

SEHSD Working paper 2011-10

Contexts of Racial Socialization: Are Transracial Adoptive Families More Like Multiracial or White Monoracial Families?

03/01/11

by Rose M. Kreider, U.S. Census Bureau and Elizabeth Raleigh, University of Pennsylvania
paper presented at the Population Association of America meetings, Washington, DC April 2011
The authors contributed equally to this project.

This paper is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. The views expressed on statistical and methodological issues are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Introduction

Although the practice of transracial¹ adoption, that is, the adoption of a non-White child by White parents, has existed for over fifty years (Rothman 2005; Herman 2008), over the past generation there has been a large overall increase in the transracial adoption of children born both in the United States and abroad (Child Welfare Information Gateway 2004, Selman 2009). Data from Census 2000 estimated that about one in six adopted children is of a different race than their parent, making adoption a more visible family form (Kreider 2003).

One reason for the growth in transracial placements is the increase in international adoptions (Ishizawa et al. 2006). From the 1990s to the early 2000s, the number of international adoptions more than doubled from about 9,000 per year to almost 23,000 per year in 2004 (U.S. Department of State 2009; Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute 2001). Recent data from the National Survey of Adoptive Parents 2007 suggests that 85 percent of these international adoptions are also transracial (Vandivere, Malm & Radel 2009).

In contrast to the earliest transracial placements when the common advice to families was to be ‘color blind’ and ignore the racial and ethnic differences between the parent and child

¹ Although we use the words transracial, interracial and multiracial throughout the paper, it is important to note that we are including Hispanic origin as a category in our race/ethnic groups so that non-White is used to mean all those other than White alone non-Hispanics. This differs from the Census Bureau categorization of Hispanic origin as separate from race. See the data and methods section for more specifics on the categories we construct using race and Hispanic origin.

(Hollingsworth 1997; Quiroz 2007), in contemporary practice adoption social workers emphasize the importance of children developing positive ethnic and racial identities. Findings from qualitative research on transracial adoption indicate that there has been a shift in the conceptualization of transracial placements, with adoption social workers emphasizing to parents that adopting across race means becoming a multiracial family. Moreover, studies of transracial adoptive parents show that some White adoptive parents have embraced this message, referring to themselves as members of multiracial families (Traver 2007; Jacobson 2008; Louie 2009). For example, one adoptive mother of a Chinese-born daughter states, "We are a Chinese American family now" (Gamache, Lui and Tessler 1999:109). Yet research on the formation of interracial unions indicates that there are likely to be significant differences between multiracial families formed via intermarriage and those created via adoption and that these differences are likely associated with the context of children's racial and ethnic socialization.²

Previous studies of transracial adoptive families find that parents who try to develop positive racial socialization strategies may draw on a symbolic ethnicity approach (Waters 1990). Under this strategy, White adoptive parents convey cultural membership through the consumption of household decorations and toys for their children, sometimes in ways that markedly differ from how the ritual is celebrated in the child's country of origin (Traver 2007; Louie 2009). For example, in a study of White parents with Chinese-born children, Traver describes a family who elaborately decorated the front of their house for Chinese New Year with Chinese flags. When told by a Chinese national that this was not how Chinese families typically celebrated, the mother responded, "And so I thought about it and I said, "Do I want to change

² Rotherman and Phinney (1987) define racial socialization as "the developmental processes by which children acquire the behaviors, perceptions, values, and attitudes of an ethnic group, and come to see themselves and others as members of the group." Racial socialization is conceptualized as including the following dimensions: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust, egalitarianism, and other (Hughes 2006).

that?” And I thought, “No, because it is how we celebrate”” (Traver 2007:216). Notable about the above example is that in this family’s community there may not have been other Chinese families to serve as models as to how Chinese American families may celebrate Chinese New Year. Rather this family drew on a symbolic approach to teaching ethnicity and repurposed the cultural holiday to conform to a Westernized celebration.

Research has shown that outside of the family, the community also plays a significant role in the racial and ethnic socialization process (Hughes et al. 2006). Although the racial socialization of children has been defined in a number of ways, it generally includes two core components: how children feel about their racial and ethnic identity and how they are taught to deal with discrimination and prejudice. Much of the work in this area focuses on how minority parents approach their children’s racial socialization and its’ correlation to children’s self-esteem (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Phinney and Chavira, 1995; Hughes and Johnson, 2001; Rodriguez, et al. 2009). Yet for White parents raising transracially adopted non-White children, the process is likely to differ since White parents may not be able to draw on personal experiences of dealing with racial discrimination and prejudice (Hollingsworth 1997; Jennings 2006; Lee 2003).

Because White transracial adoptive parents may lack the individual experiences and resources to transmit positive racial socialization messages to their children, the role of the community and social environment becomes even more important. In one study that measured racial and ethnic socialization for a small group of transracial adoptees, Mohanty (2010) identifies several aspects of how the community and social environment shape the context of racial socialization for transracial adoptees. The first identifies the importance of exposure to the adoptee’s birth language (for international adoptees), and establishing relationships with people

of the child's racial background. Since White parents were unlikely to speak the language of their internationally adopted child's birth, the racial and ethnic makeup of the larger community could serve as a potential resource for adoptive parents hoping to make connections with role models and native speakers from their child's origins.

In addition to having the opportunity to make connections with people sharing one's racial background, learning coping strategies to deal with bias and discrimination is another key aspect of racial socialization (Lesane-Brown, et al. 2009; White-Johnson, et al. 2010). However, it is possible that White parents may not have had direct experience dealing with racial bias and discrimination and may not be as equipped to discuss these issues with their non-White children (Bonilla-Silva 2009). Thus, transracial adoptive parents may draw upon the racial and ethnic resources of their community and larger environment to identify potential resources to help prepare their non-White children to navigate race in the outside world.

In a study of African American youth, Caughy and colleagues (2006) find that the social environment of the neighborhood is also associated with children's racial socialization. For example, in a qualitative study of mixed race families formed both by adoption and by intermarriage, a Black woman married to a White man reflected, "Being in an interracial neighborhood is the number one thing you need" (Dalmage 2000: p 101). While Dalmage's work underscores the benefits of living in a racially integrated community for multiracial families, little is actually known about the residential patterns of either multiracial families or transracially adoptive families compared to White monoracial families. In an analysis of Census 2000, Jones and Smith (2001) find that multiracial individuals are more likely to live in the West and in more urban areas. These areas are also likely to have greater populations of non-Whites in general. While we have some information on multiracial adults, even less is known about residential

patterns for multiracial children in interracial families. Moreover, we do not know whether these patterns differ from transracially adopted children.

Based on restricted access data from the 2009 American Community Survey (ACS), this paper contributes to the burgeoning field of research on transracial adoptive families' racial socialization in two key ways. First, our study situates these unique families along a racial spectrum by comparing transracial adoptive families to monoracial White families and multiracial families formed by interracial couples. By providing two points of reference, this approach broadens our knowledge of where transracial adoptive families 'fit in' along this spectrum. Although for the purpose of our study we position children of interracial couples at one end of a spectrum juxtaposed with White children living in White monoracial households, we also recognize that the racial socialization experiences of multiracial children in interracial households are diverse and complex (Harris and Sim 2002; Brusma 2005; Roth 2005; Lee and Bean 2007; Rockquemore, Brusma, and Delgado 2009). Our study contributes to this growing literature by exploring the similarities and differences between multiracial adoptive and interracial biological families.

