that underlying factors such as classroom or neighborhood diversity influence the importance placed on imparting equality among groups to children.
Turning to objects in children’s homes and classrooms, in the current study, 56% of children experienced a match between the two environments. Of those, 51% were congruently high in the number of items that represented their cultural background. The bioecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) advocates developmental progress based upon proximal processes that include exploration and manipulation of objects within the home and early childhood environments. Exploration of objects assists children to assimilate information and develop schemas about their social worlds (see Evangelou, Sylva, Kyriacou, Wild, & Glenny, 2009). Presumably, exploration with objects that are similar to children’s heritage and culture will permit engagement in culturally relevant developmental activities, an objective espoused in several national and international early childhood organizations (e.g., NAEYC, AECI). As revealed in the doll and related studies on toy selection bias (Clark & Clark, 1939, 1950), there is a dire need to furnish children with culturally appropriate play objects, books and artifacts.

**Group Differences in Home-School Match**

Theoretical propositions within the educational mismatch hypothesis suggest that continuity is more likely to exist when parents and teachers are a racial or ethnic match (see Tyler et al., 2008). Although, others have argued that racial and ethnic match on group identity may not necessarily capture underlying cultural beliefs due to intragroup variability, among other factors (Barbarin et al., 2010). Therefore ethnic-racial group differences in match or mismatch of ethnic-racial socialization were examined as important aspects of children’s early school experiences. Bayesian analysis of variance showed racial and ethnic group differences on most of the dichotomous and categorical measures of match, but no evidence of group differences on the continuous indicators. Groups differed on categorical measures of cultural socialization and
preparation for bias, less so on measures of egalitarianism and items present within the physical environments of homes and classrooms.

Overall, African American children were more likely to have parents and teachers who mismatched in ethnic-racial socialization than other groups. For example, 65% African American children had parents that utilized cultural socialization often but teachers who did not. Comparatively, parents and teachers of children in the combined group were much more likely to agree. Seventy-five percent of children in this group had parent-teacher pairs that matched, 56% of whom were congruently high in cultural socialization. Of interest, the roles were reversed when parents and teachers were asked about their beliefs regarding the importance of cultural socialization in children’s future. African American children were more likely to have parents and teachers who matched, 44% of whom were congruently high. Parents of children in the combined group rated the importance of future cultural socialization lower, and as such 67% mismatched with children’s teachers. Children who were European American or biracial/multiracial mostly experienced parent-teacher agreement on messages pertaining to cultural heritage, but were actually quite varied among the types of pairings.

African American children were also more likely to experience divergence in parent-teacher messages pertaining to preparation for bias. As with cultural socialization, three-quarters of African American children had parents and teachers who did not match in rates of messages related to discrimination, bias, and inequality. The majority of those (69%) included parents that spoke frequently about issues of bias paired with teachers who spoke infrequently about bias. Not surprisingly, a high majority (81%) of European American children had parents and teachers who agreed in preparation for bias socialization; 56% of who were consistently low. Parents and teachers of African American children in the study mostly disagreed in their use of cultural
socialization and preparation for bias, but agreed (56%) in communication of egalitarian messages. Of these, 44% were congruently low. Similarly, a high number of children (44%) in the combined group had parents and teachers who were both low in their use of egalitarian messages. In contrast, over half of children who were biracial or multiracial experienced mismatch in parent-teacher egalitarianism; 31% were high parent-low teacher.

One reason for these findings may be related to the historical differentiation of race versus ethnicity previously discussed in the concept constructions section. Race, and therefore racial socialization, has more often been used in studies that include African Americans with a focus on issues such as those measured by the preparation for bias subscale—racism, oppression, discrimination (Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006). Whereas the social construction of the term ethnicity, and therefore ethnic socialization, has more often been used in conjunction with cultural heritage, artifacts, and traditions and is more typically included in studies with multiple groups (Hughes et al., 2006). Parents and teachers of children in the combined group may have had higher percentages of match in cultural socialization because incorporating discussions of cultural backgrounds could be more comfortable for teachers than conversations that include components of discrimination and unfair treatment, which teachers may not have the knowledge or confidence to know how to address with young children. Because racism is considered a more taboo topic and racial tensions remain high in the US, teachers may feel uneasy about approaching such issues with young children, even when the topic arises naturally within their classrooms.

Teachers in the study were mostly European Americans, and it is worth considering whether higher agreement with European American parents is primarily rooted in shared cultural ideologies. There is certainly some evidence of this given than both were high in levels of
egalitarianism. However, teachers were higher than European American parents on other measures of socialization. A second relevant point is that teachers may believe discussing issues of race is a personal topic more appropriately addressed by parents within the comfort of children’s homes. In other words, teachers may engage in lower levels of ethnic-racial socialization not because of less salience within their belief systems, but because they may think it is not their responsibility to do so. Given the amount of time children are spending in childcare and the evidence that discussions often happen when children are exposed to diversity for the first time, relying on thematic units within a multicultural curriculum may not be enough to establish congruence with ethnic-racial socialization that takes place at home.

Finally, it was instructive to find that a majority of children across groups had homes and classrooms that matched in providing culturally representative items. One exception is that group differences were found on dichotomous match of physical environments. Biracial and multiracial children were more likely to experience discontinuity in physical environments with items related to cultural heritage. A probable reason for this lies in the intragroup diversity of those who identify as biracial/multiracial and corresponding lack of availability of items such as toys, books, so on that reflect their particular racial-ethnic background.

**Associations with Self-Regulation**

That cultural socialization from parents is related to fewer behavior problems in children has been demonstrated in several studies (Caughy & Owen, 2015; Johnston et al., 2007). As already stated, the bioecological (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and developmental niche models (Super & Harkness, 1986, 1997, 2002) highlight the importance of continuity in proximal socialization processes within the family and school settings. Taking this into consideration, the
The final aim of the study was to determine if mismatch between home and school ethnic-racial socialization had a negative association with a measure of children’s self-regulation. In this vein, directionality within the operationalization of the mismatch construct was again undertaken.

