The following body of work addressed several gaps in the literature regarding our understanding of racial/ethnic differences in parents’ emotion socialization practices, the social-cultural antecedents of African American parents’ racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices, and the interactive effect of parents’ racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices on young African American children’s social-emotion development. Study 1 used 2 waves of data to examine whether differences in experienced racial/ethnic discrimination between African American and European American parents predict differences in their beliefs about the appropriateness and social consequences of children’s displays of negative emotions and subsequent differences in their use of suppression responses to children’s negative emotions. Study 2 used 2 waves of data and a within group design to examine whether African American parents’ reported discrimination, ethnic identity, and emotion beliefs predict their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices in similar ways given the two practices are theorized as joint strategies aimed at protecting children from experiences of bias. Study 3 used 1 wave of data and a multi-informant (i.e., parent and teacher report), multi-method (observational and questionnaire data) to examine the joint role of parents’ racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices in promoting young African American children’s social-emotional adjustment. Collectively, the studies provided empirical evidence for the view that racial and emotion socialization have developed out of similar socio-cultural and ecological antecedents, specifically, the context of racism and discrimination that
African American families must navigate. Results also revealed that how parents combine their use of racial and emotion socialization has a statistically significant impact on children’s social-emotional development. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Many developmental researchers have highlighted the importance of gathering more research on the social-emotional adaptation of African American children (American Psychological Association, Task Force on Resilience and Strength in Black Children and Adolescents, 2008). This call to action is in part due to the unique obstacles to healthy social-emotional development that African American children face including systemic racism and discrimination. African American children of all ages experience various forms of racism/discrimination including teacher bias, denigrating cultural stereotypes, and peer rejection (Sanders-Phillips, 2009). A growing body of work illustrates that experiences of racism and discrimination may have deleterious short and long-term effects on African American children’s social-emotional health and well-being (Cooper, McLoyd, Wood, & Hardaway, 2008). One mechanism by which racial adversity impacts development is emotional distress and reactivity to such events (Borders & Liang, 2011). Accordingly, researchers have called for increased scholarly evaluation of processes that may contribute to children’s successful emotional development in the face of discrimination (American Psychological Association, Task Force on Resilience and Strength in Black Children and Adolescents, 2008).
A growing body of work that specifically addresses this issue is the racial socialization literature. Racial socialization refers to the messages parents relay to their children about what it means to be black in America and has generally been found to be a source of resilience for African American children and has been linked to decreased negative affect and greater social-emotional adaptation (Hughes et al., 2006). However, there is evidence to indicate that racial socialization messages sometimes has no effect and in some cases may actually contribute to African American children’s social-emotional maladjustment, leading to greater feelings of sadness and helplessness (Hughes et al.). Given the emotionally arousing nature of experiences of discrimination, the fact that children’s normative displays of negative emotions can in and of themselves make them the targets of discrimination, and that discussions of discrimination can also serve as a source of emotional distress, African American parents’ specific emotion related socialization practices is a highly relevant yet surprisingly lacking piece of the discussion regarding African American children’s emotional health. Parental emotion socialization—the practices that teach children how to understand and regulate their emotions (Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998)—may be an integral aspect of racial/ethnic socialization by virtue of the methods parents use to prepare children to cope with discrimination through the regulation of their emotions.

Recognizing the need for more emotion centered research evaluating processes that promote African American children’s social-emotional adaptation, the present body of work brings together two constructs traditionally studied in separate literatures, racial socialization and the emotion socialization, examines their socio-cultural and ecological
antecedents, and examines their joint impact on young African American children’s social-emotional well-being. Three stand-alone yet interconnected empirical studies are presented to address this topic, cumulating in a general conclusion in which themes across the studies and implications for research and practice are discussed.
CHAPTER II

STUDY 1. THE ROLE OF RACIAL/ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION AND EMOTION BELIEFS IN EXPLAINING DIFFERENCES IN AFRICAN AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN AMERICAN PARENTS’ EMOTION SOCIALIZATION PRACTICES

Introduction

Parenting practices that teach children social norms surrounding emotional expression and how to understand and regulate their emotions, referred to as emotion socialization, have substantial consequences for children’s social-emotional development (Cicchetti, Ackerman, & Izard, 1995; Cole & Deater-Deckard, 2009; Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998). Several investigators have found ethnic group differences in parents’ emotion socialization practices and how such practices influence child development (Halberstadt, Craig, Lozada, & Brown, 2011; Montague, Magai, Consedine, & Gillespie, 2003; Nelson, Leerkes, O’Brien, Calkins, and Marcovitch, 2012; Venlinski, Silk, Shaw, & Lane, 2006). Researchers theorize that these differences may be explained by non-shared social-ecological factors (Leerkes, Supple, Su, & Cavanaugh, 2012), however, few studies have empirically examined the role of such factors on parents’ emotion socialization practices. Although examining racial/ethnic group differences in parenting may provide indirect evidence for the influence of social-ecological factors on parenting, it is important for researchers to directly measure these factors in order to generate more precise inferences. The purpose of the current study is to examine differences in African American and European American parents’ emotion socialization
practices and the role of racial/ethnic discrimination and beliefs about emotions in mediating the link between race/ethnicity and emotion socialization practices.

**Parental Emotion Socialization**

Parents’ responses to children’s displays of negative emotions (e.g., fear, sadness, anger) are an important aspect of emotion socialization as negative emotions are particularly difficult for children to manage compared to positive emotions and how children learn to manage their negative emotions has important consequences for their social-emotional development (Eisenberg et al., 1998; Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Myers, & Robinson, 2007). Researchers have conceptually divided parents’ responses into two overarching categories: supportive responses which include encouraging children to express their negative emotions, problem-solving, and emotion-focused responses such as comforting; and suppression responses (often referred to as “nonsupportive” in the broader literature) which include punishing or minimizing children’s negative emotional displays (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994).

Investigators find that African American parents engage in higher levels of suppression responses to their children’s displays of negative emotions than do European American parents (Leerkes & Siepak, 2006; Montague et al., 2003; Nelson et al., 2012). This pattern has been found both in regards to adult children’s remembered responses of their parents (Leerkes & Siepak) and parents’ self-reports of their own behavior towards their young children (Nelson et al.). Regarding supportive practices, evidence suggests that African American parents support their children’s expressions of negative emotions
particularly in the family context and as long as they do not disrespect authority figures (Parker et al., 2012).

Accordingly, although suppression responses have generally been linked to maladaptive social-emotion development for European American children, such responses have been found to be adaptive for African American children (Smith & Walden, 2001; Vendlinski et al. 2006). Theory and empirical evidence, primary based on European American participants (Buckley, Storino, & Saarni, 2003), suggest that when parents respond in supportive ways to their children’s negative emotional displays through expressive encouragement, problem-focused, and emotion focused responses, children learn to accept their negative emotions and to use similar strategies to regulate their own negative emotions (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1997). Conversely, when parents discourage children from expressing themselves emotionally such as through punitive or minimizing responses, they are not providing children with models for how to effectively cope with their negative emotions (Denham, Mitchell-Copeland, Strandberg, Auerbach, & Blair, 1997; Eisenberg, et al., 1998; Jones, Eisenberg, Fabes, & MacKinnon, 2002) and thus children learn to suppress overt emotional expression but may still become physiologically aroused without developing the capacity to self-regulate (Fabes, Poulin, Eisenberg, & Madden-Derdich, 2002; Jones et al., 2002). Hence the label “nonsupportive” used by researchers in this area in reference to punitive and minimizing responses.

However, for African American children, whose normative emotional expressions are often viewed as more aggressive and threatening than those of their white
counterparts (Kang & Chasteen, 2009; Ward, 2000), higher use of suppression responses among African American families are possibly an adaptive strategy to help children circumvent racial bias. Recent findings indicating that parental suppression does not have the same detrimental effect on African American children as it does on European American children supports this view (Leerkes et al., 2012; Montague et al., 2003; Nelson et al., 2013; Smith & Walden, 2001; Vendlinski et al., 2006). For example, whereas African American parents’ expressive encouragement has been linked to teacher-reports of less competent peer interactions (Nelson et al.), suppression responses have been linked to less teacher-reported aggression (Smith & Walden). Thus, I label punitive and minimizing practices as “suppression responses” rather than “nonsupportive responses” in order to better reflect the protective goals of African American families.

**Predictors of Parental Emotion Socialization**

Parents’ socialization practices are influenced by their social environments, environments that differ by racial/ethnic group given the racially stratified context of the US (Garcia Coll et al, 1996). Ogbu’s (1981) cultural ecological model states that parents socialize children in ways that develop skills and competences necessary for adaptation to their specific cultural contexts. African American families face unique challenges due to their marginalized status, challenges that permeate all facets of life and that are non-shared with European American families (Garcia Coll). Thus, findings regarding differences between African American and European American parental socialization cannot be understood without consideration to the racialized context in which parenting occurs. One important context to consider is African American parent’s pervasive
experiences with racial discrimination due to their marginalized status (Odom, Garrett-Peters, & Vernon-Feagans, 2014) and the beliefs about emotions and their consequences that form in adaptation to this context.

**The role of emotion beliefs.** Parents’ beliefs about emotions, which reflect cultural norms and experiences, are likely to predict the types of emotion socialization strategies they use (Gottman et al., 1997; Sigel & McGillicuddy-DeLisi, 2002; Wong, Diener, & Isabella, 2008). Some evidence suggests that African American adults believe that the expression of negative emotions are less appropriate than do European American adults (Matsumoto, 1993). Further, recent research comparing African American mothers to European American mothers suggests that African American mothers’ discouragement of negative emotions may be related to their beliefs that it is not appropriate for their children to display negative emotions and that there are adverse social consequences for doing so (Nelson et al., 2012). Nelson et al. found that African American mothers, especially those of boys, were more likely than European American mothers to report that it was not appropriate for their children to display negative emotions and that there were negative social consequences for negative emotional displays. In turn, differences in African American and European American mothers’ emotion beliefs explained African American mothers’ higher use of emotion suppression strategies. Nelson et al. theorized that differences in beliefs and subsequent differences in practices could be attributed to the social-ecological context of discrimination and bias. Consistent with these findings, African American parents of boys, compared to those of girls, are more likely to believe their sons will experience overt racism (Hill, 2001; McHale et al., 2006).
The role of discrimination. Some emotion socialization researchers argue that socialization practices focused on the suppression of negative emotions may be a deliberate strategy used by African American parents to protect their children from the negative effects of racism (Leerkes et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2012). Specifically, African American parents, especially those of boys, sensitive to the racial biases of society may attempt to suppress the expression of negative emotions in their children in order to protect them from the negative views of non-Blacks, thus allowing them to better circumvent racial barriers (Dunbar, Perry, Cavanaugh, & Leerkes, 2014).

Although emotion socialization researchers have suggested that social-ecological factors such as the broad context of racism and discrimination may underlie research findings of racial/ethnic differences, no studies to my knowledge have empirically examined whether African American parents’ individual experiences with discrimination predict their emotion beliefs and subsequent higher levels of suppression when compared to European American parents. It is likely that African American parents who have experienced discrimination themselves may be more likely than European American parents to believe that it is inappropriate for their children to display negative emotions and that there will be negative social consequences for negative emotional displays, such beliefs may subsequently lead to racial/ethnic differences in the use of emotion suppression strategies.

Current Study

The current study extends the work of Nelson and colleagues (2012) by examining whether differences in experienced discrimination between African American
and European American parents predict differences in their beliefs about displaying emotion and their consequences and subsequent differences in levels of suppression responses.

As seen in Figure 1, I hypothesize that African American parents, compared to European American parents, will report higher levels of discrimination, lower acceptance of children’s displays of negative emotion, higher perceived social consequences for children’s displays of negative emotions, and higher use of suppression responses to children’s negative emotions. The association between maternal ethnicity and suppression responses will be sequentially mediated by discrimination and emotion beliefs. Specifically, African American parents’ higher levels of discrimination, compared to European American parents, will predict their lower acceptance of children’s displays of negative emotions and higher perceived negative social consequences for children’s displays of negative emotions; lower acceptance and higher perceived consequences will in turn predict higher levels of suppression responses to children’s negative emotions. The link between discrimination and suppression responses will be mediated by emotion beliefs. Further, the link between maternal ethnicity and suppression responses will be moderated by child gender such that African American parents of boys will report the greatest use of suppression responses. This moderating effect will be mediated by maternal beliefs such that African American parents of boys will report the lowest acceptance of negative emotion displays and perceive the greatest consequences, and the direct effect of the interaction to suppression responses will be reduced.
Methods

Participants

Participants in the current study will be 226 primary caregivers (96.9% mothers) who are participating in a larger study (N=277) examining the link between learning engagement and school success that follows children across 3 waves: age 4, kindergarten, and 1st grade. The current study will utilize data from waves 1 and 2. Given the goals of the current study, only parents who identified themselves and their target child as black (n=78 or 34.5%) or non-Hispanic White (n=148 or 65.5 %) will be included in analyses. Participants who identified themselves and/or their child as multiracial with white and black or who identified themselves as white and their child as black were not included. Primary caregivers ranged in age from 19 to 58 years (M= 35.25). Total yearly income ranged from $2,400 to $120,000 (Median= $42,000). Regarding education, 10.2% had a high school degree/GED or less, 27.9% had some college, and 61.9% had a 4-year college degree or beyond. The majority were married (66.8%), 8.8% were cohabiting but not married, and 24.3% were single, divorced, separated, or widowed. Approximately half of the children were female (n = 121, 53.5%). Of the 226 participants, 208 (139 white and 69 black) participated in the 2nd wave of data collection.

Procedure

Preschoolers and their primary caregivers were recruited from daycare centers, libraries, recreation centers, local parks, newspaper advertisement, local pediatric offices, a children’s museum, Woman Infants and Children (WIC), and by referrals from other participants via informational flyers/brochures in a mid-sized city in the Southeastern
United States. Interested caregivers either completed a contact form (paper or online) to be called at a later time or called our research office to inquire about the details of the study. Inclusion criteria included that the child was a singleton or caregiver was willing to allow only 1 randomly selected eligible twin to participate, was entering kindergarten in August 2014, and the child and caregiver(s) had sufficient English skills to complete the assessments, including parent-child interactive game, in English. Exclusion criteria included a diagnosis of a developmental delay and plans to homeschool the child.

Four hundred and forty-seven primary caregivers and children responded to the recruitment materials. Of these, 54 were ineligible to participate (33 were not entering Kindergarten in August 2014, 8 did not speak English, 1 was planning on homeschooling, and 12 were twins). Of these 393 potential participants, 43 did not respond when repeatedly contacted regarding the study and 24 declined to participate for various reasons. Thus, 326 primary caregivers agreed to participate on the phone or by e-mail. Of these, 15 participated as pilots and 32 did not participate in scheduled data collection after multiple attempts to contact them and/or to reschedule their appointments. Thus, the final sample consisted of 279 preschoolers and their primary caregivers (277 provided demographic data).

