

An Intersectional Approach to Parental Ethnic/ Racial Socialization Practices and Adolescent Academic Outcomes

Nicole A. Telfer *University of Maryland, Baltimore County*

Nicole M. Else-Quest *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

Amid ethnic/racial stratification and oppression, parents' engagement in ethnic/racial socialization (ERS) practices foster resilience and positive outcomes in youth. Research has found inconsistent effects of ERS practices on adolescent academic outcomes and has neglected the intersectionality of race/ethnicity and gender. Using an intersectional approach and longitudinal design, we explored how $N = 358$ parents' ERS practices (cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust) predicted academic outcomes among male and female Black/African American, Asian American, Latinx, and White/European American high schoolers 1 year later. Ethnic/racial group differences in ERS practices were consistent across youth gender. Our intersectional approach revealed that cultural socialization predicted Asian American boys' academic achievement and that preparation for bias predicted Black/African American boys' academic achievement. Future studies should continue to explore the gendered construction of ERS messages and how they shape academic outcomes differently across diverse samples.

Academic achievement and motivation are important correlates of adolescent economic, social, and health outcomes (Skinner et al., 2018), yet

Nicole A. Telfer, Department of Psychology; and Nicole M. Else-Quest, Department of Women's and Gender Studies

This research was funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation to Nicole M. Else-Quest (DRL 0910108/1153678). We are grateful to the PALS (Philadelphia Adolescent Life Study) families and the School District of Philadelphia for their cooperation. Any findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or the School District of Philadelphia.

Address correspondence to Nicole M. Else-Quest, Department of Women's & Gender Studies, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 135 East Cameron Avenue, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3135. Phone: (919) 962-3908. E-mail: neq@email.unc.edu.

Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, October 2022, Vol. 68, No. 4, pp. 368–400. Copyright © 2022 by Wayne State University Press, Detroit, MI 48201.

disparities place adolescents of color at a disadvantage. For example, relative to White/European American adolescents, fewer Black/African American and Latinx adolescents graduate from high school and pursue a college degree (Cooper & Sánchez, 2016). These disparities can have long-term consequences and further perpetuate ethnic/racial stratification and oppression. To foster resistance and resilience in this context, families of color use diverse parenting strategies, such as engaging in ethnic/racial socialization (ERS) practices (Hughes et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2020). ERS practices have been linked to adolescent outcomes such as higher academic achievement and motivation, as well as ethnic/racial identity development, more proactive coping, and enhanced self-efficacy (Else-Quest & Morse, 2015; Martínez-Fuentes et al., 2020; McDermott et al., 2018; Rodríguez et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2020).

Yet, most research on ERS practices and adolescent outcomes has not considered the intersectionality of race/ethnicity and gender (Wang et al., 2020). In the current study, we take an intersectional approach within a longitudinal design and focus on academic outcomes, exploring gender and ethnic/racial differences and similarities in parental ERS practices with adolescents in the United States and examining how those practices are associated with adolescents' subsequent academic achievement and motivation. Our study includes a diverse sample of Black/African American, Latinx, Asian American, and White/European American adolescents and their families in Philadelphia.

The Developmental Context for Youth of Color

Academic achievement develops within a social context that, for youth of color, involves direct and indirect experience with racism and discrimination (García Coll et al., 1996). Racial discrimination is linked to academic underachievement among adolescents of color (Limperopulos, 2015). Adolescents of color who report experiencing racial discrimination have lower self-esteem and higher depressive symptoms relative to adolescents who do not experience racial discrimination (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002), are less likely to persist when they encounter academic challenges (Neblett et al., 2006), and are less likely to view school performance as important for their future outcomes (Wong et al., 2003).

A growing body of literature identifies factors that may protect adolescents of color from the effects of racist stereotyping and discrimination (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002; Hughes et al., 2006). Likewise, Whaley (2009) proposed that instead of focusing on finding ways to reduce negative stereotypes and other social challenges that adolescents of color encounter,

researchers should focus on ethnic/racial identity development and familial practices, such as ERS, that might shape their academic outcomes. To that end, our project frames ERS practices as an adaptation by which parents promote more optimal developmental outcomes.

Ethnic/Racial Socialization Practices

Parents play a critical role in shaping their children's ethnic/racial knowledge by communicating cultural values, beliefs, and behaviors. Parents of color might use ERS to teach youth about their culture and heritage, prepare them to manage and cope with experiences with racism and prejudice, and promote skepticism or mistrust of other ethnic/racial groups (Hughes et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Hill, 2020). Several ERS practices have demonstrated implications for youths' developmental outcomes, such as their academic achievement and ethnic/racial identity development (Dotterer et al., 2009; Else-Quest & Morse, 2015; Hughes, Witherspoon, et al., 2009; Umaña-Taylor & Hill, 2020; Wang et al., 2020). Here, we focus on three ERS practices—cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust.

Cultural socialization, also known as pride development, is the practice in which parents teach their children about their history, culture, and heritage to instill ethnic/racial pride (Hughes et al., 2006). Research generally finds that cultural socialization is positively associated with academic outcomes among children and adolescents, including academic efficacy and engagement (Hughes, Witherspoon, et al., 2009) and academic achievement or performance (Grindal & Nieri, 2015). In a recent meta-analysis of 149 effect sizes, Wang and colleagues (2020) found an overall average effect size of $r = .11$ of cultural socialization on academic outcomes, with larger effects for academic motivation ($r = .17$) and school engagement ($r = .15$) and smaller effects on academic performance ($r = .04$).

Unlike cultural socialization, *preparation for bias* might prompt youth to view their ethnic/racial group less positively because it cultivates greater awareness of the negative stereotypes associated with their group (Hughes, Witherspoon, et al., 2009). Parents engage in preparation for bias practices to shape their children's awareness of discrimination and to prepare them to cope with it. While parents' preparation for bias messages can be understood as an adaptation to the developmental context of racism for youth of color, messages that emphasize racial barriers to opportunities have been linked to poorer outcomes among youth, including depressive symptoms (Daga & Raval, 2018; McHale et al., 2006). With regards to preparation for bias and academic outcomes, findings are somewhat mixed

(Banerjee et al., 2017; Marshall, 1995). With a pool of 77 effect sizes, Wang et al.'s (2020) meta-analysis found a small overall average effect of preparation for bias on academic outcomes ($r = .09$), with significant effects on academic motivation ($r = .17$) and academic performance ($r = .05$). Relative to other ethnic/racial groups, Black/African American families tend to engage in more preparation for bias with their adolescents (Else-Quest & Morse, 2015; Hughes et al., 2006), often in response to higher reported instances of racism and discrimination (Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al., 2009).