Second, we explore whether the context of racial socialization for transracially adopted children is more similar to children in White monoracial families or to children of interracial couples. While the data set we use does not have direct measures of racial socialization, we operationalize this concept by calculating the percent non-White in the county of residence as well as the representation of the child's race in their county compared with the nation as a whole. These measures provide a proxy for the context in which parents work to foster healthy racial identities in their children.

Literature Review

Differences in the Formation of Interracial and Transracial Families

Research on interracial unions suggests that the process of creating and being in a multiracial family formed through intermarriage and childbearing may be quite different than being a multiracial family formed through transracial adoption. First, a marriage occurs between two adults who make a conscious choice to enter into a union that crosses racial boundaries. Since both spouses are adults, interracial marriage usually brings together two people who must communicate and compromise since each is coming from a distinct cultural viewpoint (Luke and Luke 1998). Also, interracial marriage is generally preceded by some period of dating, during which the couple can experience community and family reaction to their “interracial” status (Yancey 2002; Yancey 2007).

In contrast, adoptive parents choose the relationship with their child and given that the majority of transracial adoptions occur for infants, toddlers, and preschool age children (Ishizawa et al. 2006; Jennings 2006), these children are too young to actively consent to being placed in a transracial adoptive household. Moreover, since most transracial adoptive parents are not foster parents first, they do not experience this multiracial family status until they are already a parent.

Beyond the nuclear family, when adults form an interracial marriage, the White spouse joins their partner’s family and becomes related to other people of color through extended kin networks (Goldstein 1999). These extended kin networks potentially provide even more resources and potential role models for children of mixed race couples. But in transracial adoption, adoptive parents rarely have relationships with their adopted child’s biological relatives, especially for international adoptions (Wolfgram 2008). Even in open transracial adoptions where there is a varied level of contact between the birthmother and adoptive family,

the complex relationship has the potential to be quite different than other multiracial extended kin networks (Kirton 1999; Siegel 2003).

In contrast to interracial couples who can draw on their personal experiences from their interracial partnership, White adoptive parents of non-White children may not have similar resources. Instead, for White adoptive parents raising a non-White child, the process of forming and maintaining ties to the child's racial and ethnic community is a process that parents must proactively initiate and sustain. Lee (2003) describes this dynamic as the "transracial adoption paradox," where non-White children are often raised in families and communities where the child's cultural heritage is celebrated but racial differences may be downplayed. In this regard, the child is accepted as 'one of our own' within the family and community. Yet, Lee argues that the White privilege associated with being raised by White parents may not last, leaving some transracial adoptees ill-equipped to face the structural realities of racism and discrimination. Qualitative studies on the experiences of adult transracial adoptees (Trenka, Oparah, and Shin 2006; Shiao and Tuan 2008; Samuels 2009) lend support to Lee's (2003) theory and suggest that growing up in dominantly White communities hinders opportunities to develop positive racial and ethnic identities.

Another key difference between multiracial families formed through interracial marriage and childbearing, compared with transracial adoption is that in the former, the child is biologically connected to both parents, and therefore shares at least some physical traits with both parents. Multiracial children are likely to see some aspects of their appearance reflected in their parents. In contrast, non-White children who are adopted and raised by White parents do not share a biological connection nor do they look like either of their parents. Because transracially adopted children often grow up in households where the adults in both their

immediate and extended family do not reflect their racial and ethnic heritage, the process of racial socialization is likely to differ from that of children in interracial families created biologically. Yet to the best of our knowledge, no other study has examined the context of racial socialization for transracially adopted children vis-à-vis children of interracial couples and White monoracial families.

Residential Patterns of Transracially Adopted and Mixed Race Children

The literature on residential segregation in general shows increasing levels of spatial assimilation between White and Hispanic households, and White and Asian households although there is still significant residential segregation between Whites and Blacks. In fact, compared to Asians and Hispanics, Blacks are far more likely to be “hyper-segregated” (Massey and Denton 1998). This suggests that the level of residential integration may vary by the particular racial combination in the transracially adoptive family. Despite the trend toward increased spatial assimilation, the majority of Whites still live in communities with relatively few minorities (Charles 2003).

While there is a theoretical framework for conceptualizing the residential patterns of monoracial families, less is known about the residential patterns of transracial adoptive families and interracial families. Rosenfeld’s (2007) work finds that interracial families are more likely to be clustered in metropolitan areas. He argues that since young adults (especially those who are educated) delay marriage, there is an “age of independence” during which they move to metropolitan areas. In this expanded marriage market, these individuals have greater likelihoods of meeting, dating, and marrying people from different backgrounds, increasing the likelihood of

interracial pairings. Based on this theory, we would expect that interracial families are more likely to live in metropolitan areas where there are higher minority populations.

However, for White parents of non-White children, it is unclear if they choose to live in areas with higher levels of residential integration compared to White monoracial families. Findings from qualitative studies suggest that during the pre-adoption process, some homestudy social workers suggest that the adoptive parents consider moving to a more diverse area so that the child has greater access to positive role models of the same racial and ethnic background (Raleigh 2010). However, they also acknowledge that few parents actually do so. Rather, it may be that transracial adoptive parents live in relatively White communities where their child is one of the few people of color.

Language Use in Adoptive and Mixed Race Households

From the sociological literature in general, we know that there is a positive association between language retention and ethnic identity (Phinney et al. 2001; Portes and Hao 2002). In a study of second generation Mexican, Vietnamese, and Armenian adolescents, Phinney and colleagues (2001) find that language retention was a universally strong predictor of positive ethnic identity and socialization across all three ethnic groups. In addition to fostering positive racial and ethnic identities, using data from a national sample of children of immigrants, Portes and Hao (2002) find that the benefits of bilingualism extend to academic outcomes as well. Results from these studies indicate that heritage language use is a positive correlate of ethnic identity. However, transracially adopted children may not have the opportunity to grow up speaking the language of their birth within their adoptive families.

Studies on language use for transracially adopted children tend to center on children born abroad. The focus of these studies is on the process of language disruption and reaching age-appropriate developmental parity in English (Snedeker, Geren, and Shafto 2007; Scott 2009). In a review of this literature, Glennen (2002) notes that most of the parents who adopt do not speak the original language of the child's birthplace. While transracial adoptive parents who speak a language other than English inside the home are likely to be in the minority, so far there has been no corresponding data on this issue.

Of note, most of the data on language retention is based on samples of children stemming from two immigrant parents and less is known about the role of language retention among children of mixed-race heritage. In a qualitative case study on this topic, Shin (2010) finds that the majority of multiracial individuals reported that they spoke their parent's non-English language in the home but did not gain fluency and that the lack of language knowledge impeded their ability to form connections with members of their parents' ethnic background. This suggests that children of interracial couples may be more likely than transracial adoptive families to use a language other than English in the home, and that children of interracial couples may also experience barriers to forming positive racial and ethnic identities.

Hypotheses

Given the differences in the way transracial adoptive families are created, compared with families formed by interracial couples, we hypothesize that the context of racial socialization for transracially adopted children may more closely resemble that of White monoracial families than families formed by interracial couples.

1. We expect that transracially adopted children, like children in White monoracial families, will be less likely to live in families where someone speaks a language other than English than children of interracial couples.

2. We expect that when comparing the percentage non-White in their county of residence for the three groups of children, that transracially adopted children, similarly to children in White monoracial families, will live in counties with a lower percentage non-White than children of interracial couples.

3. We expect transracially adopted children will live in counties where their own race group is underrepresented when compared with children of interracial couples, whom we expect to live in counties where the child's own race group is overrepresented compared with the nation as a whole.