The findings of this study lend credence to those of Barbarin et al.’s (2010) that categorical differences of parent-teacher match are associated with developmental outcomes while continuous predictors are not. In this study, continuous measures of absolute difference between parents and teachers were also unrelated to children’s social outcomes. One possibility for lack of associations is that the relationship may not be a linear one and may in fact be curvilinear. High-low categorizations and dichotomous match were significant for one socialization factor—egalitarianism. Children with parents who were low in egalitarian messages but teachers who used these messages more frequently scored lower in self-regulation than children whose parents and teachers both engaged in low levels of egalitarian messages. A second finding that was similar to Barbarin et al.’s results suggests that match was not necessarily associated with better outcomes. For example, in the Barbarin et al. study, mismatch on control and authoritarian beliefs was associated with better outcomes in children. Greater absolute difference in the number of items in children’s homes and schools that represent their cultural background and heritage was significantly related to higher self-regulation scores in the current study. This may indicate that children who lack items representing their cultural background at home but have these items at school notice and appreciate them more, or vice versa. Stated differently, one setting could, in effect, make up for what the other lacks (Barbarin et al.).

The finding that parent-teacher match on levels of egalitarian messages was related to higher self-regulation in children, yet greater difference in home and school environment
socialization also led to increased self-regulation, brings up the question of whether differences in context are innately a good thing or bad thing. Diversity in contexts may provide certain benefits to children who experience lower resources either at home or at school. But, an argument can be made that the difference here occurs between person match and environment mismatch. If children are receiving mixed messages from parents and teachers (e.g., parents prepare them for bias in society and instill racial and ethnic pride whereas teachers report they do not “see color”), children may experience confusion and struggle to reconcile the opposing views. However, a difference in home and school environments may not necessarily create the same contradiction. A lack of items that represent one’s cultural heritage does not necessarily equate denial of its existence, although this could be implied.

Conclusions

This study provides evidence that parents of young children use ethnic-racial socialization messages in various combinations, and methods differ somewhat according to their racial or ethnic group. Parents of children who are African American or biracial/multiracial impart to their children equality among groups, while at the same time instilling in them a sense of cultural pride and also preparing them for the experiences of bias they are likely to encounter in the larger society. European American parents were more likely to speak to children about treating people equally without discussions of existing bias or cultural orientation. Parents of children in the combined group had the lowest rates of socialization overall and saw ethnic-racial socialization as less important for the future than other groups, a finding somewhat confounded by the combination of several groups into one category.
Parents and teachers mostly matched in their ethnic-racial socialization levels. Nonetheless, group differences were apparent. African American children experienced the highest percentage of mismatch in parent and teacher messages; European American children and children in the combined group were more likely to have parents and teachers who matched in their ethnic-racial socialization beliefs and behaviors. Surprisingly, greater difference in the number of items in children’s homes and schools that represented their cultural background led to increased self-regulatory skills, perhaps indicating that cultural items are more valued and more strongly influential when they are less common, thereby creating novelty. Conversely, parent and teacher match in rates of egalitarianism provided benefits to children’s self-regulation, and congruently low rates were better than mismatches in which parents used high egalitarian rates and teachers engaged in low egalitarian rates of socialization.

As of yet, research has not fully determined the effects of egalitarian socialization on childhood development. Some have argued that egalitarianism may not only be inadequate but may be counterproductive by indirectly acknowledging the power of racial constructions in society. The fact that teachers may not see race as an influencing factor in the classroom does not make it less powerful. Quite the opposite may be true. By failing to recognize the dynamics associated with race and ethnicity in the classroom, teachers effectively provide support for the institutionalized system of oppression that fosters racist thought and action. Jeane Copenhaver-Johnson (2006) advises, “We need to talk to our children because children notice the messages our silences send” (p. 17). She recommends that teachers invest in genuine conversations with children regarding their interests, curiosities, and questions about race.
Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that should be taken into account when interpreting the findings. The relatively small sample of families impacts generalizability and situates this research as exploratory in nature. Preliminary conclusions can be drawn, but future studies should examine whether effects of divergence of home and school contexts remain true with larger samples. Because this study focused on Head Start families, a lower-income subset of the larger early childhood context, different patterns of ethnic-racial socialization may exist for families with varying levels of economic resources. Indeed, there has been some indication of this assertion in prior work (e.g., Csizmadia et al., 2014). Along these lines, future research should include early childhood classrooms with teachers from different ethnic-racial backgrounds that serve socioeconomically diverse populations.

A second limitation is that the study employed self-reports of parents’ and teachers’ ethnic-racial socialization behaviors. When observational measures of parent-child interactions were used (e.g., Pahlke et al., 2012), inconsistencies were noted between parent-reported behavior versus observed behavior. There may be a difference in behavioral expressions of and beliefs about ethnic-racial socialization. Others have compared parent self-report with child perceptions of their parents’ socialization and found the two to differ in meaningful ways (Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al., 2009; Pahlke et al., 2012). Messages that parents intend to send to their children with regard to race and ethnicity may not be received by children in the manner originally intended or perceptions may differ due to salience of race within parental mindsets that have not fully developed in the worldviews of children. Future research can tease apart
conceptual differences in measures that seek to capture both parental beliefs and behaviors of ethnic-racial socialization with young children.

Additionally, the Africentric Home Environment Inventory (Caughy, Randolph, et al., 2002) was adapted to use generic language such that it can apply to multiple racial and ethnic groups. Yet the survey given to parents of White children referenced multicultural items in the home. As such, this may not be an accurate measure of ethnic-racial socialization items in the homes of children who are White. Future research should consider alternative adaptations or measures that examine the conceptual nature of ethnic-racial socialization in White families.