Upon arrival to the laboratory, participants were read or allowed to read the consent form to sign before beginning. While the child stayed in one room with the experimenter, the primary caregiver was taken to the adjacent room (where she could see a video image of her child on the computer screen) to complete her questionnaires. Most caregivers completed their questionnaires via Qualtrics, a computerized questionnaire
service, with an assistant in the room who could answer any questions. The data from Qualtrics were transferred directly to an SPSS dataset with no need for human data entry. However, all the data will be double checked for errors. Caregivers who did not complete questionnaires via Qualtrics were given paper questionnaire packets to complete. Upon completion of the laboratory visit and questionnaires, caregivers were compensated ($75 for w1 and $100 for w2) and the child was allowed to choose a toy.

Measures

All measures were assessed at waves 1 (age 4) and 2 (kindergarten year).

Racism/discrimination. Perceived racism was assessed using the Inventory of Race Related Stress-Brief Version (IRRS-B; Utsey, 1999), a short version of the Inventory of Race Related Stress (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996). The IRRS-B is a 22-item scale consisting of three subscales: Cultural Racism (10 items), Institutional Racism (6 items), and Individual Racism (6 items). For brevity and because all the subscales are moderately to highly correlated ($p = .56-.74$; Utsey, 1999), the present study included the Individual and Institutional Racism subscales only, resulting in an abridged 12-item scale. Further, because the measure was administered to all participants regardless of race, the term “Whites/non-Blacks” was modified to “someone of another race.” Participants indicate whether specific experiences of racism and discrimination either happened to them or someone close to them (e.g., “you were treated with less respect and courtesy than someone of another race while in a store, restaurant, or other business establishment”) and the intensity of their reaction during the time of the event on a scale from 0 (*this event never happened*) to 4 (*this event happened and I was extremely upset*).
Items are summed such that higher scores indicate greater reported racism. The two subscales were combined into a composite manifest variable.

**Beliefs about emotion expression.** Parents’ beliefs regarding their children’s displays of negative emotions were assessed using the 20-item Beliefs about Emotions questionnaire, adapted for the current study from Matsumoto (1993). Parents are asked to rate how acceptable they believe it is for their child to display various negative emotions (anger, fear, sadness, and crying) in various situations (when alone, with family, with other children, in public, and with an authority figure) on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very much*). All items were averaged to compute a total score with higher scores indicating greater acceptability for their child to display negative emotions.

**Beliefs about emotion consequences.** The Beliefs about Emotion Consequences (BAE-C) was adapted from a measure created by Nelson et al., (2012) and was used to assess the extent to which parents believed there were negative social consequences associated with the display of two types of negative emotions: dominant (anger, frustration, irritation) and submissive (fear, sadness, worry, nervousness). Parents rated 12 items (6 about dominant negative emotions, 6 about submissive negative emotions) on a 6-point Likert scale (*1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree*). Examples of the items are “When my child shows anger, people may view my child as aggressive”, “If my child shows fear, people may think my child is a ‘scaredy-cat.’” Items are averaged to yield a measure in which higher scores indicated a perception of more negative social consequences for the display of negative emotion. This scale was included as a latent variable with the submissive and dominant subscales as manifest indicators.
**Responses to children’s negative emotions.** The Coping with Children’s Negative Emotions Scale (CCNES; Fabes et al., 2002) was used to measure the degree to which parents perceive themselves reacting in certain ways to their child’s negative affect in distressing situations. Respondents are asked to rate on a 7-point scale (1 = very unlikely, 7 = very likely) how likely they are to respond in various ways to 12 hypothetical scenarios in which their child is upset. The measure yields six subscales to capture respondents’ responses: distress reactions (e.g., “get angry at my child”), punitive responses (e.g., “send my child to his/her room to cool off”), minimization (e.g., “tell my child not to make a big deal out of missing the party”), expressive encouragement (e.g., “encourage my child to express his/her feelings of anger or frustration), emotion-focused responses (e.g., “distract my child by talking about happy things), and problem-focused responses (e.g., “help my child figure out how to get the bike fixed”). Given the focus on suppression strategies in the present study, only the punitive and minimizing subscales will be used. The two subscales were combined to create a composite manifest variable.

**Control variables.** Demographic variables (i.e., income, education, and family structure) will be examined as possible controls.

**Plan of Analysis**

Regarding missing data, full information maximum likelihood (FIML) will be implemented using MPlus version 7.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2014) to preserve the sample size (and subsequent power) while retaining all available information to generate parameter estimates. Before modeling hypotheses, measurement invariance of all key scales will be assessed across ethnicity using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis.
and following the guidelines of Vandenberg and Lance (2000) and Van de Vijver (2011). Measurement invariance testing will help reduce the possibility that differences found are due to non-invariance of measures across ethnicity. The most widely accepted tests of measurement invariance examine the relationships between observed indicator variables (items of a questionnaire) and latent factors (Van de Vijver, 2011) and include—in sequential order—a test of configural invariance (also referred to as weak factorial invariance), metric invariance (also referred to as strong factorial invariance), and scalar invariance (also referred to as strict factorial invariance).

Configural invariance tests that the pattern of item loadings on factors is the same across groups such that the number of latent factors is the same and the same items load onto the same factors. In other words, the configural model tests that the items and latent factors of a proposed CFA model are configured the same way across groups. Metric invariance evaluates whether the strength of item factor loadings (regression weights) onto their designated factors are similar across groups. Scalar invariance tests that the intercepts of like items across groups are invariant. Because a higher intercept for a like item in one group (indicating lack of scalar invariance) may reflect true differences in the population (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000) only achievement of metric invariance will be required.

Hypothesis will be evaluated with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using Mplus. To test the hypothesized direct and indirect effects, maternal race/ethnicity will be specified to predict wave 1 (w1) racism, wave 2 (w2) beliefs about emotions and beliefs about emotions-other, and w2 suppression responses. Racism will also be specified to
predict the two belief variables and suppression responses. To test the moderating role of child gender multiple group analyses will be implemented.

Hypotheses regarding indirect effects will be evaluated using bias-corrected bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004). Confidence intervals for unstandardized coefficients will be presented for relevant indirect effects. Confidence intervals that do not include 0 reflect statistically significant effects. Model fit will be assessed using the chi-square test of model fit (p-value >.05 indicates good fit), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; acceptable > .90, good fit > .95), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; acceptable < .08, good fit < .05). Because the chi-square test of model fit is highly sensitive to sample size, the other fit indices will be given greater weight in assessing model fit.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Measurement invariance. Because the primary analyses involved comparisons across African American and European American mothers, preliminary multiple group confirmatory factor analyses (MGCFA) were conducted on key study variables to determine whether measures were invariant, that is, to determine whether measures were tapping the same construct for both African American and European American mothers. With modifications, at least partial metric (strong factorial) invariance was found for all variables.

Independent variable. The index of racism-related stress measure required the deletion of 2 items (items 2 “You have been threatened with physical violence” and 12
“You were refused an apartment or other housing”) that demonstrated low factor loadings in the African American subsample. The reduced 10-item 1 factor model fit the data well in both groups and partial metric invariance was achieved (item 5 (“You were treated with less respect and courtesy”) was found to be non-invariant, loading more highly for black sample) and was thus allowed to be estimated freely across groups). A composite variable was computed omitting the 2 items with low factor loadings and the additional item that was found to be non-invariant, resulting in a final invariant 9-item measure (Cronbach’s alpha: African American, a=.768; European American, a=.808).

**Mediators.** The beliefs about emotion consequences measure required the deletion of the two reverse coded items (item 8 “people think it is good for my child to show fear and sadness” and item 11 “people think it is good for my child to show fear and frustration”) which demonstrated low factor loadings in both groups. The reduced 10-item, two factor (submissive emotions and dominant emotions) model demonstrated good fit and scalar invariance. A composite variable for each subscale was computed omitting the reverse coded items, resulting in a 5-item invariant submissive subscale (Cronbach’s alpha: African American, a=.874; European American, a=.890) and a 5-item invariant dominant subscale (Cronbach’s alpha: African American, a=.859; European American, a=.857). The beliefs about emotion expression measure was not found to be invariant and thus was not included in subsequent analyses. Although items loaded highly for both groups, CFA fit was poor in both groups (likely due to large standard errors) and thus further testing of invariance could not be pursued.
**Dependent variables.** The punitive responses subscale required the deletion of 2 items (item 1a “When my child gets angry I send my child to his/her room” and item 8e “if my child looks disappointed after receiving an undesirable gift I scold my child for being insensitive”) that demonstrated low factor loadings in both groups. The reduced 10-item scale demonstrated partial metric invariance (item 4a “if my child is afraid of getting an injection I tell my child to shape up or he/she won’t be allowed to do something he/she like to do” was found to be non-invariant loading more highly for the white sample). A composite variable was computed omitting the 2 items with low factor loadings and the additional item found to be non-invariant, resulting in a final 9-item invariant punitive responses subscale (Cronbach’s alpha: African American, \(a=.874\); European American, \(a=.664\)). The minimizing responses subscale required the deletion of 1 item (item 10f “If my child appears on the verge of tears because other children are being mean I tell my child that she/he will feel better soon” loading more highly for the black sample) that demonstrated a low factor loading in both groups. The reduced 11-item scale demonstrated partial metric invariance (item 7d “If my child becomes nervous for a recital I tell me child that she/he is being a baby about it” was found to be non-invariant). A composite variable was computed omitted the item with a low factor loading and the item found non-invariant, resulting in a final 10-item invariant minimizing responses subscale (Cronbach’s alpha: African American, \(a=.852\); European American, \(a=.747\)).

**Identifying covariates.** Descriptive statistics and correlations among study variables are presented in Table 1. African American mothers, compared to European American mothers, reported significantly lower income and education and were less
likely to be married. Mothers with higher income and education and those who were
married reported lower racism-related stress. Higher educational attainment was related
to lower use of punitive responses to children’s negative emotions. Income was
marginally negatively related to punitive responses and education was marginally
negatively related with minimizing responses. Given income, education, and marital
status were significantly related to both the exogenous and endogenous variables, they
were included as control variables in all subsequent path models.

**Missing data.** Less than 5% of data was missing overall, and the data were
missing completely at random (MCAR) based on Little’s test, $\chi^2 (27) = 27.09$, p>05.
Thus, full information likelihood was used.

**Primary Analyses**

Consistent with hypotheses, point biserial correlations between ethnicity and the
key study variables indicated that African American mothers reported greater racism-
related stress and marginally greater punitive responses to children’s displays of negative
emotions than European American mothers. Contrary to hypotheses, there were no ethnic
differences in mothers’ beliefs about emotion consequences or their minimizing
responses.

Given no ethnic differences in beliefs or minimizing responses (with a marginal
difference in punitive responses), rather than testing for mediating effects, the following
analyses tested for indirect effects from ethnicity and punitive and minimizing responses
through racism-related stress and beliefs. Punitive and minimizing responses were highly
correlated, however, when specified as loading on a latent construct there was a perfect
linear correlation between the punitive subscale and the latent construct. Thus, punitive and minimizing responses were included as manifest variables. The beliefs about emotion consequences dominant and submissive subscales were specified to load on a latent construct.

Structural equation modeling analyses were conducted to examine whether there is an indirect effect of ethnicity on punitive and minimizing responses through mothers’ racism-related stress and beliefs. Multiple group analyses were conducted to determine whether child gender moderated these links. Two models were compared: a model in which all structural weights were constrained to be equal across child gender and an unconstrained model in which all paths were freely estimated across gender. Results indicated that the constrained model fit the data well ($\chi^2 (35) = 39.1, p = .29; CFI = .990; RMSEA = .03$) and did not fit significantly worse than the unconstrained model ($\chi^2 \Delta (21) = 20.27, p = .504$). Thus, contrary to hypotheses, child gender did not moderate the links between mother ethnicity and beliefs and ethnicity and suppression responses. Results are displayed in Figure 4. As predicted, there was a significant indirect effect from ethnicity to punitive responses through racism-related stress and beliefs ($B = .038, p < .05, 95\% CI [.001, .090]$). There was also a marginally significantly indirect effect from ethnicity to minimizing responses through racism-related stress and beliefs ($B = .034, p < .10, 95\% CI [-.001, .096], 90\% CI [.001, .080]$). Specifically, African American mothers reported higher levels of racism-related stress than European American mothers, racism-related stress in turn predicted mothers’ greater belief that there would be negative social consequences for their children’s displays of negative emotions. Believing that there
would be social consequences for children’s displays of negative emotions was in turn associated with greater use of punitive and minimizing responses to children’s negative emotions.

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to examine racial/ethnic differences in African American and European American mothers’ suppression responses to children’s negative emotions and the role of racism/discrimination and beliefs about emotions in explaining hypothesized differences. Results revealed ethnic differences in experienced racism, and an indirect association between mothers’ ethnicity and their punitive and minimizing responses through racism-related stress and beliefs about emotion consequences.

Racial/Ethnic Differences

Results revealed partial evidence for the study hypotheses. As hypothesized, African American mothers reported experiencing greater racism-related stress than European American mothers. This finding is consistent with theory and research indicating that African Americans, due to their marginalized status in the racial hierarchy in the U.S., experience various forms of discrimination, experiences that are not shared with their more racially privileged European American counterparts Garcia Coll et al., 1997). African American mothers also reported marginally greater use of punitive responses to their children’s displays of negative emotions than did European American mothers. Contrary to hypotheses, African American and European American mothers did not differ in their use of minimizing responses or their beliefs about social consequences
for their children’s negative emotional displays. An examination of the emerging comparative emotion socialization literature reveals that African American mothers tend to report higher levels of suppression responses to children’s negative emotions. However, this descriptive difference has not always reached statistical significance (Leerkes et al., 2013; Nelson et al., 2013). Descriptively, the present findings also indicate that African American mothers’ use higher levels of punitive and minimizing responses compared to European American mothers, however, only punitive responses reached marginal significance. Thus, the results of the present study are generally consistent with past findings. Further, in the present study, preliminary invariance analyses were conducted in order to reduce the likelihood that any differences found could be due to non-invariance of measures across ethnicity. However, past studies have not consistently employed measurement invariance analyses prior to testing for mean differences. Thus, the deletion of scale items found to be invariant in some studies but not others may contribute to some inconsistency.