Data and Methods

We use the restricted access ACS 2009 data. This is a large, nationally representative data set, with records from about 2.9 million households.³ The restricted access file is about 50 percent larger than the public use microdata file, and so allows more accurate estimates of relatively small groups like transracially adopted children and children of interracial couples.⁴

In 2008, the American Community Survey expanded the “son/daughter” category of the relationship to householder item to biological son or daughter, adopted son or daughter, and stepson or stepdaughter.⁵ We compare three groups of never married children of the householder. All of the children are under 18 years of age. The first group is biological children in monoracial White families. The child, their parent and the parent's spouse (if present) are all White non-Hispanic.⁶ The second group is transracially adopted children. The child is other than White non-Hispanic⁷, while their parent, and the parent's spouse (if present) are White non-Hispanic. The third group is biological children of interracial couples. The child is other than

³ For more information about ACS, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

⁴ We are using the internal file because it is larger, although you could produce these estimates from the public use file.

⁵ The first 3-year data file to include the “adopted son/daughter” category will be the 2008-2010 ACS file, which is scheduled for release in the fall of 2011.

⁶ In ACS, there is no information about the type of relationship between the spouse of the householder and the householder's child. So we do not know whether the spouse of the householder is also the child's biological parent.

⁷ The precise definition of “other than White non-Hispanic” is everyone who did not mark White as their only race and reported they were not Hispanic, but we will refer to this group in the rest of the paper as non-White for ease of discussion. We use “White” to mean White alone, non-Hispanic.

White non-Hispanic, and they have at least one White non-Hispanic parent. So if the householder is not married, he or she is White non-Hispanic. If the householder is married, then one spouse is White non-Hispanic and the other spouse is not White non-Hispanic.

For transracially adoptive families, we narrow our focus to adoptive families with White parents since research has shown that adoptive parents are disproportionately White compared to parents with biological children. Although there are some instances of non-White parents adopting across race, research has shown that the likelihood of transracial adoption is far lower for non-White parents (Ishizawa et al. 2006). While non-White parents do adopt, they are more likely to adopt children of the same race. Another reason we limit our sample to transracially adopted children with at least one White parent is that we use monoracial White families as the comparison group. We do not include biological children of color or adopted children with parents of color since our intent is to investigate the context of racial socialization for non-White children adopted by White parents compared with other children raised by White parents.⁸ Since we are comparing the level of racial diversity where the family lives, we drop some children in families which contain multiple children and the family would be represented in several of our three groups. We keep the transracially adopted children, or children of interracial couples, dropping the White biological children with White parents when families contain two or three types according to our three groups of children.⁹

ACS reports of adopted children of the householder include both formal and informal adoption since it is based solely on the respondent's report. It also includes various types of adoption including private and public, domestic and international, and stepchildren adopted by their stepparents. ACS data collect only the type of relationship to the householder, so we do not

⁸ See Appendix Table A. for a detailed listing of all people under 18 living in households, and which groups were included in our sample.

⁹ This results in dropping about 0.96 percent of the children that fall into our three groups.

know the type of relationship with the second parent (whether adoptive or biological) when the householder/parent is married. ACS also cannot distinguish whether an unmarried partner of the householder is also a parent of the householder's child. Despite these caveats, ACS estimates of adopted children cover the majority of children who live with at least one adoptive parent.¹⁰

Analytic Strategy

We first provide a descriptive profile of the three groups of children, showing demographic characteristics of the children and economic characteristics of their households. To test whether transracially adopted children live in geographic areas that are less racially diverse than children of interracial couples (and more similar to the level of diversity in the areas where monoracial White families live), we operationalize racial diversity as the percentage non-White of the total population in the county where the child resides:

Next we estimate OLS regression models with the percentage non-White for county of residence as the continuous dependent variable in order to see whether the level of diversity in the immediate geographic area is associated with membership in the three groups of children. Children living in White biological monoracial families are the reference group.¹¹ Of course the racial diversity of a county may vary across particular neighborhoods, but this is the smallest level of geography practical for use with this sample. Children who live in counties in which total weighted respondents numbered less than 65,000 were excluded from the analysis since the

¹⁰ The Current Population Survey, which collects the presence of and type of relationship to two parents, if present, estimated 1.3 million children under 18 living with at least one adoptive parent, 97 percent of whom were the child of the householder. ACS estimated 1.6 million, higher than the CPS estimate. A third independent estimate of the number of adopted children is available from the 2007 National Survey of Adoptive Parents (Vandivere, Malm and Radel 2009). This survey estimated 1.8 million adopted children under 18 in 2007, although the estimate excluded children living with one adoptive parent and one biological parent, which are presumably included in the ACS estimate.

¹¹ All of the data shown are weighted. Replicate weights are used when standard errors are calculated.

estimate of the percent non-White for those counties was considered to be unreliable.¹² We use percent non-White as a proxy for the level of racial and ethnic diversity in the geographic area where the child lives, in order to investigate whether non-White children raised by White parents live in more diverse areas than do White children raised by White parents.

In a second OLS model, we estimate the relative representation of the child's race group in the county where they live. This is how we operationalize the idea of the child having access to same-race role models and possible relationships with those who belong to the same race group as the child. Rather than using the sheer percentage of a particular race group in the county as the dependent variable, we use the ratio of the percentage Black (for example) in the county divided by the percentage Black in the nation. So we are really measuring whether the particular race group is over or under-represented in any given county, compared with the same group's representation nationwide—a sort of 'representation ratio'. Using a ratio accounts for the fact that some race groups have small numbers overall, even in areas where they are concentrated. For example, an Asian child who lives in a county that has a higher percentage Asian than is the case nationwide will be coded similarly to a Black child who lives in a county that has a higher percentage Black than the national average, even though the overall percent Black in the country is higher than the overall percent Asian.

Results

In order to get a better sense of the characteristics of the three groups of children, we present demographic characteristics of the child and their householder parent, as well as

¹² 150,913 cases were dropped from Model 1. This is about 26 percent of the unweighted sample for the model. Those children who lived in counties with a total population of less than 65,000 are presumably less likely to live in diverse areas than children living in more populated counties. So our estimates in Model 1 are likely conservative, since 94 percent of the portion of the sample that is dropped due to county size were White monoracial children, who are the least likely to live in diverse areas. 8,757 cases were dropped from Model 2 due to small county size. This is about 16 percent of the unweighted sample. Since weights for non-White children are generally higher than for White children, the dropped cases are 20 percent of the weighted sample for Model 1, compared with 26 percent of the unweighted sample.

economic characteristics of the household. Table 1 presents descriptive characteristics of the child and their householder parent. There were 34.1 million White children in White families, 3.5 million children of interracial couples, and about 300,000 transracially adopted children. In relation to the other two groups of children, the transracially adopted children are distinct on many of the characteristics shown.¹³ Forty-five percent are foreign-born, compared with about 1 percent of children in the other two groups.¹⁴ This is expected given the increase in international adoption over the last 15 years (Selman 2009). Transracially adopted children live with older parents, whose median age is 46, compared with 39 for householders of White monoracial children and 37 for children of interracial couples. Transracially adopted children have parents with high levels of educational attainment. One third (31 percent) have a parent with a graduate or professional degree, compared with about 15 percent of children in White monoracial families and children of interracial couples.¹⁵

[Table 1 about here]

The racial distributions of the groups of children reflect patterns of international adoption and interracial marriage. Twenty-six percent of transracially adopted children are non-Hispanic Black or White/Black, compared with 21 percent for children of interracial couples. Thirty-eight percent of transracially adopted children are Asian or Pacific Islander or White/API, compared with 18 percent of children of interracial couples. The high percentage Asian for transracially adopted children reflects the popularity of Korea and China among adoptive parents, especially with the rise of China as a source country since the early 1990s. Since all of the children are

¹³ The estimates in this paper are based on responses from a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation and other factors. All comparisons made in this report have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

¹⁴ The percentage of children in White monoracial families who are foreign born does not differ statistically from the percentage for children of interracial couples.