A final limitation of this study is that statistical analyses were not able to address intra-group variation within the small sample obtained. Cultural belief systems may operate differently within families in ways not captured by racial and ethnic identification alone. This is especially true with respect to the combined group used in the study. Due to the small number of respondents, it was not possible to explore ethnic-racial socialization patterns within Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and Arab American families independent of one another. Previous studies have found that differences in ethnic-racial socialization exist between these groups (Chakawa & Hoglund, 2016; Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). Describing differences that exist within diverse groups on parents’ messages to their children about their cultural heritage, existent bias, and relationships can do much to advance our understanding of the importance of ethnic-racial socialization for all children.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

In addition to the recommendations outlined above, future research should heed the call of several scholars to further expand the study of ethnic-racial socialization to the field of
early childhood education. Egalitarian messages appear to be common among both parents and teachers of preschool-age children, but a major difference exists in the degree to which parents and early childhood teachers also teach children about bias and discrimination. The meaning of the use of equality messages in combination with bias messages by parents from marginalized groups needs further attention. Finally, much more research is needed on the mechanisms through which match between home and school settings positively impact the wellbeing of children. Key family process factors (e.g., cohesion, adaptation) and factors within teachers themselves may mediate the associations between ethnic-racial socialization and childhood outcomes. Such data could better inform early childhood education that is tailored to meeting the needs of culturally diverse groups of learners.
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SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
Institutional Review Board
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jaipaul Roopnarine
DATE: December 17, 2014
SUBJECT: Submitted for Full Board-Determined Expedited Approval of Human Participants
IRB #: 14-301
TITLE: Divergence or Convergence of Home and School Racial-Ethnic Socialization

The above referenced protocol, submitted for full board review, has been evaluated by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the following:

1. the rights and welfare of the individual(s) under investigation;
2. appropriate methods to secure informed consent; and
3. risks and potential benefits of the investigation.

Through the University’s expedited review process, your protocol was determined to be of no more than minimal risk and has been given expedited approval. It is my judgment that your proposal conforms to the University’s human participants research policy and its assurance to the Department of Health and Human Services, available at: http://orip.syr.edu/human-research/human-research-irb.html.

Your protocol is approved for implementation and operation from December 16, 2014 until December 15, 2015. If appropriate, attached is the protocol’s approved informed consent document, date-stamped with the expiration date. This document is to be used in your informed consent process. If you are using written consent, Federal regulations require that each participant indicate their willingness to participate by signing the informed consent document and be provided with a copy of the signed consent form. Regulations also require that you keep a copy of this document for a minimum of three years.

CHANGES TO APPROVED PROTOCOL: Proposed changes to this protocol during the period for which IRB approval has already been given, cannot be initiated without IRB review and approval, except when such changes are essential to eliminate apparent immediate harm to the participants. Changes in approved research initiated without IRB review and approval to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the participant must be reported to the IRB within five days. Protocol changes are requested on an amendment application available on the IRB web site; please reference your IRB number and attach any documents that are being amended.

CONTINUATION BEYOND APPROVAL PERIOD: To continue this research project beyond December 15, 2015, you must submit a renewal application for review and approval. A renewal reminder will be sent to you approximately 60 days prior to the expiration date. (If the researcher will be traveling out of the country when the protocol is due to be renewed, please renew the protocol before leaving the country.)

UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS INVOLVING RISKS: You must report any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others within 10 working days of occurrence to the IRB at 315.443.3013 or orip@syr.edu.

Office of Research Integrity and Protections
121 Bowne Hall  Syracuse, New York 13244-1200
(Phone) 315.443.3013  ♦  (Fax) 315.443.9889
orip@syr.edu ♦ www.orip.syr.edu
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STUDY COMPLETION: Study completion is when all research activities are complete or when a study is closed to enrollment and only data analysis remains on data that have been de-identified. A Study Closure Form should be completed and submitted to the IRB for review (Study Closure Form).

Thank you for your cooperation in our shared efforts to assure that the rights and welfare of people participating in research are protected.

Jeffrey Stanton, Ph.D.
IRB Chair

Note to Faculty Advisor: This notice is only mailed to faculty. If a student is conducting this study, please forward this information to the student researcher.

DEPT: FALK Child & Family Studies, 426 Ostrom Ave. STUDENT: Kimberly Davidson
MEMORANDUM

TO:                          Jaipaul Roopnarine
DATE:                       December 15, 2015
SUBJECT:                    Renewal Approval - Expedited Review
IRB #:                      14-301
TITLE:                      Divergence or Convergence of Home and School Racial-Ethnic Socialization

The request for renewal of your human subjects protocol has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and has been evaluated for the following:

1. the rights and welfare of the individual(s) under investigation;
2. appropriate methods to secure informed consent; and
3. risks and potential benefits of the investigation.

Your protocol is approved for implementation and operation for a period of one year, from December 15, 2015 to December 14, 2016. If appropriate, attached is the protocol’s approved informed consent document, date-stamped with the expiration date. This document is to be used in your informed consent process. If you are using written consent, Federal regulations require that each participant indicate their willingness to participate by signing the informed consent document and be provided with a copy of the signed consent form. Regulations also require that you keep a copy of this document for a minimum of three years.

CHANGES TO APPROVED PROTOCOL: By its very nature, research involving human participants often requires change in plans and procedures. You are reminded of your responsibility to obtain IRB approval of any changes in your protocol prior to implementing them, except when such change is essential to minimize harm to the participants. Changes in approved research initiated without IRB review and approval to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the participant must be reported to the IRB within five days. Protocol changes are requested on an amendment application available on the IRB web site; please reference your IRB number and attach any documents that are being amended.

CONTINUATION BEYOND APPROVAL PERIOD: To continue this research project beyond December 14, 2016, you must submit a renewal application for review and approval. A renewal reminder will be sent to you approximately 60 days prior to the expiration date. (If the researcher will be traveling out of the country when the protocol is due to be renewed, please renew the protocol before leaving the country.)

UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS INVOLVING RISKS: You must report any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others within 10 working days of occurrence to the IRB at 315.443.3013 or orip@syr.edu.

STUDY COMPLETION: Study completion is when all research activities are complete or when a study is closed to enrollment and only data analysis remains on data that have been de-identified. A Study Closure Form should be completed and submitted to the IRB for review (Study Closure Form).
Thank you for your cooperation in our shared efforts to assure that the rights and welfare of people participating in research are protected.