**Indirect Effect Model**

Results of the indirect effect model supported hypotheses and revealed that African American mothers, compared to European American mothers, experienced greater racism-related stress, racism-related stress in turn lead to mothers’ greater beliefs that there would be negative social consequences for their children’s displays of negative emotions and such beliefs were subsequently associated with mothers’ greater use of punitive responses to children’s negative emotions. The same pattern was found for the indirect effect of ethnicity to minimizing responses, however this path was marginally
significant. The full model suggests evidence for a sequential mediating path whereby it was only through racism-related stress that mothers’ ethnicity had an impact on their beliefs that there would be social consequences for their children’s displays of negative emotions. Similarly, mothers’ experiences with racism/discrimination predicted greater suppression of children’s negative emotions only by impacting their beliefs that there would be negative social consequences for their children if they displayed negative emotions. Contrary to hypotheses, links were not stronger for mothers of boys compared to mothers of girls. The lack of differential effects based on child gender may indicate that ethnicity rather than child gender was the main driving factor regarding the links among discrimination, beliefs about emotion consequences, and suppression responses. It may also be the case that gender effects emerge at later stages of development with African American mothers of boys becoming more concerned as boys approach adolescence and become more likely targets of discrimination.

These results extend findings by Nelson and colleagues (2012) who found that beliefs about emotion consequences explained racial/ethnic differences in suppression responses to children’s negative emotions. Nelson and colleagues speculated that African American mothers’ beliefs about emotion consequences and their subsequent greater use of suppression responses could be attributed to the broader context of discrimination in which African American families live. Specifically, they theorized that their results reflect mothers’ attempts at protecting children from racially biased perceptions of their negative emotions as aggressive and threatening. The current study moved beyond speculation of discrimination as an underlying factor by measuring mothers’ direct
experiences with discrimination and thereby supporting the theory that mothers’ own experiences with discrimination lead them to believe that their children will also experience bias, a belief that subsequently leads to practices aimed at preventing children from experience bias due to their emotional displays.

Regarding the more pronounced findings for punitive versus minimizing responses, some speculation about the intention behind each type of response might provide some insight. Punitive responses (i.e., punishing children for their negative emotions by taking away privileges or sending them to their room) might reflect a broader authoritarian parenting style and firm disciplinary control. In the discipline literature, researchers find that African American parents tend to use firmer disciplinary control over their children’s behavior than do European American parents (Dodge, McLoyd, & Lansford; 2005). Researchers theorize that the context of discrimination results in higher stakes for African American children’s misbehavior compared to their non-black counterparts. Thus, African American parents may engage in firm control over their children’s behavior in order to prevent their children from being perceived negatively in the public sphere where perceived misbehavior may lead to severe consequences. Similarly, punitive responses may reflect African American parents’ attempts to control children’s negative emotional expressions for the sake of protecting them for bias. However, although a mother’s tendency to minimize a child’s negative emotions (i.e., telling children to stop being a baby or that it’s not that big of a deal) might partially be in response to discrimination, it may also reflect her personal meta-emotion philosophy that negative emotions are not to be embraced. If this is the case,
mothers’ personal experiences with racism/discrimination should have a stronger indirect effect to punitive responses than to minimizing responses as was found in the current study.

**Strengths, Limitations and Future Directions**

There are a number of strengths of the current study. Importantly, this research is among the first to move beyond speculation of socio-cultural underpinnings of racial/ethnic differences in emotion related beliefs and practices by actually including a measure of discrimination as a proximal predictor. Further, examining these processes during early childhood provides valuable insight into the impact of mother’s discrimination experiences at age 4 on their beliefs and practices once their children entered formal schooling, a public setting in which their children might be faced with issues of bias and discrimination for the first time. This may be an important developmental window in which parents beliefs about what their children may experience and their subsequent practices are beginning to emerge and solidify.

Despite its strengths, the present study was limited by a number of factors. Although the inclusion of two time points allowed for the longitudinal examination of discrimination on beliefs and practices, three time points are ideal for the analyses of indirect effect models. Thus, the next logical step is to include a third time-point when children enter 1st grade in order to determine whether mothers’ beliefs when their children are in kindergarten predict their practices once they enter 1st grade. Further, although the indirect effects of ethnicity to suppression responses through racism and beliefs provide initial evidence that parents’ beliefs and practices are racially motivated,
future research should include measures that specifically ask about beliefs and practices in relation to racially salient events to provide stronger evidence. Shared method variance is an additional methodological limitation. Although self-report is needed to capture mothers’ racism-related stress and beliefs, future research can use an observed measure of emotion socialization to reduce the chance of inflated associations due to shared method variance. Regarding measurement, the measure used to capture racism-related stress was originally standardized using an African American sample and referenced specific racial/ethnic groups. However, for use with both African American and European American mothers, the measure was changed from “black” and “white” to say “my race” and “someone of another race.” This change may have altered the meaning of the measure for African Americans, thus, replication is needed using the original measure. Further, replication is needed due to small effects. Finally, the present study sought to elucidate the underpinnings of racial/ethnic differences in suppression responses and thus did not consider within group variability or factors specifically relevant to African American families such as ethnic identity and racial/ethnic socialization (i.e., parents messages about what it means to be black in America). Future research should examine whether the impact of discrimination on beliefs about negative emotions and suppression responses to negative emotions is stronger for African American mothers who have a stronger sense of ethnic identity. Future research should also examine whether discrimination and ethnic identity predict suppression responses and racial/ethnic socialization in similar ways given they are both theorized to have the same underlying goal of bias protection (Dunbar et al., 2015).
CHAPTER III

STUDY 2. DISCRIMINATION, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND EMOTION BELIEFS AS ANTECEDENTS OF PARENTAL RACIAL/ETHNIC AND EMOTION SOCIALIZATION

Introduction

The acquisition of social-emotional competence presents a normative developmental challenge for children (Denham, 1998). Children must become skilled at understanding and regulating their emotions in order to develop empathy, social competence with peers, and to prevent the development of internalizing and externalizing problems (Cicchetti, Ackerman, & Izard, 1995). Experiencing and learning to cope with negative emotions (e.g. fear, anxiety, sadness, and anger) presents a greater developmental challenging for children than experiencing positive emotions, and how children learn to manage their negative emotions has important consequences for their social-emotional and psychological well-being (Cole & Deater-Deckard, 2009; Ramsden & Hubbard, 2002). For African American children, this normative developmental challenge is exacerbated by experiences of racial bias (Cooper, McLoyd, Wood, & Hardaway, 2008; Spencer, Dupree, & Hartmann, 1997). African American children’s displays of negative emotions are often perceived by mainstream culture as aggressive, threatening, and violent, labels that can have dire long-term consequences (Kang & Chasteen, 2009; Stevenson, Herrero-Taylor, Cameron, & Davis, 2002). Thus, in addition to tackling everyday emotional challenges, African American children must also learn
how to express and regulate their emotions in a world in which they are stigmatized and marginalized.

Ogbu’s (1981) cultural ecological model states that parents socialize children in ways that develop skills and competences necessary for adaptation in their specific cultural contexts. Accordingly, African American parents face the unique challenge of equipping their children with the skills and competencies necessary to prepare them for potential experiences of bias (Boykin & Toms, 1985). The messages parents send to their children about race—referred to as racial socialization—and the strategies that facilitate their emotional understanding and regulation—referred to as emotion socialization—are two interconnected socialization strategies aimed at protecting children from experiences of bias and equipping them with the skills necessary to navigate such experiences. Although there is a burgeoning literature on the effects of racial/ethnic and emotion socialization on child development, fewer studies have examined the ecological and social-cultural antecedents of these practices. Given this gap, the present study will examine the association between African American parents’ discriminatory experiences and their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices, the moderating role of ethnic identity, and the mediating role of emotion beliefs.

**Racial/Ethnic and Emotion Socialization**

Racial/ethnic socialization refers to the messages parents transmit to their children about the meaning and significance of racial/ethnic group identity, racial stratification, and inter and intragroup relations (Lesane-Brown, 2006; Peters & Massey, 1983). Cultural socialization is a dimension of racial/ethnic socialization in which parents
promote racial/ethnic pride and an appreciation of black history and heritage. Preparation for bias is a dimension with two components, messages that make children aware of racial biases and the provision of strategies to cope with and overcome bias. Promotion of mistrust, less frequently utilized than cultural socialization and preparation for bias, refers to messages that instill wariness towards whites (Hughes et al., 2006). Theory and research highlight racial/ethnic socialization as an important mechanism by which African American parents attempt to prepare children for and protect them against the harmful effects of discrimination and racial bias (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Garcia Coll et al., 1996).

African American parents’ emotion socialization strategies are an additional mechanism by which they attempt to prepare their children for bias. Emotion socialization refers to the verbal and non-verbal practices that teach children the social-cultural norms of emotional expression and that facilitate children’s emotional development by aiding in the understanding and regulation of emotions (Eisenberg et al., 1998). Parent’s responses to children’s displays of negative emotions is an important aspect of emotion socialization as children may learn to respond in similar ways to their own emotions (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994). While supportive responses such as validation, encouraging children to express their emotions, problem solving, and comforting enable children to accept their negative emotions and to learn various ways of managing them (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1997), suppression responses such as punishing and minimizing teach children to suppress overt emotional expression (Fabes, Poulin, Eisenberg, & Madden-Derdich, 2002).
It is important to note that supportive and suppression responses are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Researchers examining emotion socialization among African American families suggests that African American parents take a highly nuanced approach to emotion socialization, utilizing both supportive and suppression strategies that equip children with emotion regulation skills and flexibility to suppress their emotions in context in which emotional displays may place them at risk for bias (Dunbar et al, 2014, Leerkes, Supple, Su, & Cavanaugh, 2013). When compared to parents of other racial/ethnic groups, African American parents engage in higher levels of suppression; researchers in this area theorize that these higher levels of suppression are an adaptation to the context of discrimination in which African American families live (Halberstadt, Craig, Lozada, & Brown, 2011; Leerkes & Siepak, 2006; Montague et al., 2003; Nelson et al., 2012). Specifically, African American parents sensitive to the racial biases of society may deliberately attempt to suppress the expression of negative emotions in their children in order to protect them from the negative views of the majority culture that blacks are aggressive and threatening, subsequently allowing them to better circumvent racial barriers.

**Antecedents of Racial/ethnic and Emotion Socialization**

Given theory suggesting that racial/ethnic and emotion socialization are both parental practices that arise in adaptation to the context of racial stratification and bias, it stands to reason that they would share similar socio-cultural and ecological antecedents on an individual level. Relevant antecedents may include parents own individual
experiences with discrimination, their racial/ethnic identity, and their beliefs about emotions and their consequences.

Garcia Coll and colleagues (1996) outlined an ecological model of child development building on the premise that individuals and groups are hierarchically stratified by social position factors such as race and ethnicity, and through a number of mechanisms including discrimination, this stratification results in an adaptive culture in which specific family processes occur. African Americans, being one of the most marginalized groups in the US, have historically endured oppression and continue to experience racial/ethnic discrimination. An adaptive culture has subsequently developed in response to these historical and current conditions of oppression which in turn has shaped the beliefs, goals and values of African American families.

According to this theory, there is an indirect link between parents own experiences with discrimination and their parenting practices through their beliefs about how their children will be treated. That is, discrimination experiences will inform parents’ beliefs that their children will also be at risk for experiencing bias, subsequently, these beliefs will directly predict the specific day to day practices parents employ in an attempt to protect their children. Garcia Coll and colleagues (1996) highlight parental racial/ethnic socialization as an important family process that has developed in adaptation to African Americans’ racial stratification. Emotion socialization is an additional parenting practice likely to be predicted by discrimination through a similar process as elaborated below.
Experiences of discrimination and racial socialization. Consistent with theory, research indicates that parents’ discrimination experiences predict their racial/ethnic socialization practices through their beliefs that their child, sharing the same disadvantaged racial social stratification, will encounter similar experiences (Coard et al., 2004; Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Thomas, Speight, & Witherspoon, 2010; Thornton et al., 1990). Several studies have found that higher levels of reported discrimination lead to increased levels of racial/ethnic socialization practices (Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Thomas et al., 2010; Thornton et al., 1990; White-Johnson, Ford, & Sellers, 2010). For example, discrimination experienced at work and in the community are associated with increased preparation for bias and messages to be wary of whites among parents of 10-17 year old African American children (Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Chen, 1997). Using a latent profile approach, White-Johnson et al. found that mothers of adolescents who reported more frequent discrimination were more likely than mothers who reported less frequent discrimination to use a wide range of racial/ethnic socialization messages. Similarly, African American mothers and fathers’ greater experiences of institutional, individual, and cultural racism predicted greater use of a range of adaptive racial/ethnic socialization strategies (Thomas et al.).

Beliefs and expectations about racism. A few qualitative studies indicate that the link between African American parents’ experiences with discrimination and their racial/ethnic socialization practices are their beliefs that their children, sharing the same marginalized status, will also experience discrimination (Coard et al., 2004; Thornton et al., 1990). Three emergent themes across these studies were (1) parents’ belief that
raising a black child is a unique and important task, (2) the belief that their children would receive denigrating and negative messages about blackness (e.g., black people or ugly, lazy, and unintelligent), and (3) that it is their duty as parents to help their children feel comfortable and confident in their skin and to know that being black is something to be proud of (Coard et al., 2004; Thornton et al., 1990).

Experiences of discrimination and emotion socialization. In contrast to the racial/ethnic socialization literature, few studies have empirically examined the socio-cultural antecedents of African American parents’ emotion socialization practices, although a number of authors have speculated that this link likely exists (Cole & Tan, 2007; Nelson, Leerkes, O’Brien, Calkins, & Marcovitch; 2012; Leerkes et al., 2013). One study that examined the relationship between parental discrimination and parents’ use of positive and negative emotion words with their toddlers provides some evidence that discrimination plays a role in emotion socialization practices (Odom, Garrett-Peters, Vernon-Feagans, 2014). Odom et al. found that among rural African American mothers, mothers who experienced higher levels of discrimination exhibited more frequent emotion talk with their children. The researchers posit that discrimination leads to increased hyper-vigilance in anticipation of future experiences with discrimination (Brody et al., 2008). Emotional vigilance is one aspect of hyper-vigilance in which African Americans are highly attuned to their own and others’ positive and negative emotions, which is then reflected in the emotion words they use with their children; this constant attunement is adaptive as it may aid in smoother inter-racial interactions (Odom et al.). A similar process may take place regarding African American parents’
suppression responses to their children’s emotion displays. Specifically, African American parents’ experiences with racial/ethnic discrimination may lead to their heightened anxieties that their children, because of their race, will face harmful social consequences for displaying their negative emotions, and may therefore be vigilant in their attempts to suppress such emotions in their children.