¹⁵ The percentage of children in White monoracial families who have a parent with at least a graduate degree does not differ statistically from the percentage for children of interracial couples.

under 18 in 2009, the oldest would have been born in 1991. Another third (31 percent) of the transracially adopted children are Hispanic. This reflects the popularity of birth countries such as Guatemala in recent years. Half (50 percent) of the children of interracial couples are Hispanic. This reflects the relatively high intermarriage between White non-Hispanics and Hispanics.

In comparison with some of the wide differences between transracially adopted children and children in the other two groups on particular characteristics, the living arrangements of their parents and employment status of the parents do not show such wide differences. For example, 76 percent of transracially adopted children lived in married couple households, as did 77 percent of children of interracial couples, and 78 percent of children in White monoracial families.¹⁶ Similarly, 87 percent of transracially adopted children and children in White monoracial families lived with a householder who was in the labor force, as did 86 percent of children of interracial couples.¹⁷

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2 presents economic and geographic characteristics of the children's households. Again, the transracially adopted children's households are distinct from the other two groups: they live in households with significantly higher incomes. One fifth (22 percent) of the transracially adopted children lived in households with at least \$150,000 in income, compared with 14 percent of children in White monoracial households, and 13 percent of children of interracial couples. Transracially adopted children were also more likely to live in a home their

¹⁶ The estimate for children in White monoracial families differed statistically from the estimates for the other two groups of children.

¹⁷ Among these three estimates, only the percentages for children of interracial couples and that for children in White monoracial families differ statistically.

parents owned: 91 percent compared with 77 percent for children in White monoracial families and 64 percent for children of interracial couples.

One indicator of a connection with a culture other than the dominant culture of most White non-Hispanics in the US is the usage of a non-English language at home. Just 11 percent of transracially adopted children have at least one person in their household (it could be the child themselves) who uses a non-English language at home. This is not statistically different from the 10 percent of children in White monoracial families who also have someone who uses a language other than English at home. The proportion is much higher for children of interracial couples, since one third of these children have someone in the household who uses a non-English language at home. So we find support for our first hypothesis since transracially adopted children are very similar to children in White monoracial families, compared with children of interracial couples on exposure to a non-English language at home.

In general, transracially adopted children were more similar to children in White monoracial families than children of interracial couples in terms of their residential patterns, which is not surprising since they also have White non-Hispanic parents. For example, about 60 percent of transracially adopted children and children in White monoracial families lived in an MSA, but not in a central city, compared with 53 percent of children of interracial couples.¹⁸ The percentage of transracially adopted children who lived in a central city (25 percent) fell between that for children in White monoracial families (21 percent) and that for children of interracial couples (35 percent.) So while a similar proportion of transracially adopted children lived in the remainder of the MSA as did children of White monoracial families, they were less likely than children of interracial couples to live in center cities.

¹⁸ The percentages for transracially adopted children and children of White monoracial families do not differ statistically.

Table 3 contains a descriptive look at the dependent variables used in the OLS models in the multivariate analysis which follows. Comparing the distribution for percent non-White among the three groups of children, it is clear that a higher proportion of children of interracial couples live in counties with more diversity (higher percentage non-White). While 48 percent of the children of interracial couples lived in counties where at least 38 percent of the population was non-White, this was true for 29 percent of White monoracial children and transracially adopted children. The distribution for transracially adopted children is more similar to that of children in White monoracial families than that of children of interracial couples.

The second part of the table shows the mean of the ratio used as the dependent variable in Model 2. The ratio represents the relative representation of the child's own race group in the county in which they live, compared with the representation of that race group in the nation as a whole—the 'representation ratio'. For example, if the county where an Asian child lives has the same percentage of the population who are Asian as the United States does as a whole, the ratio will equal 1. A ratio value of more than 1 indicates that the county in which the child lives has a higher percentage of their race group than does the nation overall. A ratio value of less than 1 indicates that the county in which the child lives has a lower proportion of their race group than the country as a whole.

On average, children in White monoracial families live in counties in which they are overrepresented (1.1). All of the groups of children of interracial couples also live in counties where, on average, their race group is overrepresented. In contrast, there is variation among the groups of transracially adopted children. Some groups live, on average, where their race is underrepresented: foreign-born and US born Blacks, and foreign-born API and Hispanic

transracially adopted children. But transracially adopted children who are AIAN, US born API, or US born Hispanics live in counties where they are overrepresented.¹⁹

Multivariate Models Exploring the Context of Racial Socialization

To test the hypotheses listed earlier, we run OLS regression models. These models are not causal, but are intended to test whether there is an association between being in a particular group of children and living in an area that has a higher level of diversity (Model 1), or a relatively higher representation of the child's own race group (Model 2). The first model shows the association between the percentage non-White in the county of residence and groups of children.

The first model (1A) lists a coefficient for transracially adopted children as a group, and for children of interracial couples as a group, both compared with children in White monoracial families. Since we are also interested in how particular subgroups of transracially adopted children compare with White children in White families (the reference category), we place separate indicator variables in a second model for the following groups of children:

Transracially adopted children—foreign-born Black²⁰; US Black; American Indian or Alaska Native; foreign-born Asian or Pacific Islander (API)²¹; US API; Some other race (SOR); foreign-born Hispanic; US Hispanic; and for children of interracial couples—Black; AIAN; API; SOR; and Hispanic. Then we include controls for the householder's characteristics which might be related to living in areas with higher or lower percentage non-White: age (continuous); householder's education in the following categories: high school degree or less (reference

¹⁹ The value of the ratio for transracially adopted children of Some other race does not differ statistically from 1.0.

²⁰ In the model, Black also includes children reported as White and Black (multiracial).

²¹ In the model, API also includes children reported as White and API (multiracial).

group); some college; bachelor's degree; graduate or professional degree; whether the householder is a single parent (reference group is married parents with spouse present), and logged adjusted household income. An indicator for those children living in households that have negative or 0 income is also included.

As shown in Table 4, Model 1A, transracially adopted children, as a group, do not differ from children in White monoracial families in terms of the percentage non-White in the county in which they live. However, on the whole, children of interracial couples live in counties where there are higher percentages of non-White residents.

[Table 4 about here]

Model 1B disaggregates transracially adopted children and children of interracial families into race and ethnic groups. As shown in Model 1B, there are no statistical differences between the percentage of non-White residents, for all subgroups of transracially adopted children compared with the children in White monoracial families overall, except for foreign-born API children. So, foreign born API children who were transracially adopted live in counties with less diversity than the average White child with White parents.

One explanation for these results may be that our models include additional controls for the householder's characteristics. Before the controls are added, foreign-born API children are not different from White children in monoracial families in Model 1B. But after taking into account the characteristics of the householder, API children are seen to live in counties with significantly lower percentages non-White.²² Overall, older age of householder is associated with living in a county with more diversity, as is having a householder with at least a bachelor's degree. Higher logged household income was also associated with greater levels of residential diversity. Recall from Tables 1 and 2 that parents who adopt transracially are significantly more

²² Results from the additional model available on request.

likely to be older, have more education, and higher incomes. This may be especially true for parents who internationally adopt Asian children (see Rothman 2005; Dorow 2006). This may contribute to our results that find foreign-born API children live in less diverse counties than one would expect given their parents' high SES.