Promotion of mistrust entails parents' communication to their children that encourages distrust and skepticism of other ethnic/racial groups, specifically members of the dominant ethnic/racial group (Hughes et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Hill, 2020). These messages do not provide coping strategies but are intended to protect youth from interacting with individuals from other ethnic/racial groups who might negatively stereotype them. While parents engage in cultural socialization practices at all ages, they tend to hold off on preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust until adolescence, consistent with identity development and emerging cognitive and social capacities and demands (McHale et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2020). Like preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust does not appear to promote adolescent ethnic identity development and is also associated with poorer outcomes in youth (Atkin et al., 2019; Else-Quest & Morse, 2015; Hughes et al., 2006). With regard to academic outcomes specifically, only a handful of studies have examined the effects of promotion of mistrust, and meta-analysis reveals negligible effects on youth outcomes ($r = .03$; Wang et al., 2020).

In sum, compelling evidence links cultural socialization and preparation for bias to academic outcomes such as academic motivation, but less so to academic performance. Promotion of mistrust appears to have limited effects on academic outcomes, though research is sparse. More critically, it is unclear to what extent these negligible to small effects mask greater heterogeneity of effects within the broader population. For example, only a handful of studies have examined how any of these effects are moderated by ethnic/racial group. Wang et al.'s (2020) meta-analysis predominantly sampled studies of Black/African American, with far fewer studies of Latinx, Native American, Asian American, and mixed-race youth. That literature revealed small positive effects of ERS with Black/African American and mixed-race youth, nonsignificant effects for Latinx and Native American youth, and moderate negative effects among Asian American youth (Wang et al., 2020). In short, research on ERS may be biased toward the Black/African American family experience, in that many studies on the link between ERS and academic outcomes have focused on

Black/African American samples. Moreover, White/European American youth are largely excluded from this line of work, despite evidence that their parents engage in ERS practices (Else-Quest & Morse, 2015). Given the cultural diversity of ethnic/racial groups in the United States, and their disparate experiences with racist oppression and privilege, it is important to understand how the effects of practices such as ERS may vary across multiple ethnic/racial groups, including among White/European American youth as well as Latinx and Asian American youth.

Wang and colleagues (2020) also suggested that future studies on ERS and developmental outcomes consider theoretically important moderators, such as gender, to more fully understand the diversity of experiences of youth who receive ERS messages. Importantly, analysis of moderators such as gender and race/ethnicity may reveal greater heterogeneity in the generally negligible to small effects reported by Wang et al. In short, both of these research directions—that is, comparing diverse ethnic/racial groups and evaluating gender differences—shed light on the scarcity of research on how ERS and academic outcomes may vary at the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender. Within and across different ethnic/racial groups, it remains unclear if parents engage in ERS differently for sons compared to daughters, or if their ERS practices shape boys' and girls' academic outcomes similarly. We address these gaps in our project by examining ERS practices and academic outcomes among Black/African American, Latinx, Asian American, and White/European American adolescent boys and girls.

ERS in the context of gender role socialization. Parents are key agents in transmitting gender role expectations to adolescents and ensuring that adolescents' experiences are consistent with their gender role (Brown et al., 2009; Epstein & Ward, 2011). Thus, when parents engage in particular ERS practices, they may adapt or tailor their messages to the gender of their child (Hughes & Chen, 1997; McHale et al., 2006). While research on gender differences and similarities in ERS is sparse, it suggests subtle differences.

For example, there is some evidence that Black/African American boys are more likely than Black/African American girls to receive preparation for bias messages (Hughes et al., 2006). Black/African American parents may be motivated to prepare their sons for bias because, understanding that Black/African American men and boys are depicted and perceived as dangerous, they fear for their sons' safety (Hill, 2001). Indeed, Black/African American boys report more discrimination experiences than girls (Rivas-Drake et al., 2008). By contrast, because daughters are expected to become mothers who will eventually pass on their cultural heritage, girls may receive greater cultural socialization messages. That is, girls are more likely to be viewed as *keepers of their culture* (Gonzalez et al., 2006) and receive cultural

socialization messages promoting racial pride (Hughes et. al., 2006). In their study of Mexican, Chinese, and European adolescents, Huynh and Fuligni (2008) found that girls reported receiving more cultural socialization than boys and were also more likely to be academically motivated, yet no gender differences emerged for preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust practices. In sum, limited evidence indicates that girls may be more likely than boys to receive cultural socialization, and evidence of gender differences in preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust is equivocal.

Critically, there is a dearth of research examining how the effects of ERS practices differ for sons and daughters. In one study with a sample of African American adolescents, Brown and colleagues (2009) found that youth reports of ERS were positively linked to academic performance only for boys. Thorough and complete understanding of how parenting practices like ERS contribute to youth outcomes like academic motivation and performance requires research taking an intersectional approach by analyzing gender as well as ethnic/racial group.

Theoretical Perspectives

Two theoretical perspectives support and guide our exploration of gender and ethnic/racial differences and similarities in parents' ERS practices and youths' subsequent academic outcomes. These include the integrative model and intersectionality theory.

The integrative model. García Coll and colleagues' (1996) integrative model examines child development in ethnic/racial minority populations by exploring the roles of racism, child characteristics, the social context, and family. The integrative model highlights the importance of understanding family values on adolescents' developmental competencies within families of color. García Coll and colleagues posited that *adaptive cultures*, such as traditions and cultural legacies, might directly influence family values. ERS practices can be understood as an adaptive culture, such that, for families of color, parents help their youth cope with racism and discrimination through socialization messages that might prepare youth for these experiences and help them maintain a positive view of their ethnic/racial identity.