Tracy Cromp, M.S.W.
Director

DEPT: FALK Child & Family Studies, 144 White Hall

STUDENT: Kimberly Davidson
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Letter of Support from Head Start Director

June 10, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

It is my pleasure to write this letter supporting Kimberly Davidson, M.S. in her endeavor regarding the Early Care and Education Research Scholars: Child Care Research Scholars (HHS-2014-ACF-OPRE-YE-0775) grant. We are excited to collaborate with her on her project titled “Divergence or Convergence of Home and School Racial-Ethnic Socialization: Effects on Preschool Children’s Racial attitudes, Socioemotional and Cognitive Development”.

PEACE, Inc. Head Start /Early Head Start has long supported Onondaga County in providing a comprehensive, family focused child development program that serves pregnant women and children birth to five years of age throughout Onondaga County.

PEACE, Inc. fully supports the efforts of Kimberly Davidson to seek this grant which will assist the children which will in turn benefit our community at large.

Sincerely,

Rebecca L. Heberle

Rebecca L. Heberle
Director
Head Start / Early Head Start

Joseph E. O’Hara, Executive Director
Email to Head Start Teachers

Hello,
My name is Kimberly Davidson, and I am a graduate student at Syracuse University. I'd like to invite you to participate in a research study. Involvement is voluntary, so you may choose to participate or not. If you decide to participate, you will be given a $50 gift card upon completion.

I am interested in learning more about how Head Start teachers talk to young children about race and ethnicity. Your participation will include three parts: 1) survey(s) regarding your beliefs and practices related to what you do or say with children in your classroom regarding the children's racial or ethnic backgrounds and beliefs, 2) completion of behavioral checklists for each child in your class whose parents have agreed to participate, and 3) allowing a researcher to observe the physical environment of your classroom.

Funded by a grant from the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, this project will provide information to policy makers as well as local Head Start programs on how home and school racial and ethnic beliefs and practices match or mismatch.

If you have any questions or would like further information about the project, please feel free to contact me at (865) 803-5066 or kldavids@syr.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jaipaul Roopnarine at jroopnar@syr.edu.

To participate in this exciting project, simply reply to this email, and I will be in touch with further instructions. I look forward to hearing from you!

Thank you,

Kimberly Davidson
Department of Child and Family Studies
Syracuse University
426 Ostrom Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13244
You are invited to participate in a Research Study

Preschoolers between the ages of 3-6 in your child’s Head Start classroom are invited to participate in an exciting research project being conducted in conjunction with the department of Child and Family Studies at Syracuse University. The classroom will be involved beginning August 2015 and ending December 2015. The research will take place in your child’s classroom. Participants who complete all required questionnaires and assessments will be given a $25 gift card or cash.

The purpose of the study is to learn about parent and teacher beliefs and practices related to race/ethnicity and how these affect children’s learning.

What is involved?

Participants agree to complete either online or paper surveys regarding their beliefs, practices, and home environment related to race/ethnicity. Parents consent to releasing their child’s scores on assessments completed by the Head Start teacher (DECA). The time involved is estimated to be one hour.

In order to participate:

Return the enclosed forms in the envelope provided OR go online to {website} and enter the password {password}.

Kimberly Davidson
Syracuse University
144 White Hall
Syracuse, NY 13244
Phone: 865-803-5066/315-443-2757
Email: kidavids@syr.edu
**Not too late** to participate in Syracuse University Research Study

Families of preschoolers between the ages of 3-6 in Head Start have been invited to join a research project with the Department of Child and Family Studies at Syracuse University.

Participants who complete all required questionnaires will receive a $25 gift card.

**What is involved?**

- Complete a survey regarding your beliefs and practices related to race/ethnicity. The time involved is estimated to be 30 minutes.

**TO PARTICIPATE:** You should have received a packet in the mail with the required surveys on parent or caregiver beliefs and practices related to race/ethnicity. Complete the survey materials and mail to the address below or return to your child’s Head Start teacher. If you need a new packet, check with your child’s teacher. You can also complete the surveys online at: tinyurl.com/syrheadstart with the password CUSEHeadStart

**Kimberly Davidson**
Syracuse University
144 White Hall
Syracuse, NY 13244
Phone: 865-803-5066 or 315-443-1715
Email: kldavids@svr.edu
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SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILD AND FAMILY STUDIES
DAVID B. FALK COLLEGE
OF SPORT AND HUMAN DYNAMICS

Project Title: Divergence or Convergence of Home and School Racial-Ethnic Socialization
INFORMED CONSENT

My name is Kimberly Davidson, and I am a graduate student at Syracuse University. I am inviting you and your child to participate in a research study. Involvement in the study is voluntary, so you may choose to participate or not. This sheet will explain the study to you, and please feel free to ask questions about the research if you have any. I will be happy to explain anything in detail if you wish.

I am interested in learning more about what parents and caregivers teach young children about race and ethnicity. Your participation will include completion of surveys related to what you do or say with your child regarding your racial or ethnic background and beliefs as well as items that are present in your home representing racial or ethnic pride and heritage and/or cultural diversity. This will take approximately 1 hour of your time.

Additionally, we ask for your permission for your child to participate in the following ways: 1) a researcher will observe the physical environment of your child’s classroom, and 2) a researcher will give your child a standardized test to gauge his or her academic achievement. The test will take about 15-20 minutes and will be conducted in your child’s early childhood center. Your child will be asked to answer questions that are appropriate for his or her age range that determine knowledge and learning skills. We also ask for your permission to gain access to your child’s scores on the Devereux Early Childhood Assessment Program (DECA) that is completed by your child’s Head Start teacher. We will keep your child’s study data as confidential as possible with the exception of certain information we must report for legal or ethical reasons. For example if your child were to tell us about something or someone that hurt them or others, we would have to tell someone outside of the study.

I will assign a number to your responses, and only I and my faculty advisor will have the key to indicate which number belongs to which participant. Data will be stored on password protected computers. However, whenever one works with e-mail or the internet, there is always the risk of compromising privacy, confidentiality and/or anonymity. Your confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology being used. It is important for you to understand that no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the internet by third parties.
Upon completion of the surveys, you will be given a $25 gift card or cash.