On the other hand, all groups of children of interracial couples, with the exception of American Indian children, lived in counties with a higher percentage non-White on average than did children in White monoracial families on average.

As shown in Models 1A and 1B, we find support for our first hypothesis, since all groups of transracially adopted children are either not different from children in White monoracial families in terms of the percent non-White of their county of residence, or they live in counties with a comparatively lower percent non-White, while all groups of children of interracial couples lived in counties with a higher percentage non-White than children in White monoracial families (or were not significantly different).

In Table 5 we present results from our second measure of racial socialization—the 'representation ratio', in which the dependent variable is the ratio of the percentage of the population in the child's county of residence that is the same race as the child, divided by the percentage of the total population nationwide that is of the same race as the child. In this model, the same groups of transracially adopted children as were used in the first model are included, with the reference group being all children of interracial couples. We compare transracially adopted children to children of interracial couples because qualitative research suggests that adoption professionals and adoptive parents often compare themselves to this new and emerging type of interracial family (Traver 2007; Raleigh 2010) but we know little about how these two family forms compare. Children of interracial couples are also a more appropriate comparison

group when looking at the representation ratio since they are non-White, as are the transracially adopted children. The issue of race group representation is not the same for White children in White families, since most live where they are a majority, and we are interested in racial socialization for children who are members of minority race groups in the nation as a whole.

The models test whether transracially adopted children, compared with children of interracial couples, live in counties in which people of their own race are over or under-represented compared with the nation as a whole. In addition to the indicators for the subgroups of transracially adopted children, we include controls for householder's characteristics. Model 2A shows coefficients for transracially adopted children as a summary group, while Model 2B breaks out particular race groups.

[Table 5 about here]

As shown in Table 5, Model 2A, as a group, transracially adopted children are less likely to live in counties where their 'representation ratio' is as high as that of children of interracial couples. However, when disaggregating transracially adopted children by their racial and ethnic background, we find some interesting variation. As shown in Model 2B, compared to children of interracial couples, transracially adopted Black children are significantly less likely to live in counties where Blacks are overrepresented compared with their proportion nationally. The same pattern exists for transracially adopted Hispanic children, both native and foreign-born, and foreign-born API children. Compared to children of interracial couples, these children live in counties where their race group is less well represented compared with the national average. This effect exists after adding additional controls for other household characteristics such as the householder's education, marital status, age, and household income.

Conclusion

In sum, our study suggests that even though some adoptive parents may embrace the title of being a part of a multiracial family, the context of racial socialization for transracially adopted children is distinct from children of interracial couples. While there is some variation among particular groups of transracially adopted children, most are likely to live in less diverse areas than children of interracial couples, and in areas more similar to those of children in White monoracial families. Both the transracially adopted children and those in White monoracial families have White non-Hispanic parents. Most transracially adopted children are also less likely to live in areas where their own race is as well represented as children of interracial couples experience, on average. About the same proportion of transracially adopted children as children in White monoracial families have someone in their household who uses a language other than English. Although the measures used here to proxy for the environment in which the child's racial socialization is occurring are general, this is the first study to illuminate the context of racial socialization using nationally representative quantitative data.

Our results suggest that there may be some variation of the context of racial socialization within transracial adoptive families. While we do not test these differences here, and some apparent differences are likely due to small sample size for some groups (e.g., AIAN children, and those of Some other race) this is an area for future study. Results from a recent study exploring the factors motivating parents towards international versus domestic transracial adoption suggest that parents may see international transracial adoption as less of a challenge than transracial domestic adoption (Zhang and Lee 2011). In line with other sociological research on race and adoptive parenting (Dorow 2006; Traver 2007; Jacobson 2008), Zhang and Lee find that parents who internationally adopt across race are more likely to focus on culture rather than

race. The difference between a focus on culture and ethnicity versus a focus on race in parents' efforts to help their children create healthy racial and ethnic identities is another area for future research.

Even though the ACS only contains limited data on measures of racial socialization, we find consistent and robust support that transracially adopted children with White parents 'look' more similar in terms of their residential patterns and language use to White biological children with White parents. Although there is greater awareness in adoption regarding the importance of developing transracially adopted children's racial and ethnic identities, our findings suggest that these children may be at some disadvantage compared to children of interracial couples despite adoptive parents' relatively high socioeconomic status on average. The results of this study may be helpful to adoption professionals and adoptive parents as they seek to foster healthy racial and ethnic identities in transracially adopted children.

References

- Brunsma, D. L. (2005). Interracial families and the racial identification of mixed-race children: Evidence from the early childhood longitudinal study. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1131-1157.
- Brown, T. & Krishnakumar, A. (2007). Development and Validation of the Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS) in African American Families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36, 1072-1085.
- Caughy, M. O., Nettles, S. M., O'Campo, P. J., & Lohrfink, K. F. (2006). Neighborhood matters: Racial socialization of African American children. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1220-1236.
- Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 167-207.
- Child Welfare Information Gateway (2004). How Many Children Were Adopted in 2000 and 2001 Retrieved June 15, 2009, from http://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/s_adoption/index.cfm
- Dalmage, H. (2000). *Tripping on the Color Line: Black-White Multiracial Families in a Racially Divided World*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Dorow, S. (2006). *Transnational Adoption: A Cultural Economy of Race, Gender, and Kinship*. New York: New York University Press.
- Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute. (2001). International Adoption Facts. <http://www.adoptioninstitute.org/research/internationaladoption.php>
- Gamache, G., Liu, L., & Tesslar, R. (1999). *West Meets East: Americans Adopt Chinese Children*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Glennen, S. (2002). Language development and delay in internationally adopted, infants and toddlers: A review. [Review]. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 11(3), 333-339.
- Goldstein, J. (1999). Kinship Networks that Cross Racial Lines: The Exception or the Rule. *Demography*, 36(3), 399-407.
- Harris, D. R., & Sim, J. J. (2002). Who Is Multiracial? Assessing the Complexity of Lived Race. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4), 614-627.
- Herman, E. (2008). *Kinship By Design: A History of Adoption in the Modern United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hollingsworth, L. D. (1997). Effect of transracial/transethnic adoption on children's racial and ethnic identity and self-esteem: A meta-analytic review. *Marriage and Family Review*, 25(1-2), 99-130.
- Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63(4), 981-995.
- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E., Johnson, D., Stevenson, H., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(5), 747-770.
- Ishizawa, H., Kenney, C. T., Kubo, K., & Stevens, G. (2006). *Constructing interracial families through intercountry adoption*.
- Jacobson, H. (2008). *Culture Keeping: White Mothers, International Adoption, and the Negotiation of Family Difference*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Jones, N. A., and A. Symens Smith. (2001). *The Two or More Races Population*. Census 2000 Briefs C2KBR/01-6 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-6.pdf>.
- Jennings, P. K. (2006). The trouble with the Multiethnic Placement Act: An empirical look at transracial adoption. *Sociological Perspectives*, 49(4), 559-581.
- Kirton, D. (1999). Perspectives on 'race' and adoption: The views of student social workers. *British Journal of Social Work*, 29(5), 779-796.