The integrative model also highlights social categories or position variables (e.g., race/ethnicity and gender) that can influence youths' developmental competencies and parents' ERS practices. As socially constructed variables, social categories like race/ethnicity and gender derive meaning from their historical, social, and political contexts. Thus, cultures may define gender roles differently, such that female and male roles may entail specific behaviors in one ethnic/racial group that are not gender-differentiated in another. For example, within White/European American families, girls are

socialized to be caregivers and boys are socialized to be breadwinners; by contrast, within Black/African American families, girls are socialized to be both because the Black/African American female role has always entailed breadwinning alongside caregiving (Abrams et al., 2014; Myers, 1989).

Whereas the integrative model was created for racially minoritized children, studies have suggested that it may be applicable to White/European American youth and their families (Hagerman, 2017; Spencer, 2006). That is, without decentering racially minoritized children, the integrative model may help researchers examine how being in the dominant racial position in a system of White supremacy shapes development among White/European American youth (Seaton et al., 2018). Furthermore, Seaton and colleagues (2018) noted that ERS practices are also relevant for understanding White/European American youth development, such that they can learn how to navigate a system of structural advantage and be mindful of color-blindness. For example, one study found that some White/European American parents engaged in ERS practices by teaching their children to be antiracist by creating opportunities for intergroup contact and spoke to their children about being White (Hagerman, 2017).

In sum, the integrative model calls attention to such nuances and their implications for developmental outcomes or competencies and guides our exploration of how ERS may vary among youth of different genders and ethnic/racial groups. The integrative model aligns with another theoretical perspective: intersectionality.

Intersectionality theory. Intersectionality is an approach that emerged largely within Black feminism and critical race theory, positing that individuals simultaneously occupy multiple social categories (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, and class) that are socially constructed, stratified, and interconnected (e.g., Alexander-Floyd, 2012; Collins, 2019; Combahee River Collective, 1982; Crenshaw, 1989, 1991; Hancock, 2007; May, 2015; McCall, 2005). As a critical theory, intersectionality also emphasizes the power and inequality embedded within membership in multiple social categories and on giving voice to those who are at multiple marginalized intersectional locations. Three common assumptions constitute the core of intersectionality scholarship, including recognition that (a) all individuals are characterized simultaneously by multiple interconnected social categories, dimensions, or characteristics; (b) inequality is embedded within each of these social categories; and (c) these categories are both properties of the individual (i.e., identity) as well as of the social context, and thus their significance or salience may be fluid and dynamic (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016a).

To engage intersectionality in psychology research, Cole (2009) proposed that researchers ask three questions: First, who is included within this category? Second, what role does inequality play? Third, where are

the similarities? The first question addresses within-group heterogeneity in social categories, the second question addresses how privilege and power are also associated with social categories, and the third question identifies commonality across social categories. Cole concluded that, by asking these three questions, researchers may study groups that have been overlooked in prior research, examine participants' race, gender, and other social categories, and examine both similarities and differences across groups. Importantly, an intersectional approach can reveal variations that are invisible when social categories like race/ethnicity are analyzed alone.

In their discussion of incorporating intersectionality in psychological science, Else-Quest and Hyde (2016a) noted the importance of using an intersectional approach to study privileged groups, such as White/European American families. Comparative or intercategory approaches that examine differences between privileged and disadvantaged groups (e.g., between White/European American youth and Black/African American youth) can highlight when power and privilege play a role in psychological processes or outcomes. Thus, expanding the analysis of ERS and academic outcomes among White/European American families is an important and useful direction for research that aims to understand developmental processes among ethnically/racially diverse groups of youth.

Thus, we sought to explore differences as well as similarities in ERS practices among the parents of both sons and daughters within Black/African American, Asian American, Latinx, and White/European American families. We focus on adolescent boys and girls from a sample of families diverse in race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status (SES), and parents' nativity. In doing so, we address Cole's (2009) questions and contribute to the literature on adolescent development in diverse families. That is, we can highlight within-group heterogeneity as well as between-groups similarities and examine how the power and inequality embedded within social categories are relevant to developmental competencies.

The Current Study

The current study examines the relationship between ERS practices and subsequent academic outcomes—including achievement and motivation—among male and female high schoolers from four ethnic/racial groups. Based on existing research, we hypothesized that cultural socialization would positively predict subsequent academic outcomes, but that preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust would negatively predict subsequent academic outcomes. We also examined ethnic/racial group differences in both mean levels of ERS practices and their effects and sought to deploy an intersectional approach by simultaneously incorporating analysis of gender.

We implemented an intersectional approach throughout the project by using techniques described by Else-Quest and Hyde (2016b), who proposed that intersectional approaches are appropriate in psychology research with quantitative methods. For example, the current project used stratified random sampling within neighborhood schools to facilitate between-groups comparisons among boys and girls from four major ethnic/racial groups and identify both multiplicative and additive effects among gender and ethnic/racial group, consistent with McCall's (2005) intercategory approach to intersectionality; and we interpret and frame findings with attention to power and inequality.

Method

Participants

Data for this study were collected from $N = 370$ adolescents and their parents/guardians from Waves 1 (T1: 10th grade) and 2 (T2: 11th grade) of a longitudinal study of adolescent development in diverse families (Else-Quest et al., 2013). Demographic characteristics of the sample appear in Table 1. Adolescent participants self-identified their gender and ethnic/racial group, such that the sample comprises $n = 102$ (54 male, 48 female) White/European American, $n = 99$ (57 male, 42 female) Black/African American, $n = 84$ (39 male, 45 female) Latinx, and $n = 85$ (35 male, 50 female) Asian American adolescents. Participants self-identifying from groups that were too small for meaningful quantitative comparisons (e.g., multiracial adolescents) were omitted ($n = 14$). Adolescent participants'

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample by ethnic/racial group