The benefit of this research is that you will be helping us to understand parents’ and caregivers’ methods for teaching their young children about race and ethnicity. This information should help us to determine if the same goals and beliefs are present in Early Childhood Education settings (such as Head Start), and how this match or mismatch affects young children’s development. By taking part in the research, you may benefit by thinking about what your child may need to know regarding his or her racial-ethnic background and by an increase in communication with your child’s teacher regarding the topics of racial and ethnic beliefs and practices and general cultural knowledge.

The risk to you of participating in this study may include increased negative emotions related to racial and ethnic unfairness or inequality. These risks will be minimized by short questionnaires and counterbalanced with positive phrases.

If you do not want to take part, you have the right to refuse to take part, without penalty. If you decide to take part and later no longer wish to continue, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

Contact Information:
If you have any questions, concerns, complaints about the research, contact Dr. Jaipaul Roopnarine at jroopnar@syr.edu or Kimberly Davidson at kldavids@syr.edu (865) 803-5066. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, or if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at 315-443-3013.

All of my questions have been answered, I am 18 years of age or older, and I wish to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this consent form.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of parent or caregiver    Date

_______________________________________
Printed name of parent or caregiver

_______________________________________
Printed name of CHILD

_________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of researcher    Date

_______________________________________
Printed name of researcher
Upon completion of the surveys, you will be given a $25 gift card or cash.

The benefit of this research is that you will be helping us to understand parents’ and caregivers’ methods for teaching their young children about race and ethnicity. This information should help us to determine if the same goals and beliefs are present in Early Childhood Education settings (such as Head Start), and how this match or mismatch affects young children’s development. By taking part in the research, you may benefit by thinking about what your child may need to know regarding his or her racial-ethnic background and by an increase in communication with your child’s teacher regarding the topics of racial and ethnic beliefs and practices and general cultural knowledge.

The risk to you of participating in this study may include increased negative emotions related to racial and ethnic unfairness or inequality. These risks will be minimized by short questionnaires and counterbalanced with positive phrases.

If you do not want to take part, you have the right to refuse to take part, without penalty. If you decide to take part and later no longer wish to continue, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

Contact Information:
If you have any questions, concerns, complaints about the research, contact Dr. Jaipaul Roopnarine at jroopnar@syr.edu or Kimberly Davidson at kldavids@syr.edu (865) 803-5066. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, or if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at 315-443-3013.

All of my questions have been answered, I am 18 years of age or older, and I wish to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature of parent or caregiver ___________________________ Date __________

Printed name of parent or caregiver __________________________

Printed name of CHILD __________________________

Signature of researcher ___________________________ Date __________

Printed name of researcher __________________________

Consent Form 1 – Page 2
Department of Child and Family Studies
144 White Hall / Syracuse, NY 13244-3240
315-443-2757 / Fax: 315-443-9807 / http://falk.syr.edu / falk@syr.edu
My name is Kimberly Davidson, and I am a graduate student at Syracuse University. I am inviting you to participate in a research study. Involvement in the study is voluntary, so you may choose to participate or not. This sheet will explain the study to you, and please feel free to ask questions about the research if you have any. I will be happy to explain anything in detail if you wish.

I am interested in learning more about how teachers talk to young children about race and ethnicity. Your participation will include: survey(s) regarding your beliefs and practices related to what you do or say with children in your classroom regarding the children’s racial or ethnic backgrounds and beliefs (one survey per racial-ethnic group represented in your classroom) and surveys related to items present in your classroom. This will take approximately 1 hour of your time. All information will be kept confidential. I will assign a number to your responses, and only I and my faculty advisor will have the key to indicate which number belongs to which participant.

Upon completion of the classroom visit and surveys, you will be given a $50 gift card. If you need or want to discontinue your participation at some point during the project, you will receive a $10 gift card for each portion completed (classroom visit, behavioral checklists, or racial-ethnic socialization surveys).

The benefit of this research is that you will be helping us to understand teachers’ methods for teaching young children about race and ethnicity. This information should help us to determine if the same goals and beliefs are present in home settings, and how this match or mismatch affects young children’s development. By taking part in the research, you may benefit by thinking about what children in your classroom may need to know regarding their racial-ethnic backgrounds and by an increase in communication with parents and caregivers regarding the topics of racial and ethnic beliefs and practices and general cultural knowledge.

The risk to you of participating in this study may include increased negative emotions related to racial and ethnic disparities or unfairness. These risks will be minimized by short questionnaires and counterbalanced with positive phrases.
If you do not want to take part, you have the right to refuse to take part, without penalty. If you decide to take part and later no longer wish to continue, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

Contact Information:
If you have any questions, concerns, complaints about the research, contact Dr. Jaipaul Roopnarine at jroopnar@syr.edu or Kimberly Davidson at kldavids@syr.edu (865) 803-5066. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, or if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at 315-443-3013.

All of my questions have been answered, I am 18 years of age or older, and I wish to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this consent form.

_________________________________________ _______________________
Signature of participant Date

________________________
 Printed name of participant

_________________________________________ _______________________
Signature of researcher Date

________________________
 Printed name of researcher
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Study Measures

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Department of Child and Family Studies
FALK COLLEGE OF SPORT AND HUMAN DYNAMICS

Research Study
RACIAL-ETHNIC SOCIALIZATION SURVEY
Parent/Caregiver Version

Dear Family Member:

We are inviting you to participate in a survey on families and children to be conducted by the Department of Child and Family Studies at Syracuse University. This study should provide insights into family ideas regarding the importance of teaching young children about their racial or ethnic background.

Thank you for participating.

Respectfully,

Kimberly Davidson
Graduate Student
Syracuse University
kdavids@syr.edu
(865)803-5066

Jaipaul L. Roopnarine, Ph.D.
Jack Reilly Professor of Child and Family Studies
Syracuse University
jroopnar@syr.edu

ID #_________________________
Thank you for agreeing to participate in the study and being willing to share your thoughts and feelings with us. Please read every question carefully and answer the questions to the best of your knowledge. There is no right or wrong answer. Your answers will be kept confidential.

Interviewer _____________________                Date of Interview _____________________

Your Name: ___________________________ Date of birth: ___________ MM/DD/YYYY
First         Middle          Last

Gender: _____ Male      _____ Female

Think of the “target child” as you answer the following questions…..