- Kreider, R. M. (2003). *Adopted children and step-children: 2000. Census 2000 Special Reports CENSR6-RV*. from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/censr-6.pdf>.
- Lee, J., & Bean, F. (2007). Reinventing the Color Line: Immigration and America's New Racial/Ethnic Divide. *Social Forces*, 86(2), 561-586.
- Lee, R. M. (2003). The transracial adoption paradox: History, research, and counseling implications of cultural socialization. *Counseling Psychologist*, 31(6), 709-742.
- Lesane-Brown, C. L., Brown, T. N., Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Bruce, M. A. (2009). Negotiating Boundaries and Bonds: Frequency of Young Children's Socialization to Their Ethnic/Racial Heritage. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 41(3), 457-464.
- Louie, A. (2009). "Pandas, Lions, and Dragons, oh my!" How White Adoptive Parents Construct Chineseness. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 12(3), 285-320.
- Luke, C., & Luke, A. (1998). Interracial families: difference within difference. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(4), 728-754.
- Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1998). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mohanty, J. (2010). Development of the Ethnic and Racial Socialization of Transracial Adoptee Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 20(6), 600-610.
- Neblett, E. W., Terzian, M., & Harriott, V. (2010). From Racial Discrimination to Substance Use: The Buffering Effects of Racial Socialization. *Child Development Perspectives*, 4(2), 131-137.
- Phinney, J.S., & Chavira, V. (1995). Parental ethnic socialization and adolescent coping with problems related to ethnicity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 5(1), 31-53.
- Phinney, J. S., Romero, I., Nava, M., & Huang, D. (2001). The Role of Language, Parents, and Peers in Ethnic Identity Among Adolescents in Immigrant Families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30(2), 135-153.
- Portes, A., & Hao, L. (2002). The price of uniformity: language, family and personality adjustment in the immigrant second generation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25(6), 889-912.
- Quiroz, P. A. (2007). *Adoption in a Color Blind Society*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.
- Raleigh, E. (2010). "The best fit for your family": (How) Do Adoption Providers Discuss Race at Adoption Information Meetings?" Unpublished dissertation draft. University of Pennsylvania.
- Rockquemore, K. A., Brunsma, D. L., & Delgado, D. J. (2009). Racing to Theory or Retheorizing Race? Understanding the Struggle to Build a Multiracial Identity Theory. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(1), 13-34.
- Rodriguez, J., Umana-Taylor, A., Smith, E. P., & Johnson, D. J. (2009). Cultural Processes in Parenting and Youth Outcomes: Examining and Model of Racial-Ethnic Socialization and Identity in Diverse Populations. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 15(2), 106-111.
- Rosenfeld, M. C. (2007). *The Age of Independence: Interracial Unions, Same-Sex Unions, and the Changing American Family* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Roth, W. D. (2005). The end of the one-drop rule? Labeling of multiracial children in black Intermarriages. *Sociological Forum*, 20(1), 35-67.
- Rotherman, M. and Phinney, J. (1987). Introduction: Definitions and perspectives in the study of children's ethnic socialization. In J. Phinney & M. Rotherman (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 10-28). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rothman, B. K. (2005). *Weaving a Family: Untangling Race and Adoption*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Samuels, G. M. (2009). "Being Raised by White People": Navigating Racial Difference Among Adopted Multiracial Adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71, 80-94.

- Scott, K. A. (2009). Language Outcomes of School-Aged Internationally Adopted Children A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 29(1), 65-81.
- Selman, P. (2009). The rise and fall of intercountry adoption in the 21st century. *International Social Work*, 52(5), 575-594.
- Shiao, J. L., & Tuan, M. H. (2008). Korean adoptees and the social context of ethnic exploration. [Article]. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(4), 1023-1066.
- Shin, S. J. (2010). "What About Me? I'm Not Like Chinese But I'm Not Like American": Heritage-Language Learning and Identity of Mixed-Heritage Adults. *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, 9(3), 203-219.
- Siegel, D. H. (2003). Open adoption of infants: Adoptive parents' feelings seven years later. *Social Work*, 48(3), 409-419.
- Snedeker, J., Geren, J., & Shafto, C. L. (2007). Starting over - International adoption as a natural experiment in language development. [Article]. *Psychological Science*, 18(1), 79-87.
- Traver, A. (2007). Home(land) Décor: China Adoptive Parents' Consumption of Chinese Cultural Objects for Display in their Homes. *Qualitative Sociology*, 30, 201-220.
- Trenka, J. J., Oparah, J. C., & Shin, S. Y. (Eds.). (2006). *Outsiders Within: Writing on Transracial Adoption*. Boston: South End Press.
- Vandivere, S., Malm, K., & Radcl, L. (2009). *Adoption USA: A Chartbook Based on the 2007 National Survey of Adoptive Parents*.
- Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic Options*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- White-Johnson, R.L., Ford, K. R., & Sellers, R. M. (2010). Parental Racial Socialization Profiles: Association With Demographic Factors, Racial Discrimination, Childhood Socialization, and Racial Identity. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(2), 237-247.
- Wolfgang, S. M. (2008). Openness in adoption: what we know so far - A critical review of the literature. *Social Work*, 53(2), 133-142.
- Zhang, Y., & Lee, G. R. (2011). Intercountry Versus Transracial Adoption: Analysis of Adoptive Parents' Motivations and Preferences in Adoption. *Journal of Family Issues*, 32(1), 75-98.
- Yancey, G. (2002). Who interracially dates: An examination of the characteristics of those who have interracially dated. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 33(2), 179-+.
- Yancey, G. (2007). Experiencing racism: Differences in the experiences of Whites married to blacks and non-black racial minorities. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 38(2), 197-+.

Abstract:

Much attention has been paid to the racial socialization of non-White adopted children raised by White parents. While in the mid 20th century adoptive parents were counseled to ignore racial or ethnic differences between parents and children, current practice emphasizes the importance of children developing positive ethnic and racial identities. This paper uses the restricted-access American Community Survey, a large, nationally representative data set to show that the context of racial socialization for transracially adopted children is more similar to that of White children in White families than to children of interracial couples. We compare social/demographic characteristics such as racial diversity of the county of residence for these groups of children as a proxy for racial socialization. This paper seeks to add a quantitative, nationally representative picture of the context of racial socialization for specific groups of transracially adopted children, complementing existing qualitative research published in this area.

148 words

Table 1. Characteristics of the Children and Their Parent, by Type of Child: 2009