**Beliefs about emotions.** A parent’s beliefs regarding emotion display rules, which reflect cultural norms of expression and experiences, are likely to predict the types of emotion socialization strategies they use (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1997). In a comparative study of African American and European American mothers, Nelson et al. (2012) found that African American mothers, especially those of boys, were more likely than European American mothers to report that it was inappropriate for their children to display negative emotions and that there were negative social consequences for displays of negative emotions. In turn, differences in African American and European American mothers’ emotion beliefs explained African American mothers’ higher use of emotion suppression strategies. Emotion socialization researchers have suggested that African American parents’ own experiences with discrimination may underlie their emotion beliefs and high use of emotion suppression (Leerkes, Supple, Su, & Cavanaugh, 2013), however, no studies to our knowledge have directly examined this hypothesis among African American parents. Further, in addition to predicting their suppression responses, parents’ beliefs that children will experience negative social consequences for their emotion displays may be an indicator of their general beliefs that children will experience
bias because of their race and thus may also predict parents’ greater use of racial socialization.

**The Moderating Role of Racial/Ethnic Identity**

Whether parents’ discrimination experiences have a substantial impact on their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization strategies may depend, in part, on the extent to which parents identify with their racial group and how they make meaning of their racialized experiences in relation to their sense of self, also referred to as racial/ethnic identity (Sellers, 1998). Sellers’ (1998) model of ethnic identity identifies several dimensions including centrality and public regard. Centrality is the level to which one’s race/ethnicity is a central aspect of their identity. Public regard refers to an individual’s perception of how others view and evaluate their racial/ethnic group.

Although no studies to our knowledge have examined the association between African American parents’ ethnic identity and emotion socialization, a number of studies have found links between parents’ racial identity and their racial/ethnic socialization practices. For example, White-Johnson et al. (2010) found that African American mothers who used a range of racial socialization, compared to those with low engagement in racial socialization, reported higher levels of centrality. Further, believing that others view blacks negatively (low public regard) was related to greater preparation for bias. Another study found that parents whose race was a central aspect of their identity (high centrality) also believed that preparing their children to be successful as a black person in society (or preparation for bias) was essential (Thomas and Speight, 1999).
Although researchers have examined the direct effect of racial/ethnic identity on racial socialization, no studies to our knowledge have examined the moderating role of ethnic identity on the links between discrimination and racial/ethnic and emotion socialization. While for some individuals experiences of discrimination may foster the development of racial/ethnic identity (Pahl & Way, 2006), prompting individuals to acknowledge the impact that racism has on their lives and to make meaning of their experiences through positive connections with their racial/ethnic group (Cross, 1971), for others, discriminatory experiences have little effect (Pahl & Way, 2006). Thus, it is possible that discriminatory experiences will lead to parents’ beliefs that children will experience negative social consequences for their emotion displays and subsequently attempt to suppress those emotions and have discussions about race only when they consider their race/ethnicity as a central part of their identity and perceive that others view blacks negatively. Conversely, if parents do not feel that their race/ethnicity is a central aspect of their identity, or do not feel that others’ view blacks negatively (perhaps viewing their discriminatory experiences as individual isolated acts) discrimination may have little effect on parents’ beliefs and practices.

**Developmental Significance**

One domain in which children may experience negative social consequences for their display of negative emotion is the school setting. Research has shown that many African American parents believe that getting a good education is the best way for their children to get ahead (Stevenson, 1996). Anxieties concerning negative social consequences for children’s displays of negative emotions may be particularly salient for
African American parents at the time of children’s school entry where the risk of experiencing bias from teachers can have profound and long term consequences for their academic success, making the transition to school an ideal time to study these processes. Thus, I examine how prior experiences of discrimination predict parents’ beliefs and practices once children have entered kindergarten.

**Current Study**

The current study uses two waves of data to examine the association between African American parents’ discriminatory experiences and their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices, the moderating role of ethnic identity, and the mediating role of emotion beliefs. As seen in Figure 2., I hypothesize (1) a positive association between parents’ discriminatory experiences and their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices such that higher levels of discrimination will predict higher racial/ethnic socialization (i.e., cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust) and suppression emotion socialization (i.e., punitive and minimizing) strategies. (2) The links between reported discrimination and emotion and racial/ethnic socialization will be moderated by ethnic identity such that the positive associations between discrimination and racial and suppression emotion socialization will be stronger for parents whose race/ethnicity is central to their identity and who believe that non-blacks view blacks negatively. And (3) parents’ emotion beliefs will mediate the interactive effect of discrimination and ethnic identity on racial/ethnic and emotion socialization. Specifically, parents who experience discrimination and who report moderate to high centrality and low public regard will be less accepting of children’s displays of negative emotions and
perceived greater negative social consequences for their displays. Less acceptance and
greater perceived consequences will in turn predict greater racial/ethnic socialization and
emotion suppression strategies.

Methods

Participants

Participants in the current study will be 87 primary caregivers (95.4% mothers) who self-identified as black (including 3 who were multiracial) participating in a larger study (N=277) examining the link between learning engagement and school success that follows children across 3 waves: age 4, kindergarten, and 1st grade. The current study will utilize data from waves 1 and 2. Participating primary caregivers ranged in age from 19 to 52 years (M= 32.87). Total yearly income ranged from $2,400 to $120,000 (Median= $27,000). Regarding education, 14.9% had a high school degree/GED or less, 46% had some college, and 39.1% had a 4-year college degree or beyond. Regarding marital status, 32.2% were married, 16.1% were cohabiting but not married, and 51.7% were single, divorced, or widowed. Approximately half of the children were female (n=49, 56.3%). Of the 87 initial participants, 77 participated in the 2nd wave of data collection.

Procedures

Refer to Study 1.

Measures

Refer to Study 1 for details of measures of racism, emotion beliefs, and emotion socialization.
**Ethnic identity.** Ethnic Identity was measured using the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton & Smith, 1997) and was collected at wave 2 of data collection. The MIBI is a 36-item scale consisting of three subscales: Private regard (6 items; e.g., “I feel good about Black people”), public regard (6 items; e.g., Overall, Blacks are considered good by others”), centrality (8 items; e.g., “In general, being Black is an important part of my self-image) and ideology (33 items; e.g., “Black people would be better off if they adopted Afrocentric values”). Given the scope of the current study, only the public regard and centrality subscales were included (as manifest variables; resulting in an abridged 14-item scale. Participants indicated how much they agreed with each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Racial socialization.** Racial/ethnic socialization was measured using the Parents’ Messages about Race scale (PMR; Hughes & Chen, 1997) and was collected at wave 2 of data collection. The PMR is a 14-item scale consisting of three subscales: Cultural socialization (5 items; e.g., “Encouraged your child to read books (or have books read to your child) concerning the history or traditions of his/her ethnic/racial group.”), preparation for bias (7 items; e.g., “Talked with your child about the possibility that some people might treat him/her badly or unfairly because of his/her ethnicity/race.”), and promotion of mistrust (2 items; e.g., “Done or said things to get your child to keep his/her distance from kids of other ethnicities or races.”). Participants were asked to indicate on a 6-point scale from 0 (never) to 5 (8 times or more) how often they engaged in specific
behaviors with their target child. The preparation for bias and cultural socialization subscales were used as manifest variables.

**Plan of Analysis**

Regarding missing data, full information maximum likelihood (FIML) will be implemented using MPlus version 7.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2014) to preserve the sample size (and subsequent power) while retaining all available information to generate parameter estimates. Hypotheses will be evaluated with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using Mplus. To test the hypothesized direct and indirect effects, wave 1 (w1) racism will be specified to predict wave 2 (w2) beliefs about emotion consequences, and w2 suppression responses. To test the moderating role of ethnic identity, I will create interaction terms by multiplying the racism measure with the centrality subscale, and by the public regard subscale (separately) variables and will specify racism, centrality, public regard, and the interaction terms to predict the belief variable, the suppression responses variable, and the racial/ethnic socialization variable. Multiple group analyses will be conducted to examine possible gender effects. Maternal, income, education, and family structure will also be examined as potential covariates.

Hypotheses regarding indirect effects will be evaluated using bias-corrected bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004). Confidence intervals for unstandardized coefficients will be presented for relevant indirect effects. Confidence intervals that do not include 0 reflect significant effects. Model fit will be assessed using the chi-square test of model fit (p-value >.05 indicates
good fit), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; acceptable > .90, good fit > .95), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; acceptable < .08, good fit < .05).

**Results**

**Preliminary Analyses**

**Identifying covariates.** Descriptive statistics and correlations among study variables are presented in Table 2. None of the potential covariates were significantly correlated with both the exogenous variable (racism-related stress) and the endogenous variables (beliefs, racial socialization, suppression responses) thus, no covariates were included in subsequent path models.

**Missing data.** Less than 10% of data was missing overall, and the data were missing completely at random (MCAR) based on Little’s test, $\chi^2 (34) = 30.82$, $p > .05$. Thus, full information likelihood was used.

**Primary Analyses**

**Zero-order correlations.** As expected, African American mothers’ reports of greater racism-related stress were positively associated with beliefs that there would be negative social consequences for children’s displays of negative emotions and preparation for bias messages. However, racism-related stress was unrelated to cultural socialization and suppression responses to children’s negative emotions. Centrality was positively associated with preparation for bias, however, there was no relationship between centrality and cultural socialization. There was a marginally significant negative association between centrality and minimizing responses. Centrality was unrelated to beliefs about emotions and public regard was unrelated to beliefs, racial socialization, and
suppression responses. As predicted, there were positive associations between beliefs about emotion consequences and suppression responses. Cultural socialization and preparation for bias were also positively correlated and punitive and minimizing responses were positively correlated. However, the racial/ethnic socialization variables were not significantly correlated with the suppression responses variables.

**Racial/ethnic socialization model.** Structural equation modeling analyses were conducted to examine the links between racism and ethnic identity and racial socialization. Multiple group analyses were conducted to determine whether child gender moderated these links. The constrained model fit the data well ($\chi^2 (10) = 5.29, p = .87; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .00$). Given that the unconstrained model was saturated and thus had perfect fit (due to the use of all manifest variables and all possible estimated paths), the non-significant chi-square p-value of the constrained model indicates that this model did not fit significantly worse than the model in which paths were freely estimated across gender. Thus, child gender was not a moderator. Results are presented in Figure 5.

Results indicated no main effects of racism-related stress and public regard on preparation for bias or cultural socialization. However, there was a main effect of centrality on preparation for bias such that greater centrality was associated with greater use of preparation for bias. There was no main effect of centrality on cultural socialization. As predicted, centrality moderated the association between racism-related stress and cultural socialization. The Johnson-Neyman technique of identifying regions of significant was used to probe the interaction (Johnson & Neyman, 1936). At high levels of centrality, racism-related stress predicted greater cultural socialization (Figure 6; +1SD
of centrality, $B=.05$, SE=$.03$, $t=1.76$, $p=.08$). Racism related stress had no relation to cultural socialization at low and moderate levels of centrality. Results also indicated a marginal moderating effect of centrality on the link between racism and preparation for bias such that there was a positive association between racism and preparation for bias only at high levels of centrality (Figure 7; $+1SD$ of centrality, $B=.10$, SE=$.04$, $t=2.46$, $p=.02$). Contrary to hypothesis, public regard did not moderate the link between racism-related stress and cultural socialization.

**Emotion socialization model.** Structural equation modeling analyses were conducted to examine whether there is an indirect effect of racism-related stress on punitive and minimizing responses through beliefs. Multiple group analyses were conducted to determine whether child gender moderated these links. A model in which all structural weights were constrained to be equal across child gender was compared to an unconstrained model in which all paths were freely estimated across gender. Results indicated that the constrained model fit the data well ($\chi^2 (46) = 47.66$, $p = .41$; CFI = .992; RMSEA = .03) and did not fit significantly worse than the unconstrained model ($\chi^2 \Delta (32) = 41.55$, $p=.120$). Thus, child gender was not a moderator. Results of the constrained model are displayed in Figure 8.

As predicted, there was an indirect effect of racism-related stress to punitive responses through beliefs ($B=.014$, $p=.080$, 95% CI [.001, .034], 90% CI [.000, .030]) and an indirect effect of racism-related stress to minimizing responses through beliefs ($B=.012$, $p=.096$, 95% CI [.001, .032], 90% CI [.001, .028]). Specifically, greater experiences of racism-related stress predicted greater beliefs that there would be negative
social consequences for children’s displays of negative emotions. In turn, beliefs about emotion consequences were associated with greater use of punitive and minimizing responses to children’s negative emotions. However both effects reached only marginal significance. Further both the 95% and 90% confidence intervals for the minimizing indirect path included zero indicating that the minimizing indirect path estimate may not be trustworthy. Contrary to hypotheses, ethnic identity did not moderate the link between racism-related stress and beliefs or the links between racism-related stress and suppression responses. However, there were main effects of centrality and public regard on minimizing responses. Specifically, higher centrality was associated with less frequent use of minimizing responses while higher public regard was associated with more frequent use of minimizing responses. Ethnic identity was unrelated to punitive responses.

**Discussion**

The purpose of the current study was to examine the link between African American parents’ experiences with racism/discrimination and their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices, the moderating role of ethnic identity, and the mediating role of beliefs about emotion consequences. Results revealed that mothers’ experiences with discrimination predicted their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices in similar ways albeit through different pathways and conditions of ethnic identity.

**Racial/Ethnic Socialization**

The results of the racial/ethnic socialization model revealed a moderating effect such that when mothers felt strongly that their race was central to their identity, their
experiences of racism-related stress lead to greater use of preparation for bias and cultural socialization practices. However, when mothers did not feel strongly that their race was central to their identity, their experiences of racism did not have an impact on their racial/ethnic socialization practices. These results emphasize the important role that ethnic identity, particularly centrality, plays in shaping whether experiences of discrimination translate to parenting behaviors aimed at preparing children for their own experiences of discrimination.

According to Cross’ (1971) model of racial/ethnic identity, the development of racial/ethnic identity entails acknowledging the impact that racism has on one’s life and using the strong and positive connections that one has with their racial/ethnic group to make meaning of their experiences. Thus, parents who do not have a strong attachment to their racial/ethnic group and for whom their race is not central to who they are may be less affected by their experiences of discrimination. For these parents, such experiences may not be internalized or may be perceived as isolated individual acts rather than a systemic problem that their children may need to be protected from. These findings are consistent with hypotheses and extend previous studies that have found a link between African American parents’ reports of discrimination and their racial/ethnic socialization practices with their adolescent and children in middle childhood (Hughes, 2003; Thomas et al., 2010; White-Johnson, Ford, & Sellers, 2010). Specifically, the present study demonstrating that parents’ experiences with discrimination and strong sense of centrality may lead to their efforts to prepare even their young children for and protect them from similar bias experiences.
Contrary to hypotheses and previous findings with parents of children in middle childhood and adolescence (White-Johnson et al., 2010), public regard (i.e., perceived level to which others view one’s group positively) was not associated with racial/ethnic socialization either as a main effect or a moderator. Perhaps for parents of children in this early childhood age group, a strong sense of attachment to one’s racial/ethnic group has a greater impact on their early racial/ethnic socialization practices than how they perceive others view their racial group. It may be the case that as children get older and are more likely to experience various forms of discrimination in the public sphere that public regard has a greater impact on parents’ racial socialization practices.