Name of Child: ___________________________ Date of birth: ___________ MM/DD/YYYY
First         Middle          Last

Gender: _____ Male      _____ Female

Birth Order: _____ First –Born _____ Second-Born _____ Third-Born _____ Later-born

1. Your relationship to the child participating in the study…

Birth Mother _______ Adoptive Mother _______
Step Mother _______ Birth Father _______
Adoptive Father _______ Step Father _______
Foster Mother (Blood Related) _______ Foster Mother (not blood related) _______
Foster Father (Blood Related) _______ Foster Father (not blood related) _______
Maternal/ Paternal Grandfather _______ Maternal/ Paternal Grandmother _______
Female Guardian /Caregiver _______
Male Guardian/Caregiver _______
Other ___________________________ (please specify)
2. Please list all the related and unrelated people living in your home, their relationships to the child participating in the study, and their ages. Start with yourself followed by all other people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the codes to indicate each adult person’s education. For children in school report their current standard that they are enrolled in.

1 = No school, Kindergarten only;  
2 = Completed elementary school;  
3 = Less than high school;  
4 = Completed high school or GED;  
5 = Completed business or technical or trade school;  
6 = Some University education (in college and not completed degree);  
7 = Completed University (have undergraduate degree BA/BS);  
8 = Some postgraduate education (in graduate school and not completed);  
9 = Completed graduate school (have MS/PhD/MD)
3. **On ethnicity and race, how do you identify yourself?**

**Race:**
- African American or Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- European American/Caucasian/White
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Biracial/Multiracial (Please Specify) ________________________________
- Other (Please Specify) _______________________________________

**Ethnicity:**
- Hispanic or Latino
- Non Hispanic or Latino
- Other (Please Specify) _______________________________________

4. **Which is your current marital status?**

a. Single-never married
b. Divorced, separated
c. Common-law
d. Married (to father/mother of this child)
e. Married (not to father/mother of this child)
f. Widow
g. Other

(Please specify) ________________________________
5. What is your country of birth? _______________________________________

6. If you were not born in this country, at which age did you come to this country? _______________________________________

7. On ethnicity and race, how do you identify your child who is participating in this study?

   **Race:**
   - African American or Black __________
   - American Indian or Alaska Native __________
   - Asian __________
   - European American/Caucasian/White __________
   - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander __________
   - Biracial/Multiracial (Please Specify) _______________________________________
   - Other (Please Specify) _______________________________________

   **Ethnicity:**
   - Hispanic or Latino __________
   - Non Hispanic or Latino __________
   - Other (Please Specify) _______________________________________

8. Primary language spoken by you:

   _______________________________________

9. Primary language spoken by the child who is participating in the study:

   _______________________________________

10. Other languages spoken in your home:

    _______________________________________


11. Which of these best describes your current employment status?

- [ ] EMPLOYED (INCLUDING SELF-EMPLOYED) FULL-TIME (35 or more hours/week)
- [ ] EMPLOYED PART-TIME (less than 35 hours/week)
- [ ] UNEMPLOYED, LOOKING FOR WORK
- [ ] SEASONAL/TEMPORARY (e.g., house painter, lawn care)
- [ ] RETIRED AND NOT WORKING
- [ ] STUDENT
- [ ] HOMEMAKER
- [ ] DISABLED OR TOO ILL TO WORK
- [ ] OTHER (please specify: ____________________________)

12. Do you currently have more than one job?

- [ ] NO          - [ ] YES

13. ON AVERAGE, WHAT IS YOUR EARNED MONTHLY INCOME (FROM EMPLOYMENT)?

- [ ] Below $500
- [ ] $501-$1,000
- [ ] $1,001-$2,000
- [ ] $2,001-$3,000
- [ ] $3,001 or above
- [ ] Don’t Know/No Response

14. ON AVERAGE, WHAT IS YOUR MONTHLY INCOME FROM ALL FAMILY MEMBERS (FROM EMPLOYMENT)?

- [ ] Below $500
- [ ] $501-$1,000
- [ ] $1,001-$2,000
- [ ] $2,001-$3,000
- [ ] $3,001 or above
- [ ] Don’t Know/No Response
15. How many adult family members (living under the same roof with you) contribute to your total family income?

Include yourself also in the total number, if you are working

________________________ people

16. How long has this child been enrolled in Head Start? _____ years _____ months

17. In your family, who is the main person(s) for educating (doing homework, reading, etc.) this child? Check only one – more than half of the time.

___________ Birth Mother
___________ Birth Father
___________ Both biological parents
___________ Grandmother (maternal/paternal)
___________ Grandfather (maternal/paternal)

___________ Other (please specify) ____________________________

18. In this family, who assumes the most responsibility for interacting with Head Start (e.g., attend parent-teacher meetings, talks to child’s teacher, etc.)? Check only one – more than half of the time.

___________ Birth Mother
___________ Birth Father
___________ Both biological parents
___________ Grandmother (maternal/paternal)
___________ Grandfather (maternal/paternal)

___________ Other (please specify) ____________________________

19. In today’s society, where do young children learn their values from (Choose all that apply)? Please rank the values chosen (e.g., if “school teachers” is the most important source, then it will be ranked first and given a value of 1, second most important will be given a value of 2 and so on).

____ Parents/Family
____ School teachers
____ TV/ Films/Radio
____ Religious leaders
____ Street/neighborhood people
____ School friends
____ Sports heroes

____ Others (please specify) _________________________________
20. Rank order from 1 (most important) to 13 (least important) the cultural values that you want this child to develop.

- Be loyal to the family
- Be respectful and obedient
- Be honest
- Be affectionate
- Be humble
- Be responsible
- Share with others
- Be independent
- Be creative
- Be assertive
- Carry oneself with dignity
- Value older persons
- Get along with others

We want to thank you for participating in this survey and sharing some of your very personal thoughts and feelings about some sensitive topics. As indicated to you earlier, all your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you very much.
Please use this space to provide any additional thoughts or comments related to your answers on the previous questionnaire or about your beliefs and practices related to teaching your child about his or her racial-ethnic background.