	White/ European American		Black/ African American		Latinx		Asian American	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Adolescent gender								
Male	54	52.9	57	57.6	39	46.4	35	41.2
Female	48	47.1	42	42.4	45	53.6	50	58.8
Adolescent country of origin								
U.S. born	76	74.5	89	89.9	78	92.9	50	58.8
Foreign born	21	20.6	7	7.1	6	7.1	33	38.8

Continued

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample by ethnic/racial group (*Continued*)

	White/ European American		Black/ African American		Latinx		Asian American	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Adolescent's native language								
English	73	71.6	92	92.9	64	76.2	28	32.9
Other	23	22.5	2	2.0	17	20.2	55	64.7
Parent country of origin								
U.S. born	70	68.6	84	84.8	42	50.0	2	2.4
Foreign born	26	25.5	10	10.1	38	45.2	77	90.6
Parent education								
<8th grade	1	1.0	0	0.0	3	3.6	12	14.1
9th–11th grade	6	5.9	10	10.1	16	19.0	5	5.9
High school graduate	23	22.5	38	38.4	23	27.4	24	28.2
Some college	31	30.4	30	30.3	24	28.6	13	15.3
College graduate	25	24.5	10	10.1	9	10.7	11	12.9
Graduate school	10	9.8	3	3.0	1	1.2	4	4.7
Prefer not to answer	0	0.0	3	3.0	4	4.8	11	12.9
Household income								
<\$20,000	14	13.7	29	29.3	28	33.3	20	23.5
\$20,000–\$50,000	38	37.3	39	39.4	33	39.3	22	25.9
>\$50,000	37	36.3	17	17.2	8	9.5	12	14.1
Prefer not to answer	7	6.9	9	9.1	11	13.1	26	30.6
Number of books in the home								
0–10	1	1.0	6	6.1	8	9.5	5	5.9
10–50	26	25.5	30	30.3	35	41.7	37	43.5
50–100	20	19.6	28	28.3	17	20.2	19	22.4
>100	49	48.0	26	26.3	23	27.4	18	21.2
Prefer not to answer	6	5.9	6	6.1	4	4.8	6	7.1
Total sample	102		99		84		85	

Note. Cases with missing data included in table; columns may not sum to total sample.

mean age at T1 was 16.20 ($SD = 0.74$) years. Additionally, 80.8% reported being born in the United States and 72.3% reported English as their native language. As noted elsewhere (e.g., Else-Quest & Morse, 2015), 89.2% of youth participated at both T1 and T2, and attrition was not significantly related to any key study variables.

The parents/guardians of $n = 358$ of the adolescents also participated in the study. These included $n = 295$ self-identified women and $n = 53$ self-identified men; $n = 10$ parents/guardians did not report their gender. In terms of their relationship to the adolescent, $n = 328$ (91.6%) were a biological or adoptive parent or a stepparent; $n = 9$ (2.5%) were a grandparent, $n = 6$ (1.7%) were an aunt/uncle, and $n = 1$ (0.3%) was a sibling; $n = 9$ (2.5%) did not report their relationship. Based on self-report data, 63.0% of the parents/guardians were employed and 27.6% were unemployed; 9.5% did not report their employment status. Regarding the annual household income, 24.6% reported earning less than \$20,000 per year, 35.7% reported earning \$20,000–\$50,000 per year, and 20% reported earning more than \$50,000 per year; 19.5% did not report their annual household income. Data on number of books in the household were also collected from parents; 5.4% reported fewer than 10, 35.6% reported 10–50, 23.3% reported 50–100, 31.4% reported more than 100, and 4.2% did not report the number of books in the household.

Although the families resided in the same neighborhoods and attended the same five schools, White/European American adolescents came from homes with significantly higher parental income and education, and a greater number of books compared to Black/African American, Latinx, and Asian American adolescents ($p < .05$). Thus, in all analyses, a composite SES variable, constructed from the mean of standardized values (z scores) for income, parental education, and number of books in the home serves as a covariate, as in previous reports from this project (Else-Quest et al., 2013). Additionally, Asian American and Latinx youth were more likely than White/European American or Black/African American youth to have foreign-born parents ($p < .05$). More specifically, among Asian American girls, all the parent/guardian participants reported being born outside the United States, whereas 86.5% of Asian American boys had parents/guardians who reported being born outside the United States. Thus, parent's nativity (i.e., U.S. born, or foreign born) is included as a covariate.

Procedures

A sample of 10th-grade students was recruited from five ethnically/racially diverse urban public high schools (i.e., schools that included $\geq 10\%$ of each of four major ethnic groups in the student population, were coeducational,

were not selective/magnet or charters, and were default schools for children in a given geographical area) in Philadelphia during the spring semester of the school year at T1. Details about the stratified random sampling technique used for sample recruitment have been described elsewhere (Else-Quest et al., 2013; Else-Quest & Morse, 2015). Parents and adolescents completed consent/assent forms and separate paper-and-pencil questionnaires by mail in the spring of 10th and 11th grade; both were compensated with a \$100 check for their participation. We obtained end-of-year grades from the School District of Philadelphia, with parental permission. The project was approved by the institutional review board at the second author's university and the School District of Philadelphia.

Measures

Parent ethnic/racial socialization practices. Parents reported their ERS practices on the Ethnic Socialization Scale (Hughes & Chen, 1997), which includes three subscales comprising 13 items answered on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). The *cultural socialization* subscale contains two items and measures parents' emphasis on ethnic history and traditions to instill pride in their youth; for example, "Taken child to cultural events for their ethnic/racial group." This subscale demonstrated adequate internal consistency in the full sample ($\alpha = .78$, $r = .64$) and within each of the four ethnic groups: White/European American, $\alpha = .79$, $r = .66$; Black/African American, $\alpha = .85$, $r = .74$; Latinx, $\alpha = .67$, $r = .50$; and Asian American, $\alpha = .71$, $r = .55$.

The *preparation for bias* subscale contains nine items and assesses parents' emphasis on coping with discrimination; for example, "Talked to child about racism." It demonstrated good internal consistency in the full sample ($\alpha = .82$) and within each of the four ethnic groups: White/European American, $\alpha = .76$; Black/African American, $\alpha = .86$; Latinx, $\alpha = .82$; and Asian American, $\alpha = .82$.