**Emotion Socialization**

Consistent with hypotheses, I found that African American mothers’ reports of greater racism-related stress lead to their beliefs that there would be negative social consequences for their children when they displayed negative emotions. Such beliefs in turn lead to their greater attempts to suppress their children’s negative emotional displays through the use of punitive and minimizing responses. Importantly however (and contrary to hypotheses), experiences with racism/discrimination did not directly influence mothers’ use of suppression responses to their children’s negative emotions, it was only through influencing their beliefs that children would experience social consequences for their negative emotions that their own experiences with racial bias lead to greater use of suppression strategies.

These results are consistent with theory suggesting that parents socialize children in ways that develop competences and behaviors necessary for adaptation in their specific
socio-cultural and ecological contexts (Ogbu, 1981). Specifically, results suggest that parents who have firsthand experience with discrimination may become increasingly aware that their children may also experience the same. Parents may then become purposeful and vigilant in their attempts to suppress negative emotions in their children in order for their children to be perceived as non-threatening, thereby promoting adaptation in a racially stratified environment. Results are also consistent with the one other known study to examine the impact of mothers’ experiences with discrimination on their emotion socialization practices which found that mothers who experienced higher levels of discrimination exhibited greater use of both positive and negative emotion words with their toddlers (Odom et al., 2014). Odom et al. similarly concluded that discrimination leads to increased emotional hyper-vigilance (a high attunement to one’s own and others’ positive and negative emotions) in anticipation of future experiences with discrimination (Brody et al., 2008). Such emotional vigilance is then reflected in the emotion words mothers use with their children.

Contrary to hypotheses, mothers’ level of centrality and public regard did not moderate the extent to which their experiences with racism/discrimination impacted their emotion beliefs or suppression strategies. However, ethnic identity did have a direct association with mothers’ minimizing responses although unrelated to their punitive responses. Specifically (and contrary to hypotheses), having a stronger attachment to one’s racial/ethnic group was associated with less frequent use of minimizing responses while believing that non-blacks view blacks positively was associated with more frequent use of minimizing responses. Results reveal a competing influence of experiences of
discrimination and centrality on mother’s minimizing responses in which through beliefs, discrimination leads to greater minimization of children’s negative emotions while having a strong attachment to one’s racial/ethnic group does the opposite and leads to less frequent minimization of children’s negative emotions.

To help elucidate these complex findings, I turn to Boykin and Toms’ (1985) triple quandary theory. Given the competing effect was present only for mothers’ minimizing responses, it may be important to first distinguish between minimizing versus punitive responses. Punitive responses to children’s negative emotions may primary reflect a deliberate strategy to place firm control over children’s negative emotions in order to protect them from bias. Theoretically, a mother can value the expressions of negative emotions yet feel compelled to punish her child’s emotional expressions particularly in settings where expression can come with detrimental consequences. If a mother also engages in minimizing responses however (e.g. “stop being a baby”), this may also reflect her personal meta-emotional philosophy that the expression of negative emotions are unimportant, not to be embraced, or not valued.

Theory and research find that in general, African Americans value the open expression of both positive and negative emotions as a cultural value (Blackmon & Thompson, 2014; Boykin & Toms’; Parker et al., 2012). Accordingly, a strong sense of attachment to one’s ethnic group might be an indicator that a person shares the cultural values of that group. Thus, if African American mothers feel that being black is an important aspect of their identity this may indicate that they share the cultural value of embracing the expression of negative emotions and would therefore be less likely to
minimize the expression of negative emotions in their children. However, according the Boykin and Toms, African American families must simultaneously and effectively navigate not only their own cultural context but also their position as ethnic minorities and the mainstream context. Therefore, although higher centrality (and by approximation a value for negative emotions) may lead to lower use of minimizing responses, there is a simultaneous counter effect whereby experiencing discrimination as an ethnic minority may lead mothers to suppress their children’s negative emotions in order to avoid negative consequences. Regarding the finding that higher public regard was associated with greater use of minimizing responses, it could be the case that mothers who believe others view blacks positively minimize their children’s negative emotions in order to maintain that positive impression.

**Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions**

The current study had a number of strengths. Researchers examining racial ethnic differences in parental emotion socialization practices have called for more within-group examination with the inclusion of culturally relevant variables such as racial/ethnic socialization and ethnic identity (Nelson et al., 2013), and the current study is among the first to heed this call. Further, the current study was able to extend the literature by revealing that discrimination has an impact on parenting practices aimed at protecting children from bias as early as when children first start school, whereas the racial/ethnic socialization literature thus far has focused almost exclusively on middle childhood and adolescence. Further, much of the literature examining the association between discrimination and parenting have relied on cross-sectional data (White-Johnson et al.,
The present study examined mothers’ discrimination experiences prior to their children entering formal schooling and their beliefs and racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices upon formal school entrance, thus capturing an important developmental transition for both parents and children.

Despite its strengths, the current study also had some limitations. Although the current study utilized 2 waves of data, with beliefs and emotion socialization examined at the same time-point, 3 waves of data are ideal for indirect effect analyses. Although it is more likely that beliefs about emotion consequences predict suppression strategies rather than suppression strategies predicting beliefs, a longitudinal approach will provide stronger evidence to this claim. Although self-report is needed to capture mothers’ racism-related stress and beliefs, future research can use an observed measure of emotion socialization (in addition to self-report) to reduce the chance of inflated associations due to shared method variance. In addition, the measure used to capture racism-related stress was originally standardized using an African American sample and referenced specific racial/ethnic groups. However, because the present study participants were drawn from a larger sample including European American, for use with both African American and European American mothers, the measure was changed from “black” and “white” to say “my race” and “someone of another race.” This change may have altered the meaning of the measure for African Americans and may have reduced its predictive power. Thus, replication is needed using the original measure. Also, given interaction effects are harder to detect with small sample sizes, replication with larger samples is needed to determine whether some of the null findings were due to the small sample size. Further, the present
study asked mothers to report on their minimizing and punitive responses to their children’s displays of negative emotions in general non-racism related scenarios such as getting upset at a doctor’s office. Future research should examine parents emotion socialization behaviors in response to children’s negative emotions during and/or after experiences with racism, such as being admonished at school for wearing a certain hair style or peer rejection due to race. In such situations, mothers’ experiences with discrimination may then lead to less punitive and minimizing reactions to children’s negative emotions because mothers may empathize with their children’s emotions and desire to help them work through such emotions. In the present study, I examined the links between African American mothers’ experiences with racism/discrimination and ethnic identity and their racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices and found initial evidence that racial/ethnic and emotion socialization may indeed have similar socio-cultural and ecological antecedents rooted in the context of racial stratification and oppression.
CHAPTER IV

STUDY 3. RACIAL/ETHNIC SOCIALIZATION AND YOUNG AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN’S SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT: THE MODERATING ROLE OF SUPPORTIVE EMOTION SOCIALIZATION PRACTICES

Introduction

There is accumulating evidence that experiencing racial bias and discrimination can be emotionally and physiologically distressing and may lead to affective problem behaviors among African American children and adolescents (Borders & Liang, 2011; Hatzenbuehler, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Dovidio, 2009; Kiang, Blumenthal, Carlson, Lawson, & Shell, 2009; Smart Richman, Pek, Pascoe, & Bauer, 2010; Zeiders, Doane, & Roosa, 2012). Generally, parents’ messages about race, or racial/ethnic socialization, have been found to buffer against the negative effects of discrimination and to directly promote positive adjustment (Granberg, Edmond, Simons, Lei, & Gibbons, 2012; Neblett et al., 2008; White-Johnson, Ford, & Sellers, 2010). Although researchers in this area almost exclusively study the effects of parents’ racial/ethnic socialization among families with children in middle childhood and adolescence, some research indicates that children as young as 3 years old have an understanding of their racial identity, are aware of racial bias, and experience prejudice and racial bias themselves (Bigler and Wright, 2014). Accordingly, the few studies that have examined parental racial/ethnic socialization of young children (i.e., preschool age to 1st grade) find that parents of young children
engage in a variety of racial/ethnic socialization messages and that these messages have varying effects on children’s adjustment (Caughy, Nettles, & Lima, 2011; Caughy, Nettles, O’Campo, & Lohrfink, 2006; Caughy, O’Campo, Randolph, & Nickerson, 2002). Given the emotionally distressing nature of racial bias exposure and that early childhood is a critical period for the development of emotion regulation (Calkins & Hill, 2007), whether parents teach children about bias in a context that also allows them to process and manage their negative emotions may have important consequences for their social-emotional well-being. Yet little is known about how racial/ethnic socialization may have differential effects on young children’s well-being depending on the emotional socialization context in which they occur. To address this gap, the current study will examine the effect of parents’ racial/ethnic socialization messages on African American kindergartener’s social-emotional adjustment and the role of emotion socialization in moderating this effect.

**Racial Bias and the Role of Racial/Ethnic Socialization**

**Young children’s understanding of racial bias.** Researchers examining the effect of racial discrimination on adolescents’ and adults’ well-being find that direct and vicarious experiences of bias are linked to negative emotional reactivity such as sadness and anger, increased physiological reactivity, and increased internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors (Borders & Liang, 2011; Hatzenbuehler et al., 2009; Kiang et al., 2009; Smart Richman et al., 2010; Zeiders et al., 2012). Fewer studies have examined the effects of experiencing, perceiving, or learning about racial bias on young children’s social-emotional adjustment, perhaps due to the commonly held belief that
young children are “colorblind” and do not engage in nor perceive prejudiced behavior (Bigler and Wright, 2014; Lewis, 2001). Contrary to this belief, studies find that young children (ages 3-6) are aware of the racial social structure as demonstrated by their strong preferences for white over black, use of race to separate themselves and re-create social hierarchies, behaviors that exclude and stereotype on the basis of race, and use of racist language to emotionally hurt their peers (Connolly, 2002; Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001; Winkler, 2009). Further, studies find that young black children not only have a racial group identity but are also aware of their lower social status (Bigler, Averhart, & Liben, 2003; McKown & Weinstein, 2003) and may internalize denigrating messages about their racial group (Jordan & Hermandez, 2009; Connolly, 2002).

Racial/ethnic socialization of young black children. In line with findings that young children are indeed aware of racial bias, one program of research indicates that African American parents of children as young as four begin to relay messages about what it means to be a member of their racial/ethnic group in an attempt to prepare children for biased experiences and to protect them from its harmful effects (Caughy et al., 2011; Caughy et al., 2006; Caughy et al., 2002); such messages are referred to as racial/ethnic socialization (Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006). Two commonly studied facets of racial/ethnic socialization are cultural socialization and preparation for bias. While parents’ cultural socialization messages promote racial/ethnic pride and an appreciation of cultural heritage and history, preparation for bias messages foster children’s awareness of bias that occurs against their racial group and include guidelines on ways to overcome bias (Hughes et al., Lesane-Brown). Theory and research suggest
that racial/ethnic socialization may mitigate the negative effects of discrimination and promote positive adaptation by providing children with positive messages about their racial/ethnic group that offset the denigrating messages from society and by reducing children’s negative emotional reactivity to experiences of bias by warning children about such experiences (Hughes et al., Lesane-Brown).

Similar to the larger racial/ethnic socialization literature, the few studies with young children find that cultural socialization consistently predicts lowered internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors (Caughy et al., 2002; McHale et al., 2006). However, whereas researchers find that preparation for bias sometimes promotes positive adaptation for adolescents (Harris-Britt, Valrie, Kurtz-Costes, & Rowley, 2007), among young children, preparation for bias seems to either have no effect or contribute to affective problem behaviors (Caughy et al., 2006). For example, in a study examining racial/ethnic socialization among African American 1st graders and their parents, Caughy et al. (2006) found that preparation for bias predicted higher rates of externalizing and internalizing problem behaviors. Similarly, Caughy et al. (2011) used a profile approach to examine African American parents’ racial/ethnic socialization practices and relations to 1st grade children’s problem behaviors. They found that parents fell into four groups: silence about race (i.e., low endorsement across all racial/ethnic socialization measures), cultural socialization emphasis (i.e., much higher endorsement of cultural pride messages than all other racial/ethnic socialization messages), a balanced approach (i.e. equal emphasis of cultural pride and preparation for bias messages with the highest promotion of mistrust messages compared to other groups) and coping emphasis/cultural
socialization (i.e., endorsement of all racial/ethnic socialization messages but with lower promotion of mistrust than balanced group). Caughy et al (2011) found that children with parents in the balanced group displayed higher levels of anxiety and depression than children with parents in the coping emphasis/cultural socialization group. The primary difference between these groups were the higher levels of preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust of other groups emphasized in the balanced group, whereas the balanced and coping emphasis/cultural socialization groups emphasized similar levels of cultural socialization. Caughy and colleagues (2011) concluded that for young children, messages about racial bias above a certain level may increase children’s anxiety and depression.

The Role of Negative Affect and Emotion Regulation

The association between preparation for bias messages and affective problem behaviors may be attributed to the content focus of unfair treatment, a focus which may be especially distressing for young children who around the ages of 3-6 are developing a growing concern for fairness and negative emotional reactions to unfair treatment (LoBue, Nishida, Chiong, DeLoache, & Haidt, 2011). First, such discussions may make children more alert to and aware of others’ biased treatment towards them (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000) possibly making them more susceptible to the negative emotions that arise from such treatment (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2009). Further, while being treated unfairly may be emotionally distressing, talking about racism may be emotionally distressing in and of itself, invoking feelings of anger, sadness, anxiety, and helplessness (Bigler et al., 2014; Davis, & Stevenson, 2006; Hughes, Bigler, & Levy, 2007;
Stevenson, 1998). The emotional distress associated with alertness to racial bias may be especially detrimental for young children given that their ability to emotionally self-regulate is still developing (Calkins & Hill, 2007). Emotion self-regulation refers to “behaviors, skills, and strategies, whether conscious or unconscious, automatic or effortful, that allow children to modulate, inhibit, or enhance emotional expressions and experiences” (Calkins & Hill, 2007, p. 229). Negative emotions are particularly difficult for children to manage compared to positive emotions (Fabes, Leonard, Kupanoff, Martin, 2001; Ramsden & Hubbard, 2002), and the inability to regulate negative emotions has robust consequences for children’s internalizing behaviors such as depressive symptoms and anxiety, and externalizing behaviors such as acting out (Cicchetti, Ackerman, & Izard, 1995; Cole & Deater-Deckard, 2009).