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

	White monoracial ¹			Transracially adopted children			Children of interracial couples		
	Number	Percent	Margin of error ²	Number	Percent	Margin of error ²	Number	Percent	Margin of error ²
Total children	34,050,860	100.0	(X)	299,720	100.0	(X)	3,497,758	100.0	(X)
Age of Child									
0-2 years	5,452,638	16.0	0.06	28,549	9.5	0.84	734,948	21.0	0.38
3-5 years	5,573,662	16.4	0.08	59,770	19.9	1.31	684,440	19.6	0.36
6-8 years	5,511,576	16.2	0.09	58,484	19.5	1.12	597,679	17.1	0.33
9-11 years	5,678,470	16.7	0.08	58,861	19.6	1.27	543,955	15.6	0.31
12-14 years	5,864,886	17.2	0.10	51,565	17.2	0.99	496,982	14.2	0.35
15-17 years	5,969,628	17.5	0.05	42,491	14.2	1.05	439,754	12.6	0.30
Race and Hispanic Origin of Child									
Not Hispanic or Latino	34,050,860	100.0		208,416	69.5	1.53	1,758,570	50.3	0.57
White alone	34,050,860	100.0		(X)	(X)		(X)	(X)	
Black or African American alone	(X)	(X)		48,284	16.1	1.11	156,669	4.5	0.28
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	(X)	(X)		5,546	1.9	0.40	85,952	2.5	0.17
Asian or Pacific Islander alone	(X)	(X)		105,770	35.3	1.40	77,758	2.2	0.17
Some other race alone	(X)	(X)		2,700	0.9	0.27	55,865	1.6	0.13
Two or more races	(X)	(X)		46,116	15.4	1.15	1,382,326	39.5	0.54
White-Black	(X)	(X)		28,690	9.6	0.71	565,896	16.2	0.40
White-American Indian and Alaska Native	(X)	(X)		5,020	1.7	0.41	200,236	5.7	0.24
White-Asian and Pacific Islander	(X)	(X)		6,475	2.2	0.44	533,977	15.3	0.32
White-Some other race	(X)	(X)		790	0.3	0.14	27,839	0.8	0.12
Other multiple races	(X)	(X)		5,141	1.7	0.41	54,378	1.6	0.16
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	(X)	(X)		91,304	30.5	1.53	1,739,188	49.7	0.57
White alone	(X)	(X)		47,320	15.8	1.15	1,342,311	38.4	0.64
Black or African American alone	(X)	(X)		2,403	0.8	0.23	4,744	0.1	0.04
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	(X)	(X)		5,759	1.9	0.39	7,651	0.2	0.05
Asian or Pacific Islander alone	(X)	(X)		1,315	0.4	0.18	1,749	0.1	0.02
Some other race alone	(X)	(X)		24,903	8.3	0.91	133,008	3.8	0.23
Two or more races	(X)	(X)		9,604	3.2	0.54	249,725	7.1	0.28
Foreign born	324,289	1.0	0.04	135,421	45.2	1.51	19,454	0.6	0.09
Living Arrangement of the Householder/Parent									
Married couple households	26,707,582	78.4	0.20	228,824	76.3	1.42	2,694,338	77.0	0.54
Male--no spouse present	1,901,633	5.6	0.08	16,148	5.4	0.82	98,204	2.8	0.23
With an unmarried partner	655,689	1.9	0.05	6,099	2.0	0.49	39,510	1.1	0.14
No unmarried partner present	1,245,944	3.7	0.07	10,049	3.4	0.67	58,694	1.7	0.17
Female--no spouse present	5,441,645	16.0	0.17	54,748	18.3	1.18	705,216	20.2	0.54
With an unmarried partner	1,014,059	3.0	0.07	9,514	3.2	0.54	136,639	3.9	0.24
No unmarried partner present	4,427,586	13.0	0.16	45,234	15.1	1.12	568,577	16.3	0.55
Median age of the householder³ (in years)	(X)	39	0.03	(X)	46	0.25	(X)	37	0.11
Educational Attainment of the Householder									
Less than high school	1,917,972	5.6	0.13	7,035	2.3	0.48	241,725	6.9	0.38
High school graduate	7,369,786	21.6	0.14	30,738	10.3	1.12	705,622	20.2	0.52
Some college	11,326,493	33.3	0.17	78,387	26.2	1.64	1,320,118	37.7	0.57
Bachelor's degree	8,476,121	24.9	0.18	90,544	30.2	1.38	726,535	20.8	0.47
Graduate or professional school degree	4,960,488	14.6	0.13	93,016	31.0	1.55	503,758	14.4	0.43
Labor Force Participation of the Householder⁴									
In labor force	29,556,968	86.8	0.17	261,240	87.2	1.39	3,001,790	85.8	0.39
Employed	27,842,277	81.8	0.20	251,523	83.9	1.41	2,779,718	79.5	0.49
Unemployed	1,714,691	5.0	0.09	9,717	3.2	0.54	222,072	6.3	0.32
Not in labor force	4,493,508	13.2	0.17	38,480	12.8	1.39	495,968	14.2	0.39

(X) - not applicable.

¹ White monoracial includes children who are White non-Hispanic biological children of the householder, and whose parent(s) are White non-Hispanic. Transracially adopted children includes adopted children of the householder who are other than White non-Hispanic and whose parent(s) are White non-Hispanic. Children of interracial couples includes biological children of the householder who are other than White non-Hispanic and whose parent is White non-Hispanic if she is not living with a spouse, or who have one White non-Hispanic parent and one parent who is other than White non-Hispanic if the parent has a spouse present.

² This figure, added to, or subtracted from the percent, provides the 90 percent confidence interval.

³ Medians calculated using SAS9.

⁴ The universe for this question is age 16 and over.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2009.

Table 2. Characteristics of the Children's Households, by Type of Child: 2009

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

	White monoracial			Transracially adopted children			Children of interracial couples		
	Number	Percent	Margin of error ¹	Number	Percent	Margin of error ¹	Number	Percent	Margin of error ¹
Total children	34,050,860	100.0	(X)	299,720	100.0	(X)	3,497,758	100.0	(X)
Household Income in 2007²									
\$0 or less	205,275	0.6	0.04	654	0.2	0.12	22,746	0.7	0.11
\$1-\$14,999	1,925,711	5.7	0.11	7,307	2.4	0.53	278,286	8.0	0.35
\$15,000-\$24,999	2,001,601	5.9	0.10	9,798	3.3	0.68	263,945	7.5	0.36
\$25,000-\$34,999	2,401,949	7.1	0.12	13,317	4.4	0.81	272,715	7.8	0.33
\$35,000-\$49,999	3,966,844	11.6	0.11	21,119	7.0	0.86	421,095	12.0	0.42
\$50,000-\$74,999	6,820,788	20.0	0.16	57,051	19.0	1.44	661,536	18.9	0.51
\$75,000-\$99,999	5,667,255	16.6	0.14	53,526	17.9	1.21	529,366	15.1	0.41
\$100,000-\$149,999	6,222,034	18.3	0.14	70,797	23.6	1.59	586,727	16.8	0.42
\$150,000-\$199,999	2,291,055	6.7	0.10	27,276	9.1	1.02	232,763	6.7	0.30
\$200,000 or more	2,548,348	7.5	0.12	38,875	13.0	1.11	228,579	6.5	0.25
Median household income ³ (in dollars)	(X)	74,092	208	(X)	93,340	1,963	(X)	68,133	724
Below the poverty level	3,843,709	11.3	0.16	17,127	5.7	0.85	515,764	14.7	0.50
Tenure									
Owns with a mortgage	23,510,324	69.0	0.23	241,316	80.5	1.25	2,038,364	58.3	0.54
Owns free and clear	2,612,544	7.7	0.09	31,171	10.4	0.97	190,142	5.4	0.26
Rents home ⁴	7,927,992	23.3	0.24	27,233	9.1	1.00	1,269,252	36.3	0.61
Region									
Northeast	6,620,032	19.4	0.05	60,486	20.2	1.22	456,715	13.1	0.40
Midwest	9,671,621	28.4	0.06	90,769	30.3	1.34	651,885	18.6	0.44
South	11,582,684	34.0	0.08	77,562	25.9	1.58	1,144,535	32.7	0.54
West	6,176,523	18.1	0.08	70,903	23.7	1.49	1,244,623	35.6	0.60
Division									
New England	1,975,711	5.8	0.03	22,433	7.5	0.73	126,489	3.6	0.19
Mid Atlantic	4,644,321	13.6	0.04	38,053	12.7	1.05	330,226	9.4	0.35
East North Central	6,477,572	19.0	0.06	55,091	18.4	1.14	449,438	12.8	0.36
West North Central	3,194,049	9.4	0.04	35,678	11.9	0.98	202,447	5.8	0.22
South Atlantic	6,010,291	17.7	0.06	42,630	14.2	1.35	561,624	16.1	0.45
East South Central	2,332,760	6.9	0.04	14,276	4.8	0.70	114,372	3.3	0.21
West South Central	3,239,633	9.5	0.06	20,656	6.9	0.72	468,539	13.4	0.42
Mountain	2,558,265	7.5	0.05	31,914	10.6	1.21	395,316	11.3	0.37
Pacific	3,618,258	10.6	0.06	38,989	13.0	1.12	849,307	24.3	0.52
Metro/Nonmetro									
central city of MSA	7,223,454	21.2	0.12	73,898	24.7	1.67	1,212,899	34.7	0.57
remainder of MSA	20,042,403	58.9	0.14	179,695	60.0	1.77	1,862,779	53.3	0.56
outside of MSA	6,785,003	19.9	0.07	46,127	15.4	1.06	422,080	12.1	0.38
At least one household member speaks a language other than English	3,483,967	10.2	0.13	32,502	10.8	0.95	1,185,793	33.9	0.58