The *promotion of mistrust* subscale contains two items and measures parents' transmission of cautiousness about members of other ethnicities to their children; for example, "Told child to distrust people of other ethnic/racial groups." The subscale demonstrated good internal consistency in the full sample ($\alpha = .79$; $r = .66$). In general, it performed adequately within the four ethnic groups: White/European American, $\alpha = .81$, $r = .68$; Black/African American, $\alpha = .43$, $r = .39$; Latinx, $\alpha = .81$, $r = .68$; and Asian American, $\alpha = .83$, $r = .73$. While the internal consistency of this scale among parents of Black/African American youth was low, it is close to the cutoff of $\alpha = .50$ that is generally considered acceptable (e.g., Kehoe, 1994),

particularly with a scale with fewer than five items. Yet, because Briggs and Cheek (1986) note that an inter-item correlation of $r = .20$ to $.40$ is optimal, we chose to analyze the scale among all groups and interpret analyses of parents' transmission of promotion of mistrust messages among Black/African American youth with some caution.

Adolescent Academic Outcomes

Value of school. At T2 (spring of 11th grade), adolescents reported their academic motivation on the attitudes toward school scale, developed and used within the cross-national OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2004). This scale contains four items describing the perceived utility value of school, such as "School has taught me things which could be useful in a job," and "School has been a waste of time" (reversed). Higher values indicate greater perceived value in school. The scale demonstrated adequate internal consistency in the full sample ($\alpha = .72$) and within each of the four ethnic groups (White/European American, $\alpha = .75$; Black/African American, $\alpha = .70$; Latinx, $\alpha = .65$; and Asian American, $\alpha = .76$).

Academic achievement. Academic achievement at T2 was measured with mean year-end grades in core academic courses. The School District of Philadelphia provided year-end math, science, and English grades for 11th grade on a 0–100 scale. Before averaging across courses, grades were adjusted or weighted based on academic level or rigor, such that grades in honors courses were weighted one-half level grade and advanced placement courses were weighted by one letter grade, as reported elsewhere (Else-Quest et al., 2013).

Data Analytic Strategy

In this study, we used an intersectional approach to examine ethnic/racial group and gender differences in both mean levels of ERS practices and academic outcomes and the longitudinal effects of ERS practices on academic outcomes. To first examine gender and ethnic/racial group differences in mean levels of ERS practices at T1 (i.e., cultural socialization preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust), we conducted a 2 (gender) \times 4 (ethnic/racial group: White/European American, Black/African American, Latinx, and Asian American) multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), with SES and parent's nativity as covariates. To examine gender and ethnic/racial group differences in academic achievement and motivation at T2, we conducted two 2 (gender) \times 4 (ethnic/racial group: White/European

American, Black/African American, Latinx, Asian American) analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs), with SES and parent's nativity as covariates, on year-end grades and self-reported value of school. Given the PALS sample size, these analyses have sufficient statistical power to detect medium effect sizes of Cohen's $d = 0.30$.

To examine the link between specific parental ERS practices at T1 and subsequent adolescent academic outcomes at T2, we ran six linear hierarchical regressions. Separate models were conducted for each ERS variable (i.e., cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust) as a predictor and each academic outcome (i.e., average of year-end grades in math, English, and science; value of school) as a criterion variable. In each model, we entered the composite SES and parent's nativity at Step 1. At Step 2, the ERS variable, gender, and ethnic/racial group were entered; ethnic/racial group was dummy-coded into three variables to examine specific effects related to belonging to each of the three racially minoritized groups (i.e., Black/ African American, Latinx, and Asian American), with White/European American youth as the reference group. In Step 3, the cross-products of ERS and ethnic/racial group were entered, ERS and gender, and gender and ethnic/racial group. Finally, in Step 4, the three-way interaction between gender, ERS, and ethnic/racial group was entered. Given the PALS sample size, this analysis has sufficient statistical power to detect a medium effect size of $f^2 = 0.15$, which is slightly larger than the range of effects reported by Wang and colleagues (2020).

Results

Gender and Ethnic/Racial Group Differences in ERS Practices and Academic Outcomes

Means and standard deviations for the MANCOVA assessing group differences in ERS practices appear in Table 2. The multivariate main effect of gender was not significant, $F(3, 316) = 0.07, p = .98, \eta_p^2 = .001$, Pillai's trace = .001, indicating gender similarities. The multivariate interaction between gender and ethnic/racial group was also not significant, $F(9, 954) = 0.32, p = .97, \eta_p^2 = .003$, Pillai's trace = .009. Yet, the multivariate main effect of ethnic/racial group on ERS practices was significant, $F(9, 954) = 8.02, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .071$, Pillai's trace = .211. Follow-up univariate tests indicate significant ethnic/racial group differences in cultural socialization, $F(3, 318) = 10.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .093$. Post hoc comparisons indicated that parents of Black/African American adolescents engaged in more cultural socialization than parents of White/European American and Latinx

Table 2. Means (standard deviations) among variables by adolescent ethnic/racial group and gender

	Cultural socialization	Preparation for bias	Promotion of mistrust	Year-end grades	Value of school
Black/African American					
Girls	3.23 (0.87)	2.86 (0.76)	1.03 (0.12)	81.39 (11.50)	3.28 (0.52)
Boys	3.21 (0.78)	2.85 (0.83)	1.09 (0.33)	79.83 (14.50)	3.29 (0.60)
Latinx					
Girls	2.83 (0.70)	2.42 (0.80)	1.19 (0.49)	86.25 (12.72)	3.09 (0.43)
Boys	2.91 (0.87)	2.43 (0.66)	1.21 (0.56)	80.55 (13.77)	3.25 (0.51)
White/European American					
Girls	2.58 (0.96)	2.47 (0.62)	1.20 (0.53)	87.82 (12.49)	3.14 (0.56)
Boys	2.62 (0.89)	2.37 (0.69)	1.33 (0.60)	84.81 (13.29)	3.04 (0.65)
Asian American					
Girls	3.18 (0.83)	2.40 (0.73)	1.57 (0.89)	92.13 (10.40)	3.20 (0.50)
Boys	3.24 (0.90)	2.40 (0.79)	1.37 (0.75)	93.94 (9.36)	3.13 (0.56)