### The Role of Parents’ Emotion Socialization Practices

Developmentally, young children rely heavily on their caregivers for emotional regulation (Calkins, 2011; Calkins and Howse, 2004; Propper & Moore, 2006), and parents’ emotion socialization strategies have a direct influence on children’s ability to self-regulate their negative emotions (Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998). Thus, when having discussions about racism and discrimination, topics that are emotionally arousing, it may be especially important for parents to also engage in practices that support children’s ability to process, understand, and regulate their negative emotions; such practices are known as supportive emotion socialization (Eisenberg et al., 1998). Although racial/ethnic and emotion socialization are largely studied separately, there is some empirical evidence to suggest that parents’ discussions about racism and bias
include strategies that facilitate children’s emotional understanding and regulation (Coard et al., 2004; Dunbar, Perry, Cavanaugh, Leerkes, 2015; Thomas & Blackmon, 2015). For example, in a qualitative study examining parents’ responses to a vicarious experience of discrimination, the death of Trayvon Martin, Thomas and Blackmon found that parents engaged in emotional processing of the event with their children by talking about the event and asking children to express their feelings. However, little is known about the role of parents’ general emotion socialization practices in modulating the effect of racial/ethnic socialization on children’s social-emotional wellbeing.

**Parents’ responses to negative emotions.** Research and theory suggest that how parents respond to their children’s displays of negative emotions is a core aspect of emotion socialization and has important consequences for children’s developing emotional competence (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1997). Specifically, how parents evaluate and respond to their children’s emotions influences how children evaluate and modulate their own emotions. Research indicates that parental supportive responses to children’s negative emotions—such as encouraging children to accept and express their negative emotions, using problem-solving strategies, and emotion-focused responses such as comforting—provide children with opportunities to learn about and practice various ways of coping with their negative emotions (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Gottman et al., 1997). Conversely, when parents forgo responding in supportive ways to their children’s negative emotions, and/or primarily discourage children from expressing themselves by punishing or minimizing their negative emotions (labeled suppression responses), children miss opportunities to learn to accept and
regulate their negative emotions and may become restricted in their range of self-regulation strategies (Fabes, Poulin, Eisenberg, & Madden-Derdich, 2002; Propper & Moore, 2006). Consequently, children may learn to suppress overt/behavioral emotional expression but may experience increased physiological arousal (Fabes et al., 2002). Thus, parents’ reliance on punitive and minimizing responses has been linked to children’s use of inappropriate regulation strategies when dealing with emotional experiences independently (e.g., revenge seeking, physical aggression, or avoiding situations that involve negative affect; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Eisenberg, Fabes, Schaller, & Carlo, 1991) and subsequent internalizing and externalizing problems (Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Myers, & Robinson, 2007).

It is important to note that parents can engage in a blend of supportive and punitive and minimizing responses; that is, they are not mutually exclusive. This point is especially relevant for African American parents who seem to utilize a highly nuanced approach to emotion socialization (Dunbar et al., 2015, Leerkes, Supple, Su, & Cavanaugh, 2013). Studies indicate that African American parents engage in both supportive practices that reflect a cultural value for the open expression of positive and negative emotions (Odom, Garrett-Peters, & Vernon-Feagans, 2014; Parker et al., 2012) and suppression practices in an attempt to protect children from bias given that black children’s expressions of negative emotions are often perceived as more aggressive and threatening than those of their white counterparts (Kang & Chasteen, 2009; Stevenson, Herrero-Taylor, Cameron, & Davis, 2002). Further, in the context of supportive responses, some suppression responses may be adaptive (Dunbar et al., 2015; Nelson et
Thus, for African American families, particularly regarding how discussions of racism impact development, the important factor may be their use of supportive responses.

Joint effect of racial and supportive emotion socialization. Given the importance of supportive responses in facilitating children’s regulation of negative emotions, the level of parents’ supportive responses in day-to-day parent—child interactions may have a significant impact on whether preparation for bias messages promote or hinder children’s social emotional adjustment. Parents’ preparation for bias messages when relayed in a context where parents are also consistently responding in supportive ways to children’s day-to-day negative emotional displays may promote children’s emotion regulation and reduce problem behaviors by both warning children about the bias they may face and equipping them with a range of effective emotion regulation strategies, thereby reducing the likelihood that children will experience prolonged emotional distress when they encounter biased treatment. Conversely, parents who attempt to prepare their children for bias but do not at the same time model and facilitate effective emotion regulation strategies may inadvertently contribute to children’s dysregulation and problem behaviors by exposing children to an emotionally arousing topic without the tools to regulate those negative emotions.

Although there is less risk for parents’ cultural socialization messages to contribute to children’s maladjustment given the content of these messages focuses on the promotion of racial-ethnic pride and an understanding of heritage (Hughes et al., 2006), within discussions of heritage and history, particularly regarding the history of slavery
and civil rights, there is still potential for children to become distressed. Thus, although research indicates that cultural socialization is consistently linked to positive outcomes, the positive association between cultural socialization and social-emotional wellbeing may be even greater in the context of high supportive responses for children’s displays of negative emotions.

A recent study utilizing a latent profile approach and African American young adults’ retrospective accounts to examine parents’ joint use of racial/ethnic and emotion socialization provides initial evidence for these hypotheses. Dunbar et al. (2015) found that young adults whose mothers combine high levels of cultural socialization and supportive responses with moderate levels of preparation for bias reported lower depressive symptoms than young adults whose mothers combined high levels of preparation for bias with lower levels of cultural socialization and supportive responses. Although a strength of this study was the use of latent profiles to examine how parents’ comprehensive strategies impact development, the aforementioned groups differed on various socialization indicators. Taking a variable centered approach may provide additional information regarding how specific racial/ethnic and emotion socialization indicators jointly impact social-emotional adjustment. Further, the study relied solely on young adults’ retrospective reports and is thus limited by shared methods bias and further research is needed to examine whether these processes work in similar ways for families with young children.
Current Study

In light of the aforementioned research gaps, the current study uses parent-report of racial/ethnic and emotion socialization, and parent, teacher, and observed indicators of social-emotional adjustment to examine the joint role of parents’ racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices in promoting young (kindergarten aged) African American children’s social-emotional adjustment. As seen in Figure 3, I hypothesize that the associations between preparation for bias and (a) emotion regulation, (b) internalizing behaviors, and (c) externalizing behaviors will be moderated by supportive responses to children’s negative emotions such that at moderate and high levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias will be positively associated with emotion regulation and negatively associated with internalizing and externalizing problems. At lower levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias will be negatively associated with emotion regulation and positively associated with internalizing and externalizing problems. Further, there will be a positive association between cultural socialization and emotion regulation and a negative association between cultural socialization and problem behaviors. The associations between cultural socialization and emotion regulation, internalizing behaviors, and externalizing behaviors will be moderated by supportive responses such that the positive association between cultural socialization and emotion regulation and the negative associations between cultural socialization and problem behaviors will be stronger at higher levels of supportive responses.
Methods

Participants

Participants in the current study will be 91 primary caregivers (94.4% mothers) who identified their 5 yr. old children as black. The majority of the caregivers self-identified as black (n=75, 82.4%) while 16 (17.6%) identified as white. Participants are part of a larger study (N = 277) on the link between learning engagement and school success that follows children across 3 waves: age 4, kindergarten, and 1st grade. The current study only utilizes data from the kindergarten wave (w2) as the racial/ethnic socialization measure was not administrated at the earlier wave. Caregivers ranged in age from 20 to 53 years (M = 33.93). Total yearly income ranged from $2,400 to $120,000 (Median = $27,000). Regarding education level, 12.2% had a high school degree/GED or less, 45.6% had some college, and 42.2% had a 4-year college degree or beyond. Regarding marital status, 40% were married, 7.8% were cohabiting but not married, and 52.2% were single, divorced, or widowed. Approximately half of the children were female (n = 53, 58.2%).

Procedures

Refer to Study 1 for procedures regarding collection of caregiver and child data. Of the 277 primary caregivers who participated in the larger study, 243 consented to allowing the study to contact their child’s teacher. Teachers were contacted through email and/or by phone and were asked to complete questionnaires regarding the study child’s school behavior. They were given the opportunity to complete either paper and pencil questionnaires or online, most completed online questionnaires. Of the teachers
contacted, 220 teachers completed questionnaires. Teachers were compensated $75 for each completed questionnaire (some teachers completed questionnaires for multiple target children). Of the 91 participants in the current study, 86 have teacher data (5 parents did not consent to contact the teacher).

Measures

Refer to Study 1 and 2 for details regarding measures of racial/ethnic socialization (only the preparation for bias and cultural socialization subscales will be used for this study) and emotion socialization (only the supportive responses subscales with be used).

Emotion regulation.

Parent and teacher reported emotion regulation. The Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC; Shields & Cicchetti; 1997, 1998) is a parent and teacher-report measure of child emotion regulation. The version used in the current study included 24 items. Each item describes how children control their emotional states using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 4 (Always). The ERC includes two subscales: reactivity (15 items; e.g., “is easily frustrated”) and regulation (8 items; e.g., “can recover quickly from times of upset or distress”). Items are averaged such that higher scores indicate greater reactivity and regulation respectively.

Observed emotion regulation during frustrating tasks. Each child’s affect and regulatory behaviors were coded across two frustrating laboratory tasks: the not sharing task and the disappointing gift task. Coders watched videos of the tasks rather than coding in the moment.
The not sharing task in the present study originates from Lab-TAB’s “I’m not sharing” episode of distress (Goldsmith, Reilly, Longley, & Prescott, 2001). This task targets the child’s feelings of being treated unjustly and is intended to be frustrating to the child. The task starts with the experimenter telling the child that the assistant has a surprise for them. The assistant then comes into the room with candy and instructs the experimenter to divide the candy evenly between them both. The assistant leaves, marking the beginning of the fair episode, and the experimenter gives three pieces of candy to the child and themselves; and asks the child how they feel about that. Next the unfair episodes of the task begins. The experimenter gives themselves more candy than the child multiple times (becoming increasingly unfair), and at one point eats a piece of the child’s candy; allowing time for the child to respond after each event. At the end of the very unfair episode, the experimenter takes all of the child’s candy. Once the child’s response was recorded (typically after 20 seconds but shorter if the child displayed a strong negative reaction); the experimenter allowed the child to pick and eat 2 pieces of their favorite candy.

The disappointing gift task in the present study was adapted from Carlson and Wang (2007) and Goldsmith, Reilly, Lemery, Longley, and Prescott (1999). Children are presented with a gift for all of their hard work. The experimenter encourages the child to open the gift right away, while the experimenter leaves the room to go get the next game. The gift is sealed so that it cannot be opened by the child. The experimenter returns after one minute and apologizes to the child for giving them the wrong gift box. The experimenter then gives the child a gift box that is very easy to open, but has a
disappointing gift inside (a piece of tree bark). The experimenter acts busy in the room while the child’s responses are recorded for one minute. After one minute, the experimenter notices that the wrong toy was wrapped, and gives the child the toy (unwrapped) they were supposed to receive (a small plush animal).

Children’s affect and regulation were coded as follows: latency to distress, computed as the difference between the first display of distress and the start time of the task in seconds; global affect, the frequency and intensity of distress displayed during the task, rated on a scale from 0 (no clear signs of negative affect) to 5 (intense displays of distress such as vocal crying or sobbing); global regulation, the ability to maintain or regain neutral or positive affect, rated on a scale from 1 (unregulated) to 5 (well-regulated); and negative verbal expressions, the frequency of the child’s negative verbal expressions of frustration, rated on a scale from 0 (no negative vocalizations) to 3 (6 or more instances of negative vocalizations). Each code was averaged across tasks then standardized and computed as a composite such that higher scores indicate greater affective regulation.

Teacher and parent report of internalizing and externalizing problems. The Child Behavior Checklist 4-18 years (CBCL; Achenbach, 1991) is a list of 120 items that includes a broad range of children’s behavioral/emotional problems. For each item, the respondent was asked to determine how well that item describes the child currently or within the last six months using a scale of 0 = Not True (as far as you know), 1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True, and 2 = Very True or Often True. The Internalizing (e.g.,
“feels worthless or inferior”) and Externalizing (e.g., “cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others”) total scores are used for these analyses.

**Plan of Analysis**

Regarding missing data, full information maximum likelihood (FIML) will be implemented using MPlus version 7.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2014) to preserve the sample size (and subsequent power) while retaining all available information to generate parameter estimates. Hypotheses will be evaluated using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using Mplus. Cultural socialization and preparation for bias will be evaluated in separate models due to sample size. In the first model, I will specify preparation for bias and supportive responses as exogenous variables that will predict emotion regulation, and internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors. To test the moderating role of supportive responses, I will create an interaction term by centering and multiplying the manifest preparation for bias and supportive responses (global score) variables, and will specify preparation for bias, supportive responses, and the interaction term to predict all outcome variables. Multiple group analyses will be implemented to test for gender effects. Parental income, education, and family structure will be examined as potential controls. The model for cultural socialization will be specified in the same manner.

Model fit will be assessed using the chi-square test of model fit (p-value >.05 indicates good fit), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; acceptable > .90, good fit > .95), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; acceptable < .08, good fit < .05).
Results

Preliminary Analyses

Identifying covariates. Descriptive statistics and correlations among study variables are presented in Table 3. None of the potential covariates were significantly correlated with both the independent variables and the dependent variables thus, no covariates were included in subsequent path models.

Missing data. Less than 10% of data was missing overall, and the data were missing completely at random (MCAR) based on Little’s test, $\chi^2 (34) = 30.82$, $p>.05$. Thus, full information likelihood was used.

Primary Analyses

Zero-order correlations. Preparation for bias and cultural socialization were significantly correlated. However, preparation for bias and cultural socialization had no zero-order associations with supportive responses or any of the child outcome variables. Supportive responses had a marginally significant negative association with mother-reported reactivity and a significant positive association with mother-reported regulation. Supportive responses were unrelated to all other child outcome variables.