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________
Dear Teacher:

We are inviting you to participate in a survey on Head Start teachers, families and children to be conducted by the Department of Child and Family Studies at Syracuse University. This study should provide insights into ideas regarding the importance of teaching young children about their racial or ethnic background.

Thank you for participating.

Respectfully,

Kimberly Davidson  
Graduate Student  
Syracuse University  
kldavids@syr.edu  
(865)803-5066

Jaipaul L. Roopnarine, Ph.D.  
Jack Reilly Professor of Child and Family Studies  
Syracuse University  
jroopnar@syr.edu

ID #_________________________
Thank you for agreeing to participate in the study and being willing to share your thoughts and feelings with us. Please read every question carefully and answer the questions to the best of your knowledge. There is no right or wrong answer. Your answers will be kept confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Your Name: ___________________________ Date of birth: __________ MM/DD/YYYY

First   Middle   Last   MM/DD/YYYY

Gender: _____ Male    _____ Female

1. Please indicate your highest level of education (ECE = Early Childhood Education).

   _____ Less than high school;
   _____ High school or GED;
   _____ High school/GED and additional ECE trainings/workshops;
   _____ Business or technical/trade school;
   _____ Associate’s degree in ECE or related field;
   _____ Associate’s degree in field other than ECE;
   _____ Some University education (in college and not completed degree);
   _____ Bachelor’s degree in ECE or related field;
   _____ Bachelor’s degree in field other than ECE;
   _____ Some postgraduate education (in graduate school and not completed);
   _____ Master’s degree in ECE or related field;
   _____ Master’s degree in field other than ECE;
   _____ PhD/MD or other advanced degree
2. **On ethnicity and race, how do you identify yourself?** Please check all that apply.

**Race:**
- African American or Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- European American/Caucasian/White
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Biracial/Multiracial (Please Specify)
- Other (Please Specify)

**Ethnicity:**
- Hispanic or Latino
- Non Hispanic or Latino
- Other (Please Specify)

3. **Which is your current marital status?**
   a. Single-never married
   b. Divorced, separated
   c. Common-law
   d. Married
   e. Widow
   f. Other
   (Please specify)
4. What is your country of birth? _______________________

5. If you were not born in this country, at which age did you come to this country?

____________________________________________________

6. Primary language spoken by you:

____________________________________________________

7. Primary language spoken by the child who is participating in the study while he/she is in your classroom:

____________________________________________________

8. Other languages spoken in your classroom:

____________________________________________________

9. In today’s society, where do young children learn their values from (Choose all that apply)? Please rank the values chosen (e.g., if “school teachers” is the most important source, then it will be ranked first and given a value of 1, second most important will be given a value of 2 and so on).

___ Parents/Family
___ School teachers
___ TV/ Films/Radio
___ Religious leaders
___ Street/neighborhood people
___ School friends
___ Sports heroes
___ Others (please specify) ________________________________
10. Rank order from 1 (most important) to 13 (least important) the cultural values that you want children in your classroom to develop.

- Be loyal to the family
- Be respectful and obedient
- Be honest
- Be affectionate
- Be humble
- Be responsible
- Share with others
- Be independent
- Be creative
- Be assertive
- Carry oneself with dignity
- Value older persons
- Get along with others

We want to thank you for participating in this survey and sharing some of your very personal thoughts and feelings about some sensitive topics. As indicated to you earlier, all your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you very much.
Please use this space to provide any additional thoughts or comments related to your answers on the previous questionnaire(s) or about your beliefs and practices related to teaching children in your classroom about their racial-ethnic background.

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
Parent/Caregiver Racial-Ethnic Socialization Questionnaire

Directions: For each of the items below, please answer two related questions. Please circle one response under the gray columns and one response under the white columns.

The Gray Columns: The first question is how often you explicitly or directly tell your child these things now. For each item, please circle one of the response options in the gray columns. So, for example, for item 1, please circle one number that indicates how often you tell your child that people are equal, regardless of their race or ethnic background.

The White Columns: The second question is how important you think it is that you do these things at some point in the future. Sometimes, parents or caregivers have not talked to children about issues related to race or ethnicity because they do not think it is important. In other cases, parents or caregivers have not talked to children about these issues because the right time has not come up. For each item, please circle one of the response options in the white columns. So, for example, for item 1, please circle one number that indicates how important you think it is that you tell your child at some point in the future that people are equal, regardless of their race or ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I explicitly or directly tell my child…</th>
<th>About how often do you tell your child this?</th>
<th>How important do you think it is that you do this at some point in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. People are equal, regardless of their race or ethnic background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. About important people in the history of his/her racial or ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They should try to make friends with people of all races and ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other racial or ethnic groups are just as trustworthy as people of the child’s own ethnic or racial group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People of all races have an equal chance in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. About the possibility that some people might treat him/her badly or unfairly because of his/her race or ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. About discrimination or prejudice against his/her ethnic or racial group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I explicitly or directly tell my child…</td>
<td>About how often do you tell your child this?</td>
<td>How important do you think it is that you do this at some point in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. About discrimination or prejudice against other ethnic or racial groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is important to appreciate people of all racial and ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Something unfair that the child witnessed was due to racial or ethnic discrimination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To read or look at books that include history and traditions of his/her racial or ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is best to have friends who are the same race or ethnic group as you are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The importance of getting along with people of all races and ethnicities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. American society is fair to all races and ethnicities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People are sometimes still discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To learn about the history or traditions of his/her racial or ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People of one race or ethnic group have better opportunities than people of other racial or ethnic groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. People of different races and ethnicities have different values and beliefs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sometimes people are treated badly just because of their race or ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In the past people were discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher Questionnaire

**Directions:** For each of the items below, please answer two related questions. Please circle one response under the gray columns and one response under the white columns.

**The Gray Columns:** The first question is how often you explicitly or directly tell children in your classroom these things now. For each item, please circle one of the response options in the gray columns. So, for example, for item 1, please circle one number that indicates how often you tell children that people are equal, regardless of their race or ethnic background.