adolescents ($p < .001$); there were no significant differences in cultural socialization between Black/African American and Asian American families. Also, the univariate test of ethnic/racial group differences in preparation for bias practices was significant, $F(3, 318) = 7.62$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .067$. Post hoc comparisons indicated that Black/African American parents engaged in greater preparation for bias than White/European American, Latinx, and Asian American parents. Lastly, the univariate test of ethnic/racial group differences in promotion of mistrust practices was also significant, $F(3, 318) = 5.73$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .051$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that White/European American and Asian American parents engaged in significantly greater promotion of mistrust than Black/African American parents, and Asian American parents engaged in greater promotion of mistrust than Latinx parents. In sum, we found significant ethnic/racial group differences in ERS practices, which were consistent across genders.

Means and standard deviations for the ANCOVAs assessing group differences in academic outcomes appear in Table 2. For year-end grades, neither the main effect of gender, $F(1, 305) = 3.56$, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, nor the interaction effect, $F(3, 305) = 1.02$, $p = .38$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, were significant. However, the main effect of ethnic/racial group on achievement was significant, $F(3, 305) = 6.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Bonferroni post hoc analyses

indicate that Asian American youth earned significantly higher grades than White/European American ($p = .04$), Black/African American ($p < .001$), and Latinx ($p = .005$) youth; no other pairwise comparisons were significant. For value of school, neither of the main effects of gender, $F(1, 315) = 0.01$, $p = .91$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, and ethnic/racial group, $F(3, 315) = 1.97$, $p = .12$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, was significant, nor was the interaction effect, $F(3, 315) = 0.87$, $p = .46$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

Academic Outcomes and ERS Practices Across Ethnic/Racial Groups

Next, we examined cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust practices as unique predictors of academic achievement (i.e., year-end grades) and motivation (i.e., value of school) separately and conducted one hierarchical linear regression for each of the three ERS variables and two academic outcomes, for a total of six models. These regression results appear in Tables 3 (cultural socialization), 4 (preparation for bias), and 5 (promotion of mistrust). In Step 1 of each model, we entered parent's nativity and the composite SES as covariates. In Step 2, we entered the ERS variable, gender, and ethnic/racial group. Ethnic/racial group was dummy-coded as three dichotomous variables referencing Black/African American, Latinx, and Asian American youth, respectively. In Step 3, we entered the cross-products of ERS and the ethnic/racial group variables, ERS and gender, and gender and the race/ethnicity variables. Finally, in Step 4, we entered the three-way interactions between gender, ERS, and ethnic/racial group.

In all three models predicting academic achievement, 13.0% of the variance was explained by SES and parent's nativity. Additionally, in all three models, Step 2 (i.e., ERS practices, adolescent gender, and ethnicity) produced a significant change in R^2 , such that Black/African American race/ethnicity negatively predicted achievement and Asian American race/ethnicity positively predicted achievement, consistent with the aforementioned group differences identified by the ANCOVAs. However, in none of the models did ERS practices directly and significantly predict academic achievement, contrary to the hypotheses. Step 3 produced no significant change in R^2 , meaning that the two-way interaction terms did not account for any significant variance in academic achievement above and beyond SES, parent's nativity, or ethnic/racial group. For promotion of mistrust, Step 4 produced no significant change in R^2 , indicating no significant three-way interactions between gender, ethnic/racial group, and promotion of mistrust. However, for cultural socialization and preparation for bias,

Table 3. Results from two hierarchical linear regression models: cultural socialization (CS) practices predicting academic achievement and motivation across gender and ethnic/racial group

	Year-end grades					Value of school				
	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1				.13	.13***				.00	.00
Nativity	-8.94	1.15	-.33***			-0.01	0.07	-.01		
SES	4.72	1.59	.23***			0.01	0.05	.02		
Step 2				.20	.07***				.02	.02
CS	0.46	0.92	.03			-0.02	0.04	-.03		
Male	-3.95	1.52	-.15*			-0.01	0.06	-.01		
Black/Af. Am.	-4.75	2.28	-.15*			0.23	0.09	.18*		
Latinx	-4.51	2.35	-.14			0.09	0.10	.07		
Asian Am.	3.29	2.56	.11			0.06	0.11	.05		
Step 3				.21	.02				.03	.02
CS x Male	2.14	1.87	.12			0.05	0.08	.13		
CS x Black/Af. Am.	2.78	2.55	.30			0.05	0.10	.13		
CS x Latinx	3.16	2.80	.29			0.14	0.11	.31		
CS x Asian Am.	0.08	2.45	.01			0.11	0.10	.28		
Male x Black/Af. Am.	0.55	4.30	.01			0.08	0.18	.05		
Male x Latinx	0.31	4.51	.01			0.25	0.18	.13		
Male x Asian Am.	3.78	4.15	.09			0.02	0.19	.01		

Step 4		.24	.03*	-.023	0.21	-.48	.05	.01
CS × Male × Black/Af. Am.	5.46	3.66	.47	-0.23	0.21	-.48	.05	.01
CS × Male × Latinx	2.26	4.41	.15	0.07	0.22	.11		
CS × Male × Asian Am.	8.36	3.39	.68**	0.18	0.21	.31		

Note. Nativity is coded 0 (*parent born outside the U.S.*) and 1 (*parent born in the U.S.*). For analyses with year-end grades, listwise $n = 251$; for analyses with value of school, listwise $n = 325$.