Regulation models: Preparation for bias. Structural equation modeling analyses were conducted to examine associations between preparation for bias and supportive responses to children’s negative emotions with observer, teacher, and mother reports of regulation and reactivity. Multiple group analyses were conducted to determine whether child gender moderated links between socialization and child outcomes. A constrained model in which all path coefficients were forced to be equal was compared to a model in
which all paths were freely estimated across gender. The constrained model fit the data well ($\chi^2 (15) = 13.82, p = .54; \text{CFI} = 1.000; \text{RMSEA} = .00$) and the non-significant change in chi-square indicated that the constrained model did not fit significantly worse than the unconstrained model (for which fit was perfect given the model was saturated). However, modification indices suggested that freeing the path from the interaction term to teacher-reported reactivity would improve model fit. The final model (illustrated in Figure 9) with paths constrained with the exception of the interaction term to teacher-reported reactivity fit the data well ($\chi^2 (14) = 9.09, p = .83; \text{CFI} = 1.000; \text{RMSEA} = .00$) and fit significantly better ($\chi^2 \Delta (1) = 4.73, p = .03$) than the fully constrained model. Thus, results suggested that most paths were similar across gender; however, there was a moderating effect of supportive responses on the association between preparation for bias and teacher-reported reactivity for boys only.

Results indicated a significant main effect of preparation for bias on teacher-reported reactivity such that mothers’ greater use of preparation for bias was associated with lower teacher-reported reactivity. There were also significant main effects of supportive responses on mother-reported reactivity and regulation such that mother’s greater use of supportive responses to children’s negative emotions were associated with lower mother-reported reactivity and higher mother-reported regulation. As predicted, the association between preparation for bias and observed affective regulation was moderated by supportive responses. However, the pattern of the moderating effect was contrary to predictions. As illustrated in Figure 10, at high levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias was associated with lower observed affective regulation and was
unrelated to regulation at low and moderate levels. Similarly, the association between preparation for bias and teacher-reported reactivity was moderated by supportive responses, although the pattern of the moderating effect was contrary to predictions and the moderating effect was present only for boys. As illustrated in Figure 11, at high levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias was associated with higher teacher-reported reactivity. At low levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias was associated with lower teacher-reported reactivity. Preparation for bias was unrelated to teacher-reported reactivity at moderate levels of supportive responses. Contrary to hypotheses, preparation for bias was unrelated to teacher-reported regulation and mother-reported reactivity and regulation and these associations were not moderated by supportive responses.

Regulation models: cultural socialization. The constrained model fit the data well ($\chi^2 (15) = 15.17, p = .44; CFI = .997; RMSEA = .02$) and the non-significant chi-square indicated that the constrained model did not fit significantly worse than the unconstrained model (for which fit was perfect given the model was saturated). Thus, the constrained model was retained indicating that parameters were similar for boys and girls. Results are illustrated in Figure 12.

Contrary to prediction, cultural socialization was not significantly related to the outcome variables. However, there were main effects of supportive responses on observed affective regulation, teacher-reported regulation, and mother-reported reactivity and regulation. Specifically, mothers’ higher use of supportive responses to children’s negative emotions were associated with marginally lower observed affective regulation, marginally higher teacher-reported regulation, marginally lower mother-reported
reactivity, and significantly higher mother-reported regulation. There were no main effects of cultural socialization or supportive responses on teacher-reported reactivity. However, as predicted, the association between cultural socialization and teacher-reported reactivity was moderated by supportive responses, although the pattern of moderation was contrary to prediction. As illustrated in Figure 13, at low levels of supportive responses, cultural socialization was associated with lower teacher-reported reactivity. Cultural socialization was unrelated to teacher-reported reactivity at high and moderate levels of supportive responses.

**Problem behavior models: preparation for bias.** Structural equation modeling analyses were conducted to examine associations between preparation for bias and supportive responses to children’s negative emotions with teacher and mother reports of children’s internalizing and externalizing problems. Multiple group analyses were conducted to determine whether child gender moderated links between socialization and problem behaviors. A constrained model in which all path coefficients were forced to be equal was compared to a model in which all paths were freely estimated across gender. The constrained model fit the data poorly ($\chi^2 (12) = 28.22, p = .000; \text{CFI} = .841; \text{RMSEA} = .17$). Modification indices indicated that freeing the path from the interaction term to mother-reported internalizing problems would improve model fit. The final model (illustrated in Figure 14) with paths constrained with the exception of the interaction term to mother-reported internalizing problems was an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 (11) = 16.71, p = .117; \text{CFI} = .944; \text{RMSEA} = .11$), and fit significantly better ($\chi^2 \Delta (1) = 11.51, p < .000$) than the fully constrained model. Thus, results suggested that the paths were
similar across gender; however, there was a moderating effect of supportive responses on the association between preparation for bias and mother-reported internalizing problems for boys only.

Results indicated a marginally significant main effect of preparation for bias on teacher-reported externalizing problems such that mother’s greater use of preparation for bias was associated with lower teacher-reported externalizing problems. No other main effects of preparation for bias were found. There were significant main effects of supportive responses on both teacher and mother-reported internalizing problems such that mothers’ higher use of supportive responses were associated with lower internalizing problems. There were no main effects of supportive responses on teacher or mother-reported externalizing problems. As predicted, the association between preparation for bias and mother-reported internalizing problems was moderated by supportive response and in the expected pattern. However, the moderating effect was present only for boys. As illustrated in Figure 15, at high levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias was associated with lower mother-reported internalizing problems. At low levels of supportive responses, preparation for bias was associated with higher mother-reported internalizing problems. There was no association at moderate levels of supportive responses.

**Problem behavior models: cultural socialization.** The constrained model fit the data well ($\chi^2 (12) = 7.43, p = .83; \text{CFI} = 1.000; \text{RMSEA} = .00$) and the non-significant chi-square indicated that the constrained model did not fit significantly worse than the unconstrained model (for which fit was perfect given the model was saturated). Thus, the
constrained model was retained, indicating that parameters were similar for boys and girls. Results are illustrated in Figure 16.

Results indicated a marginal main effect of cultural socialization on teacher-reported externalizing problems such that mother’s greater use of cultural socialization was associated with lower teacher-reported externalizing problems. No other main effects of cultural socialization were found. There were also marginally significant main effects of supportive responses on both teacher and mother-reported internalizing problems such that mothers’ higher use of supportive responses were associated with lower internalizing problems. There were no main effects of supportive responses on teacher or mother-reported externalizing problems. As predicted, the association between cultural socialization and mother-reported internalizing problems was moderated by supportive response and in the expected pattern. As illustrated in Figure 17, at high levels of supportive responses, cultural socialization was associated with lower mother-reported internalizing problems. Cultural socialization was unrelated to mother-reported internalizing problems at low and moderate levels of supportive responses.

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to examine the link between African American mothers’ racial/ethnic socialization messages and their kindergarten children’s social-emotion adaptation and the moderating role of mothers’ emotion socialization practices. Results revealed that the impact that racial/ethnic and emotion socialization had on children’s adjustment was dependent on the type of outcome, the reporter, and child gender.
Socialization and Problem Behaviors

Regarding children’s internalizing problem behaviors, results were consistent with hypotheses. Specifically, mothers’ messages to their children about racial/ethnic pride and heritage were associated with decreased internalizing problems only when mothers also engaged in highly frequent supportive responses to their children’s negative emotions. Importantly however, such messages had no effect when mothers engaged in low or moderate levels of supportive responses. In other words, at low and moderate levels of supportive responses, cultural socialization messages were neither adaptive nor maladaptive regarding mothers’ reports of internalizing problems. Regarding preparation for bias, mothers’ messages to their boys about being aware of racial bias were associated with lower internalizing problems only when such messages were paired with high levels of supportive responses to boys’ negative emotions. In contrast to cultural socialization, for which no adverse effects were found at any level of supportive responses, preparation for bias was associated with increased internalizing behaviors when mothers did not engage in high levels of supportive responses with their boys but rather engaged in low levels.

These results are consistent with the general literature indicating that although cultural socialization is not maladaptive, preparation for bias messages can either be adaptive or maladaptive depending on the context in which parents relay such messages (Caughey et al., 2006; 2011). Accordingly, studies have found that frequent messages about racial bias can be emotionally distressing and thus may actually place children at risk for problem behaviors (Bigler et al., 2014; Davis, & Stevenson, 2006; Stevenson,
The present study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that when bias messages are provided in a context in which parents are supportive of children’s negative emotions, providing models and opportunities for how to regulate them, learning about racial bias can be adaptive and associated with decreased internalizing problems. Results imply that preparing young children for the bias they may face is adaptive as long as children are given the supports they need to manage the negative emotions that such lessons may invoke. However, when provided in a context in which mothers are not responding in supportive ways to children’s negative emotions, such messages although aimed at protecting children can inadvertently contribute to greater internalizing problems, especially for boys.

Results are also consistent with the one other known study that has examined parents’ joint use of racial/ethnic and emotion socialization, which utilized a latent profile approach and African American young adults’ retrospective accounts (Dunbar et al., 2015). Similar to the present study, Dunbar et al. found that young adults who reported that their mothers combine high levels of preparation for bias with low levels of supportive responses to their negative emotions also reported greater levels of depression compared to young adults who reported that their mothers combined racial/ethnic socialization with high levels of supportive responses. This replication is noteworthy given that the two studies differed drastically in age group and type of reporter.

Regarding children’s externalizing behaviors, neither racial socialization nor emotion socialization predicted mothers’ reports of externalizing problems. However, mothers’ preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages were marginally
associated with lower teacher-reported externalizing problems. Results suggest stronger effects for children’s internalizing problems and specifically mothers’ reports of children’s internalizing problems. Given that externalizing problems include issues like bullying and delinquent behavior, the impact of racial socialization and the moderating role of supportive responses on such behaviors may become more important as children approach adolescence.

**Socialization and Regulation**

Contrary to hypotheses, results revealed a moderating effect such that when mothers engaged in high levels of supportive responses to their children’s negative emotions, their preparation for bias messages were associated with lower observed affective regulation. Preparation for bias had no association with observed regulation when mothers engaged in low or moderate levels of supportive responses. Similarly, when mothers of boys engaged in high levels of supportive responses to their sons’ negative emotions, their preparation for bias messages were associated with higher teacher reports of reactivity. When mothers of boys engaged in low levels of supportive response to their sons’ negative emotions, their preparation for bias messages were associated with lower teacher-reported reactivity. This moderating effect was not found for girls. Regarding cultural socialization, for both boys and girls, it was only when mothers engaged in low levels of supportive responses to their children’s negative emotions that their cultural socialization messages were associated with lower teacher-reported reactivity.
Although moderation findings are contrary to hypotheses, they extend previous literature finding that parental supportive responses are linked to teacher-reports of less competent peer interactions and more aggression (Nelson et al., 2013; Smith & Walden, 2001). Thus, when it comes to teacher and observer reports of regulation and reactivity (evaluations that occur in the public sphere), children receiving racial/ethnic socialization messages in the context of little support for displaying negative emotions may be learning to suppress their negative emotions when they are in public where they are likely to encounter authority figures of various races. The finding that supportive responses moderated the effect of preparation for bias on teacher reports of reactivity for boys but not girls is noteworthy given mothers of boys did not differ in their level of use of preparation for bias from mothers of girls. That the gender specific effect was present for preparation for bias but not cultural socialization is also noteworthy. These results highlight the important joint effect that messages about bias and emotion socialization have on boys’ behavior and the subsequent ways in which teachers evaluate their emotional expressions. Whereas cultural socialization messages have a focus on building racial/ethnic pride and an understanding of culture and heritage, preparation for bias messages focus on preparing children to be aware of the bias they may face and ways to cope (Hughes et al., 2006). Thus, African American parents’ bias messages combined with not encouraging expressions of negative emotions may be especially adaptive for their boys given black boys are particularly vulnerable to perceptions of their normative displays of emotion as aggressive and threatening (Kang & Chasteen, 2009; Ward, 2000).
Neither preparation for bias or cultural socialization predicted teacher-reported regulation or mother-reported reactivity or regulation. There were also no interaction effects for these outcomes. However, mothers’ supportive responses were marginally associated with higher teacher-reported regulation and significantly associated with lower mother-reported reactivity and higher mother-reported regulation. Thus, regarding mothers’ reports of their children’s behaviors, supportive responses are directly related to more adaptive regulation although in the context of racial socialization greater supportive responses were less adaptive for observer regulation and teacher reported reactivity. Results may suggest a different pattern of adaption depending on the reporter and depending on whether supportive responses are examined as a main effect or a moderator.

**The Quandary of Mothers’ Racial and Emotion Socialization**

The distinction between the role of supportive responses in relation to racial/ethnic socialization for children’s internalizing problems as reported by mothers versus their regulation and reactivity as reported by public observers is noteworthy. Results point to the quandary that African American parents face when preparing their children for a world in which they are often marginalized (Boykin and Toms’, 1985). On the one hand, teaching children about bias in a context in which they are not encouraged to express their negative emotions may help children circumvent racial bias regarding how their emotions are perceived by public observers. On the other hand, teaching children about bias, a potentially emotionally arousing topic, and not providing them the
opportunity to express and understand their negative emotions may lead to problems such as depressive symptoms, withdrawal behaviors, and anxiety.

If pairing racial/ethnic socialization with low levels of supportive responses leads to more positive observer and teacher reports of regulation while the same practice increases internalizing problems, children who receive such messages may learn to suppress their negative emotions in public contexts but may remain physiologically aroused during times of distress, thus contributing to their internalizing problems. A recent study found that, according to youth report, the majority of African American parents utilized a nuanced approach to socialization in which they paired racial/ethnic socialization messages with a balance of supportive responses and suppression responses to children’s negative emotions (Dunbar et al., 2015). In light of the present findings, such an approach may prove optimal by equipping children with the flexibility to suppress their negative emotions in certain contexts but also the regulation tools to manage their negative emotions when faced with emotional challenges.

**Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions**

There are a number of strengths of the current study. Most importantly, the current study builds upon attempts in the general literature to better understand the circumstances under which preparation for bias messages are adaptive or maladaptive in relation to children’s developmental outcomes. Although racial/ethnic socialization researchers and researchers generally interested in the development of children of color have acknowledged the important role of emotion understanding and regulation (APA Task Force, 2008), this study is among the first to examine the joint impact of
racial/ethnic and emotion socialization on children’s social-emotional adjustment. The one other known study that examined the joint role of racial/ethnic and emotion socialization relied fully on young adults’ reports (Dunbar et al., 2015). Thus, an important strength and contribution of the current study was the use of parents’ reports of their own parenting and multi-informant reports of children’s adaptations (i.e., mother, observer, and teacher). Finally, the racial/ethnic socialization literature has focused almost exclusively on middle childhood and adolescence. The present study demonstrates that parents begin their attempts to prepare and protect children from bias while children are quite young and that these practices already have a significant impact on children’s developmental outcomes. This is an important contribution because the processes that take place early in childhood often lay the foundation for future development. Thus, having a better understanding of these early processes will only help our understanding of continuing developmental processes.