**The White Columns:** The second question is how important you think it is that you do these things at some point in the future. Sometimes, teachers have not talked to children about issues related to race or ethnicity because they do not think it is important. In other cases, teachers have not talked to children about these issues because the right time has not come up. For each item, please circle one of the response options in the white columns. So, for example, for item 1, please circle one number that indicates how important you think it is that you tell children at some point in the future that people are equal, regardless of their race or ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I explicitly or directly tell children in my classroom...</th>
<th>About how often do you tell children this?</th>
<th>How important do you think it is that you do this at some point in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are equal, regardless of their race or ethnic background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About important people in the history of their racial or ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They should try to make friends with people of all races and ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other racial or ethnic groups are just as trustworthy as people of the child’s own ethnic or racial group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all races have an equal chance in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the possibility that some people might treat him/her badly or unfairly because of his/her race or ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About discrimination or prejudice against their ethnic or racial group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Africentric Home Environment Inventory**  
*adapted for use with European American families*  
(Caughy, Randolph, & O’Campo, 2002)

For each item below, choose YES to indicate the item is present in your home or NO to indicate you do not have this/these item(s) in your home. Please answer the questions honestly and to the best of your ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know/ Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Child has culturally appropriate toys (e.g., multicultural dolls or action figures)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Multicultural pictures, posters or artwork in the home?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Child has at least three multicultural children’s books (children’s books, coloring books, etc.)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There are at least ten multicultural books in the home (History books, magazines, textbooks, novels)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Home has a variety of music?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Child has access to toys which facilitate learning about multicultural history (board games, etc.)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Pictures of multicultural family members or persons are visible in the home?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Have clothing or household items made of multicultural fabrics or prints?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Africentric Home Environment Inventory
adapted for use with multiple racial and ethnic groups
(Caughy, Randolph, & O’Campo, 2002)

For each item below, choose YES to indicate the item is present in your home or NO to indicate you do not have this/these item(s) in your home. Please answer the questions honestly and to the best of your ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Child has culturally appropriate toys (e.g., dolls or action figures that represent his/her racial or ethnic group(s))?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pictures, posters or artwork representing the child’s racial/ethnic group(s) in the home?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Child has at least three children’s books (children’s books, coloring books, etc.) that include his/her racial/ethnic group(s)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There are at least ten multicultural books in the home (History books, magazines, textbooks, novels) that include his/her racial/ethnic group(s)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Home has a variety of music?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Child has access to toys which facilitate learning about the history or culture of his/her racial/ethnic group(s) (board games, etc.)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Pictures of family members or persons representing the child’s racial/ethnic group(s) are visible in the home?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Have clothing or household items made of fabrics or prints that represent the child’s racial/ethnic culture or background?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Africentric Home Environment Inventory
adapted for use with multiple racial and ethnic groups in classrooms
(Caughy, Randolph, & O’Campo, 2002)

Again, please complete one survey for each racial-ethnic group represented in your classroom.
Racial-Ethnic Group: _____________________________________________________

For each item below, choose YES to indicate the item is present in your classroom or NO to indicate you do not have this/these item(s) in your classroom. Please answer the questions honestly and to the best of your ability. For items d and e, you only need to answer one time, on the first survey that you complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know/ Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Classroom has culturally appropriate toys (e.g., dolls or action figures that represent this racial or ethnic group(s)?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pictures, posters or artwork representing this racial/ethnic group(s) in the classroom?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Classroom has at least three children’s books (children’s books, coloring books, etc.) that include this racial/ethnic group(s)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. There are at least ten multicultural books in the classroom?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Classroom has a variety of music?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Children have access to toys which facilitate learning about the history or culture of this racial/ethnic group(s) (board games, etc.)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Pictures of family members or persons representing this racial/ethnic group(s) are visible in the classroom?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Have clothing or household items made of fabrics or prints that represent this racial/ethnic culture or background?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

### Additional Analyses Results

**Bayesian Confirmatory Factor Analyses Model 1: Four-Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egalitarianism</th>
<th>Std Lambda</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are equal, regardless of race or ethnic background (Q1)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to make friends with people of all backgrounds (Q3)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups are just as trustworthy as own group (Q4)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all races have equal chance in life (Q5)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to appreciate people of all backgrounds (Q9)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to get along with people all races and ethnicities (Q13)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American society is fair to all races (Q14)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Socialization</th>
<th>Std Lambda</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read/look at books that include history and traditions own group (Q11)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about history/traditions own group (Q16)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different races and ethnicities have different values and beliefs (Q18)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important people in history of own group (Q2)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation for Bias</th>
<th>Std Lambda</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Something unfair child witnessed was due to discrimination (Q10)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People sometimes still discriminated against because race/ethnicity (Q15)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes people treated badly just because of their race or ethnicity (Q19)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past, people were discriminated against because race/ethnicity (Q20)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility that some might treat him/her badly because of race/ethnicity (Q6)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination or prejudice against his/her group (Q7)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination or prejudice other racial/ethnic groups (Q8)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion of Mistrust</th>
<th>Std Lambda</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 2.5%</th>
<th>Upper 2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of one race or ethnic group have better opportunities than other groups (Q17)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best to have friends same race as you (Q12)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model 1: Self-regulation on Home Environment Match

Model 1: Self-regulation on Cultural Socialization Match
Model 1: Self-regulation on Preparation for Bias Match

Model 1: Self-regulation on Egalitarianism Match
Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical Low Parent–High Teacher *Home Environment*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-Low Teacher *Home Environment*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-High Teacher *Home Environment*
Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical Low Parent-High Teacher *Cultural Socialization*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-Low Teacher *Cultural Socialization*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-High Teacher *Cultural Socialization*
Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical Low Parent-High Teacher *Preparation for Bias*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-Low Teacher *Preparation for Bias*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-High Teacher *Preparation for Bias*
Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical Low Parent-High Teacher *Egalitarianism*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-Low Teacher *Egalitarianism*

Model 2: Self-regulation on Categorical High Parent-High Teacher *Egalitarianism*
Model 3: Self-regulation on Continuous *Home Environment* Difference

Model 3: Self-regulation on Continuous *Cultural Socialization* Difference

Model 3: Self-regulation on Continuous *Preparation for Bias* Difference

Model 3: Self-regulation on Continuous *Egalitarianism* Difference
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