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

Table 4. Results from two hierarchical linear regression models: preparation for bias (Pfb) practices predicting academic achievement and motivation across gender and ethnic/racial group

	Year-end grades						Value of school					
	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	
Step 1				.13	.13***					.00	.00	
Nativity ^a	-8.84	1.59	-.33***			-0.01	0.07	-.01				
SES	4.72	1.22	.23***			0.01	0.05	.02				
Step 2				.20	.07***					.02	.02	
Pfb	0.94	1.03	.05			-0.01	0.04	-.02				
Male	-3.89	1.52	-.14**			-0.01	0.06	-.01				
Black/Af. Am.	-4.88	2.24	-.16*			0.22	0.09	.17*				
Latinx	-4.43	2.33	-.13			0.09	0.10	.06				
Asian Am.	3.43	2.50	.11			0.06	0.11	.04				
Step 3				.21	.01					.03	.02	
Pfb × Male	2.21	1.88	.13			0.04	0.09	.10				
Pfb × Black/Af. Am.	0.97	3.10	.10			0.04	0.12	.09				
Pfb × Latinx	-.80	3.29	-.06			0.15	0.13	.29				
Pfb × Asian Am.	-1.67	3.12	-.14			-0.01	0.13	-.02				
Male × Black/Af. Am.	0.42	4.31	.01			0.10	0.18	.06				
Male × Latinx	0.49	4.51	.01			0.27	0.18	.15				
Male × Asian Am.	3.61	4.17	.09			0.05	0.18	.03				

Step 4										
PfB × Male × Black/ Af. Am.	10.72	3.80	.82***	.24	.02**	-0.35	0.25	-0.65	.05	.01
PfB × Male × Latinx	-6.30	4.65	-.34			0.32	0.27	.45		
PfB × Male × Asian Am.	1.70	3.78	.10			0.04	0.27	.05		

Note. Nativity is coded 0 (*parent born outside the U.S.*) and 1 (*parent born in the U.S.*). For analyses with year-end grades, listwise $n = 265$; for analyses with value of school, listwise $n = 325$.

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

Table 5. Results from two hierarchical linear regression models: promotion of mistrust (PoM) practices predicting academic achievement and motivation across gender and ethnic/racial group

	Year-end grades						Value of school					
	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	R ²	SE B	B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	
Step 1				.13	.13***					.00	.00	
Nativity	-8.84	1.59	-.33***				0.07	-0.01	-.01			
SES	4.72	1.22	.23***				0.05	0.02	.03			
Step 2				.20	.06***					.02	.02	
PoM	-0.10	1.20	-.01				0.05	0.06	.07			
Male	-3.95	1.52	-.01*				0.01	0.00	.00			
Black/Af. Am.	-4.43	2.21	-.14*				0.09	0.24	.18*			
Latinx	-4.36	2.34	-.13				0.10	0.11	.08			
Asian Am.	3.58	2.51	.12				0.11	0.06	.05			
Step 3				.21	.02					.04	.01	
PoM x Male	3.85	2.46	.22				0.11	0.10	.12			
PoM x Black/Af. Am.	-0.25	4.79	-.10				0.22	-0.27	-.24			
PoM x Latinx	-2.29	3.70	-.10				0.17	0.02	.02			
PoM x Asian Am.	-3.30	2.86	-.19				0.13	-0.02	-.03			
Male x Black/Af. Am.	0.85	4.31	.02				0.18	0.14	.09			
Male x Latinx	0.86	4.51	.02				0.18	0.25	.13			
Male x Asian Am.	3.28	4.17	.08				0.19	0.03	.01			

Step 4		.22	.01	.04	.00
PoM × Male × Black/ Af. Am.	-10.63	9.59	-.32	0.30	0.44
PoM × Male × Latinx	-0.98	7.40	-.03	-0.06	0.34
PoM × Male × Asian Am.	3.44	5.79	.13	-0.08	0.27

Note. Nativity is coded 0 (*parent born outside the U.S.*) and 1 (*parent born in the U.S.*). For analyses with year-end grades, listwise $n = 251$; for analyses with value of school, listwise $n = 325$.

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

Step 4 produced a significant change in R^2 , indicating significant three-way interactions between gender, ERS, and ethnic/racial group. The three-way interaction effects for cultural socialization were probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2018), which revealed that cultural socialization predicted higher grades for Asian American boys ($B = 5.93$, $SE = 2.05$, $p = .004$) but not for Asian American girls ($B = -1.39$, $SE = 1.96$, $p = .16$). The three-way interaction effects for preparation for bias were also probed using PROCESS, which revealed that preparation for bias predicted higher grades for Black/African American boys ($B = 7.07$, $SE = 2.42$, $p = .004$) but not for Black/African American girls ($B = -4.88$, $SE = 2.87$, $p = .09$).

In contrast to the models predicting academic achievement, no significant proportion of variance in adolescents' valuing of school was explained by parents' nativity, SES, ERS practices, or gender. However, in Step 2 of the models predicting value of school, Black/African American race/ethnicity accounted for a significant proportion of variance, consistent with the aforementioned ANCOVA results. Neither Step 3 nor Step 4 produced a significant change in R^2 , indicating that none of the interaction terms predicted adolescents' valuing of school.

Discussion

With this longitudinal project, we sought to apply an intersectional lens and examine ethnic/racial group and gender differences in ERS practices and their link to subsequent adolescent academic outcomes. Results revealed a pattern of differences between ethnic/racial groups in mean levels of ERS. For example, parents of Black/African American adolescents reported the greatest preparation for bias and cultural socialization, a finding that is consistent with previous reports (e.g., Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes et al., 2006).

In addition, parents of White/European American adolescents and Asian American adolescents reported the greatest promotion of mistrust. Among parents of White/European American youth, greater engagement in promotion of mistrust might be attributed, in part, to the sociocultural setting of Philadelphia. That is, adolescent participants were recruited from five ethnically/racially diverse schools in Philadelphia, none of which was predominantly White. This finding is consistent with the literature indicating that, when there is a greater proportion of youth of color at a child's school, the likelihood of ERS messages among White/European American families increases (Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al., 2009). However, when White/European American parents caution their youth about interacting with youth of color, this may contribute to the racist biases and prejudices

that White/European American youth develop. Scott and colleagues (2020) recommended that, instead of promoting distrust of racially minoritized groups, White/European American parents (a) call out racism in the environment, (b) teach about the history of race relations, and (c) name race (e.g., label skin color when reading books). These recommendations are similar to “color-conscious” messages (Zucker & Peterson, 2018).