Despite its strengths, there were some limitations of the current study. First, both parenting practices and child outcomes were assessed when children were in kindergarten. Although the current study conceptually assumes that parenting influences development, it is also possible that children’s adjustment influences parenting. For example, it could be the case that mothers of children who have a tendency for internalizing problems make a point to pair their racial/ethnic socialization messages with lots of support in helping children manage their negative emotions. The process could also be bidirectional in which parenting impacts development and development also impacts parenting. Future longitudinal research is needed to help elucidate the
directionality of effects. Future lab-based studies should examine both observed reactivity and regulation as well as physiological indicators of reactivity and regulation to determine whether children are indeed regulated or if they simply appear regulated. Future research should also examine whether characteristics of teachers such as race and gender and the teacher-child relationship quality have an impact on how parents racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices impact teacher evaluations of children’s emotional expressions and behaviors. Finally, given interaction effects are harder to detect with small sample sizes, replication with larger samples is needed to determine whether some of the null findings were due to the small sample size. This study was an initial step in exploring the intersection of racial/ethnic and emotion socialization as they relate to young African American children’s social-emotional adjustment and provides initial evidence that the effectiveness of racial/ethnic socialization messages may depend in part on how such messages are paired with parents supportive responses to children’s negative emotions.
CHAPTER V
GENERAL CONCLUSION

The present body of work brought together two constructs traditionally studied in separate literatures, racial socialization and the emotion socialization, both of which have been theorized to be practiced by African American families with the same underlying goal of protecting children from experiences of racial bias (Dunbar et al., 2015). Together, the studies provided empirical evidence for the view that racial and emotion socialization have developed out of similar socio-cultural and ecological antecedents, specifically, the context of racism and discrimination that African American families must navigate. In addition to implying that African American parents’ personal experiences with discrimination predict their efforts to help their children to avoid and navigate similar experiences via their racial and emotion socialization practices, results also revealed that how parents combine their use of racial and emotion socialization has a significant impact on children’s social-emotional development.

The finding that parents’ experiences with discrimination had an impact on their emotion socialization strategies through their beliefs that there would be negative social consequences for their children’s displays of negative emotions implies two things: 1) African American parents’ suppression responses have developed in adaptation to the context of discrimination and oppression and 2) such responses are likely at least in part deliberate and purposeful as strategies to help children successfully navigate life as a
marginalized ethnic minority in the mainstream. Having likely developed out of a context of oppression, findings also provide empirical evidence that parents’ combined use of racial and emotion socialization may in fact help children adapt to this context through the regulation of their emotions and behavior. Specifically, when mothers relayed messages about pride, heritage, and current racial bias in a context in which they did not encourage children’s expressions of negative emotions, children were evaluated by their teachers and observers in the lab setting as being less reactive and more emotionally regulated. Findings imply that even at this early age, African American children are already learning how to suppress their negative emotions in mainstream contexts.

Although apparently adaptive in the mainstream context, findings also imply that mothers’ use of suppression strategies and low supportive responses to children’s negative emotions might conflict with their cultural values for the open expression of all emotions and may also come at a cost to their children’s internalizing problems. Although mothers’ experiences of discrimination lead to greater suppression strategies through their emotion beliefs, having a strong attachment to their racial/ethnic group (and by approximation sharing in the group’s cultural values) had the opposite effect of decreasing mothers’ use of suppression strategies. Results imply that although African American mothers may have little desire to suppress their children’s negative emotions in their own cultural context, their experiences with racism and the accompanying stress may compel them to attempt to suppress their children’s negative emotions as a protective mechanism despite their cultural values. There is an additional quandary regarding effects on children’s development. Results revealed that although relaying
messages about bias and engaging in low levels of supportive responses to children’s negative emotions may teach children to suppress their negative emotions, thus resulting in more positive evaluations from teachers, doing so may inhibit children from expressing their emotions in healthy ways and from learning adequate emotion regulation strategies thus leading to greater internalizing problems such as sad mood, withdrawal, and anxiety. However, teaching children about racial/ethnic pride, heritage, and racial bias while providing lots of opportunities for children to express and learn to regulate their negative emotions had the opposite effect of decreasing children’s internalizing problems. Results suggest that a balanced approach of both suppression and supportive responses in the context of racial socialization may be optimal.

Although experiences of discrimination did not differentially impact use of racial and emotion socialization practices for mothers of boys versus mothers of girls, mothers’ racial and emotion socialization practices did have some differential effects for boys’ and girls’ social-emotional adjustment. How mothers combined their preparation for bias messages with supportive responses was especially important for boys’ internalizing problems and teacher reports of their reactivity. Given mothers of boys and mothers of girls did not differ in the frequency with which they relayed preparation for bias messages, results suggest that mothers may differ in the style with which they prepare their girls versus their boys. It could also be the case that how mothers’ combine preparation for bias with supportive responses to negative emotions may be more relevant for boys given black boys tend to experience more overt forms of bias including their
normative displays of negative emotions being perceived as aggressive and threatening (Kang & Chasteen, 2009; Ward, 2000).

The current body of work has important implications for researchers and practitioners implementing prevention and intervention parent education programs. Many parent education programs with a primary or ancillary focus on improving parents’ emotion socialization practices often train parents to improve their emotion coaching (including supportive responses) skills and decrease their emotion dismissing (including punitive and minimizing) practices (e.g. the Tuning into Kids program; Havighurst, Wilson, Harley, & Prior, 2009). Such programs are often universal programs, meaning that theoretically the program should work the same way for all families. However, such programs are based on literature that has been primary conducted with European American families and have not yet incorporated the emerging literature conducted using more diverse samples. This is important because practitioners who educate African American families with the assumption that their family process work the same way as European American families may attempt to drastically reduce their use of suppression strategies when such strategies may serve an adaptive purpose. This may be especially important for education programs focused on improving the parenting practices of parents living in lower income or high risk neighborhoods where suppression practices may be highly adaptive. Thus, rather than attempting to take away these strategies, practitioners might instead relay to parents the importance of also engaging in high levels of emotional coaching and supportive responses to their children’s negative emotions.
The present body of work addressed several gaps in the literature and furthered our understanding of racial/ethnic differences in parents’ emotion socialization practices, the social-cultural antecedents of African American parents’ racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices, and the interactive effect of parents’ racial/ethnic and emotion socialization practices on young African American children’s social-emotion development.
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Figure 1. Conceptual Model of Racial/Ethnic Differences in Suppression Responses and the Mediating Role of Racism/Discrimination and Emotion Beliefs.
InsR=Institutionalized Racism, IndR=Individual Racism, PR=Punitive Responses, MR=Minimizing responses.
Figure 2. Conceptual Model of Racism/Discrimination Influences on Suppression Responses and Racial Socialization: The Mediating Role of Emotion Beliefs and the Moderating Role of Ethnic Identity. 
InsR=Institutionalized Racism, IndR=Individual Racism, PR=Punitive Responses, MR=Minimizing responses, CS=Cultural Socialization, PFB=Preparation for Bias.
Figure 3. Conceptual Model of Racial/Ethnic and Emotion Socialization Influences on Social-Emotional Adjustment. EE=Expressive Encouragement, PF=Problem Focused Responses, EF=Emotion Focused Responses. T-report=Teacher Report, P-Report=Parent Report
Table 1

Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables (N=226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother Ethnicity: Black/African American = 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child Gender: Female = 1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Income</td>
<td>-.427***</td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
<td>-.358***</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>.471***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family Structure: Married = 1</td>
<td>-.575***</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>.500***</td>
<td>.424***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Racism-Related Stress</td>
<td>.413***</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-.257***</td>
<td>-.160*</td>
<td>-.337***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Beliefs about Emotion Consequences-Dom</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-.167*</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Beliefs about Emotion Consequences-Sub</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>.279***</td>
<td>.791***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Punitive Responses</td>
<td>.123+</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-.130+</td>
<td>-.156*</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>.115+</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Minimizing responses</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.114+</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.736***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range | -- | -- | .13-6.40 | 7-Jan | -- | 0-34 | 1.5-80 | 1.5-60 | 1.6-11 |
Mean | -- | -- | 2.09 | 4.69 | -- | 5.79 | 2.68 | 2.33 | 2.06 |
STD | -- | -- | 1.33 | 1.65 | -- | 5.1 | 1.15 | 1.1 | 0.79 |

*p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Figure 4. Indirect Effect Model from Mother Ethnicity to Punitive and Minimizing Response through Racism-Related Stress and Beliefs about Emotion Consequences.
Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standardized betas in parentheses.
Mother Ethnicity: Black =1. Dom=Dominant emotions. Sub=Submissive emotions
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Punitive Indirect Ethnicity path (B=.038, p<.05, 95% CI [.001, .090])
Minimizing Indirect Ethnicity path (B=.034, p<.10, 95% CI [-.001, .096], 90% CI [.001, .080])
Good fit ($\chi^2$ (35) = 39.1, p = .29; CFI = .990; RMSEA = .03)
Not shown: income, education, and marital status were included as controls.
Table 2

Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables (N=87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Child Gender: Female=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income-to-needs ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>.223*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Structure: Married =1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Racism-Related Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Beliefs - Emotion Consequences-Dom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Beliefs - Emotion Consequences-Sub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Preparation for Bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cultural Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.221+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Punitive Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Minimizing responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Figure 5. Model of Racism-Related Stress and Ethnic Identity Predicting Racial Socialization. Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standardized betas in parentheses. 
+ p<.10, * p<.05  
Model fit ($\chi^2 (10) = 5.29, p = .87$; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .00)
Figure 6. The Moderating Effect of Centrality on the Association between Racism-Related Stress and Cultural Socialization.
Regions of Significance (asterisks on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, B=-.04, SE=.04, t=-1.06, p=.29  
Mean, B=.003, SE=.03, t=.11, p=.92  
+1SD Supportive, B=.05, SE=.03, t=1.76, p=.08
Figure 7. The Moderating Effect of Centrality on the Association between Racism-Related Stress and Preparation for Bias.
Regions of Significance (asterisks on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, B=.006, SE=.06, t=.11, p=.91
Mean, B=.05, SE=.04, t=1.44, p=.16
+1SD Supportive, B=.10, SE=.04, t=2.47, p=.01
Figure 8. Indirect Effect Model from Racism-Related Stress to Punitive and Minimizing Response through Beliefs about Emotion Consequences.
Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standardized betas in parentheses.
Dom=Dominant emotions. Sub=Subordinate emotions
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Punitive Indirect Ethnicity path (B=.014, p=.080, 95% CI [-.001, .034], 90% CI [.000, .030])
Minimizing Indirect Ethnicity path (B=.012, p=.096, 95% CI [-.001, .032], 90% CI [-.001, .028])
Model fit ($\chi^2$ (46) = 47.66, p = .41; CFI = .992; RMSEA = .03)
Table 3

Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables (N=91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Child Gender: Female=1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income-to-needs ratio</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>-.276**</td>
<td>.415***</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Structure: Married =1</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.538***</td>
<td>.395***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>.180+</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.591***</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supportive Responses</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observed Affective Regulation</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. T Reactivity</td>
<td>-.402***</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. T Regulation</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.232+</td>
<td>.197+</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.441***</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. M Reactivity</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.179+</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.209+</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. M Regulation</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.371***</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.230*</td>
<td>-.364***</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. T Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.633***</td>
<td>-.474***</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.201+</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. T Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>-.351**</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.919***</td>
<td>-.398***</td>
<td>.190+</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.656***</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. M Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.187+</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.407***</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. M Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.219*</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.052***</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.657***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.13-6.08</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.279-1.18</td>
<td>-.20-4.12</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.07-2.87</td>
<td>2.50-4.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
T= Teacher-Reported, M= Mother Reported
Figure 9. Model of Preparation for Bias and Supportive Responses Predicting Emotion Regulation and Reactivity. Unstandardized coefficients are presented.

*p<.05, ***p<.001; b = parameter estimate for boys, g = parameter estimate for girls

Model fit ($\chi^2$ (14) = 9.09, p = .83; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .00)
Figure 10. The Moderating Effect of Supportive Responses on the Association between Preparation for Bias and Observed Affective Regulation.
Regions of Significance (asterisks on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, B=.37, SE=.27, t=1.33, p=.19
Mean, B=.04, SE=.14, t=.30, p=.76
+1SD Supportive, B=-.46, SE=.23, t=-1.10, p=.05
Figure 11. The Moderating Effect of Supportive Responses on the Association between Preparation for Bias and Teacher Reported Reactivity.
Regions of Significance (asterisks on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, B=-.10, SE=.04, t=-2.40, p=.01
Mean, B=-.007, SE=.04, t=1.09, p=.28
+1SD Supportive, B=.09, SE=.04, t=1.90, p=.06
Figure 12. Model of Cultural Socialization and Supportive Responses Predicting Emotion Regulation and Reactivity. Unstandardized coefficients are presented.

+p<.10, *p<.05, ***p<.001

Model fit (χ² (15) = 15.17, p = .44; CFI = .997; RMSEA = .02)
Figure 13. The Moderating Effect of Supportive Responses on the Association between Cultural Socialization and Teacher-Reported Reactivity.

Regions of Significance (asterisks on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, $B=-.10$, $SE=.05$, $t=-1.9$, $p=.06$
Mean, $B=-.003$, $SE=.04$, $t=-.09$, $p=.93$
+1SD Supportive, $B=.91$, $SE=.06$, $t=1.47$, $p=.15$
Figure 14. Model of Preparation for Bias and Supportive Responses Predicting Internalizing and Externalizing Problems. Unstandardized Coefficients Are Presented.

+\( p < .10 \), *\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \), ***\( p < .001 \); \( b \) = parameter estimate for boys, \( g \) = parameter estimate for girls

Model fit (\( \chi^2 (11) = 16.71, p = .117 \); CFI = .944; RMSEA = .11)
Figure 15. The Moderating Effect of Supportive Responses on the Association between Preparation for Bias and Mother-Reported Internalizing Problems.
Regions of Significance (asterisk on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, $B=1.31$, $SE=.44$, $t=2.96$, $p=.005$
Mean, $B=.19$, $SE=.24$, $t=.77$, $p=.45$
+1SD Supportive, $B=-.94$, $SE=.38$, $t=-2.48$, $p=.02$
Figure 16. Model of Cultural Socialization and Supportive Responses Predicting Internalizing and Externalizing Problems. Unstandardized coefficients are presented.

+p<.10, *p<.05

Model fit ($\chi^2 (12) = 7.43, p = .83; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .00$)
Figure 17. The Moderating Effect of Supportive Responses on the Association between Cultural Socialization and Mother-Reported Internalizing Problems.
Regions of Significance (asterisks on graph denotes significance):
-1SD Supportive, B=.35, SE=.23, t=1.53, p=.13
Mean, B=-.09, SE=.18, t=-.50, p=.62
+1SD Supportive, B=-.53, SE=.27, t=-1.96, p=.04