(X) - not applicable.

¹ This figure, added to, or subtracted from the percent, provides the 90 percent confidence interval.

² This is adjusted household income--in 2008 dollars.

³ Medians calculated using SAS9.

⁴ Includes those who occupy without cash payment.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2009.

Table 3. Modeling the Context of Racial Socialization: Dependent Variables

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

	White monoracial			Transracially adopted children			Children of interracial couples		
	Number	Estimate	Margin of error ¹	Number	Estimate	Margin of error ¹	Number	Estimate	Margin of error ¹
Total children²	26,978,837	100.0	(X)	252,937	100.0	(X)	3,082,470	100.0	(X)
Dependent Variable for Model 1--measure of diversity in county of residence									
Percent of population nonwhite in county of residence									
0 to 8.9 percent	2,445,416	9.1	0.0	20,227	8.0	0.9	94,958	3.1	0.2
9.0 to 15.9 percent	4,714,138	17.5	0.1	45,730	18.1	1.4	319,413	10.4	0.3
16.0 to 24.9 percent	5,209,931	19.3	0.1	52,061	20.6	1.7	457,827	14.9	0.4
25.0 to 37.9 percent	6,883,354	25.5	0.1	62,788	24.8	1.3	721,160	23.4	0.5
38.0 to 100 percent	7,725,998	28.6	0.1	72,131	28.5	1.6	1,489,112	48.3	0.6
Dependent Variable for Model 2--relative representation of child's own race group in county of residence²									
Mean of the 'representation ratio'³									
White non-Hispanic children in White families	26,978,837	1.1	0.001	X			X		
Transracially adopted children									
foreign-born black	X			6,648	0.74	0.1	X		
US black	X			54,033	0.80	0.0	X		
AIAN	X			7,531	2.92	1.0	X		
foreign-born API	X			83,270	0.95	0.0	X		
US API	X			15,833	1.21	0.1	X		
Some other race	X			7,469	1.16	0.2	X		
foreign-born Hispanic	X			26,903	0.64	0.1	X		
US Hispanic	X			51,250	1.15	0.1	X		
Children of interracial couples									
Black	X			X			634,062	1.07	0.0
AIAN	X			X			198,629	2.45	0.2
API	X			X			574,473	1.87	0.0
SOR	X			X			124,086	1.76	0.1
Hispanic	X			X			1,551,220	1.48	0.0

(X) - not applicable.

¹ This figure, added to, or subtracted from the percent, provides the 90 percent confidence interval.

² ratio of percent of population same as child's race in county to percent child's race in nation

³ Includes children who live in a county with at least 65,000 weighted population and are part of the regression sample.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2009.

Table 4. Model 1: Percentage Nonwhite in County of Child's Residence: 2009

Predictor	Model 1A		Model 1B	
	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error
Main Effects				
White non-Hispanic children in White families	(reference)		(reference)	
Transracially adopted children	-0.020	0.02	NA	
foreign-born black	NA		-0.060	0.08
US black	NA		-0.034	0.04
AIAN	NA		-0.015	0.08
foreign-born API	NA		-0.049	0.02 *
US API	NA		0.009	0.08
Some other race	NA		0.011	0.09
foreign-born Hispanic	NA		-0.046	0.04
US Hispanic	NA		0.045	0.04
Children of interracial couples	0.094	0.01 ***	NA	
Black	NA		0.045	0.02 **
AIAN	NA		0.030	0.02
API	NA		0.091	0.01 ***
SOR	NA		0.092	0.04 *
Hispanic	NA		0.123	0.01 ***
Householder's age	0.001	0.00 ***	0.001	0.00 ***
Householder has high school degree or less	(reference)		(reference)	
Householder has some college	0.010	0.01	0.010	0.01
Householder has bachelor's degree	0.019	0.01 **	0.020	0.01 **
Householder has graduate or professional degree	0.037	0.01 ***	0.037	0.01 ***
Householder is married parent	(reference)		(reference)	
Householder is single parent	0.008	0.01	0.009	0.01
Logged household income	0.018	0.00 ***	0.017	0.00 ***
Household had negative or 0 income last year	0.225	0.05 ***	0.222	0.05 ***
unweighted sample size	432,993		432,993	

Significance is noted as follows: *(<0.05), **(<0.01), ***(<0.001).

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

NA- not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2009.

Table 5. Model 2: Representation Ratio: Child's Own Race in County of Residence: 2009

Predictor	Model 2A		Model 2B	
	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error
Children of interracial couples	(reference)		(reference)	
Transracially adopted children	-0.599	0.138 ***	NA	
foreign-born black	NA		-0.867	0.410 *
US black	NA		-0.777	0.178 ***
AIAN	NA		1.336	3.125
foreign-born API	NA		-0.677	0.175 ***
US API	NA		-0.416	0.376
Some other race	NA		-0.450	0.508
foreign-born Hispanic	NA		-0.972	0.205 ***
US Hispanic	NA		-0.427	0.202 *
Householder's age	0.005	0.008	0.005	0.008
Householder has high school degree or less	(reference)		(reference)	
Householder has some college	-0.044	0.209	-0.045	0.209
Householder has bachelor's degree	-0.055	0.217	-0.050	0.217
Householder has graduate or professional degree	-0.085	0.227	-0.078	0.227
Householder is married parent	(reference)		(reference)	
Householder is single parent	-0.169	0.161	-0.170	0.159
Logged household income	0.086	0.076	0.085	0.076
Household had negative or 0 income last year	0.782	0.939	0.775	0.948
unweighted sample size	45,293		45,293	

Significance is noted as follows: *(<0.05), **(<0.01), ***(<0.001).

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2009.

Appendix Table A. People Under 18 Years: ACS 2009

	Number
Total people under 18 years of age	74,270,902
Ever married or is the householder	92,109
Never married	74,178,793
Other than a child of the householder	8,251,318
Children of the householder	65,927,475
White monoracial ¹	34,050,860
Transracially adopted ¹	299,720
Child of interracial parents ¹	3,497,758
Dropped because of overlap	367,463
Stepchildren	2,406,146
Biological children who are nonwhite, and/or have parents who are nonwhite	24,047,650
Adopted children who are white, or are nonwhite with nonwhite parent	1,257,878

1 In descriptive sample--Tables 1 and 2.

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exp_acs2009_1yr.html.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2009.