The greater promotion of mistrust messages from parents of Asian American adolescents may stem from many of them being born outside the United States. That is, they may have felt suspicious of American culture and thus preferred for their children to engage primarily in within-group relations. Prior studies have found that Asian American families are more likely to expose their children to their own cultural heritage than to the mainstream culture (Daga & Raval, 2018) and that Asian American youth receive high frequencies of promotion of mistrust messages containing warnings from parents about other ethnic/racial groups (Atkin et al., 2019). For Asian American youth, ERS practices are an important mechanism that can influence their ethnic and cultural identities, which are integral to acculturation (Woo et al., 2020).

Applying an intersectional lens to ERS practices, we found no significant gender differences among Black/African American, White/European American, Latinx, or Asian American youth. While this finding could indicate that parents engaged in similar ERS practices and provided similar socialization messages to their sons and daughters, regardless of ethnic/racial group, there are also alternative explanations. For example, it may also be that some social identities of adolescents and their families were more salient than other identities when completing the survey or that the ERS scale did not tap into unique intersectional phenomena. Also, the items on the ERS scale are usually attributed to one’s ethnic/racial background and not to gender; thus, parents in this sample may have answered these questions with heightened focus on race/ethnicity. Finally, the Ethnic Socialization Scale (Hughes & Chen, 1997) may not include practices that are gendered. Yet, teaching a daughter, but not a son, how to prepare foods reflecting one’s ethnic/racial group is clearly a practice of cultural socialization. Measures that tap into gendered ethnic/racial socialization could be developed with a mixed-methods approach in future work. Likewise, signaling additional opportunities for intersectional approaches to ERS, Umaña-Taylor and Hill (2020) noted a lack of research on how gender role socialization might function in combination with ERS.

In addition, an intersectional approach includes exploring other social categories beyond race/ethnicity and gender, such as SES and nativity. Findings from the current study indicated that parent’s SES and

nativity might be strong predictors of academic achievement outcomes, without accounting for ERS practices, gender, and ethnic/racial background. Exploring those social categories in greater depth was beyond the scope of this article, however.

Expanding our intersectional approach to the link between ERS practices and subsequent academic achievement, we examined whether that link was moderated by gender and ethnic/racial group. We found a significant three-way interaction between preparation for bias, gender, and ethnic/racial group on academic achievement, such that, for Black/African American boys only, preparation for bias predicted higher academic achievement 1 year later. This finding echoes a previous report that preparation for bias and grade-point average (GPA) were positively correlated only for African American boys (Friend et al., 2011). We also found that the link between cultural socialization and subsequent year-end grades was moderated by gender and ethnic/racial group, such that cultural socialization significantly and positively predicted higher achievement for Asian American boys only. By contrast, among Latinx and White/European American families, ERS practices were not linked to subsequent achievement, regardless of gender. While we cannot make *casual* inferences from our results, these findings suggest that ERS practices may be differentially supportive of academic achievement for some groups of youth or in some contexts. Follow-up research should explore which aspects of cultural socialization messages are especially important for different groups.

Finally, we found no significant links between ERS practices and value of school, regardless of gender or ethnic/racial group. Previous meta-analytic findings (Wang et al., 2020). have revealed significant but very small effects that we did not replicate with the PALS sample. Nonetheless, other motivational aspects of academic outcomes should continue to be explored in this line of work to more comprehensively understand when and how ERS matters for an array of developmental outcomes.

Strengths and Limitations

The current study has many strengths, including its diverse sample representation of adolescent boys and girls and their parents from across four ethnic/racial groups in the United States. Nonetheless, although our sample is very diverse in terms of ethnicity, it is not sufficiently large to identify subtle patterns of small gender differences within ethnic/racial groups or to examine subcultural variations or within-group differences in ethnic/racial groups (e.g., Chinese vs. Vietnamese families). Across the four ethnic/racial groups represented, there were many first- and second-generation

American families included. Specifically, many Asian American and Latinx youth had parents born outside of the United States, which also contributed to the intersectional design of this study and reflected the geographical context of the study. While the role of parent's nativity and SES was not the focus of the current study, these variables explained a unique proportion of variance in youth's academic achievement beyond that explained by ERS practices, gender, and race/ethnicity, and highlights the importance of understanding immigration status and SES factors on youth's academic achievement.

Another important strength of the current study is its longitudinal design, which highlights the developmental significance of parent behaviors in youth development. While our study design cannot make causal claims, the longitudinal design enables the examination of parents' reports of ERS practices at 10th grade and youths' academic outcomes at 11th grade. Thus, in analyzing parent reports, adolescent reports, and school district data, the study also avoids mono-method bias. Although our project used a validated measure of ERS, the promotion of mistrust subscale of the Ethnic Socialization Scale (Hughes & Chen, 1997) did not perform as well with parents of African American youth as it did with parents of youth from other ethnic/racial groups. Finally, gender was collected as a self-identified single binary measure (i.e., female, male) at sample recruitment in 2009. While that measurement strategy facilitated group comparisons, it did not allow for identification of adolescents who did not identify as exclusively female or male.

In addition, we acknowledge that cultural socialization, promotion of mistrust, and preparation for bias, which are not highly intercorrelated in this sample (Else-Quest & Morse, 2015), do not operate in isolation. Past research reveals the differential effects of these three ERS practices (e.g., Wang et al., 2020), yet a more complex analytic model could shed light on how these practices interact, perhaps mitigating or exacerbating their effects. In the current study, we were unable to address that question with sufficient statistical power to also analyze the intersectionality of race/ethnicity and gender.

Future Directions

Findings from the current study affirm that ERS practices are important and salient in many families across diverse ethnic/racial groups in the United States. Yet, the link between ERS practices and academic outcomes among adolescents remains unclear. Examining adolescent's grades in core classes and their self-reported valuing of school cannot fully explain or capture their

academic achievement and motivation or school experiences. Thus, future studies might examine academic functioning, which includes affective, behavioral, and cognitive components, among adolescents. For example, Dotterer and colleagues (2009) examined racial socialization and school engagement among African American adolescents. The authors measured adolescent's school self-esteem, school bonding, and GPA as indicators of school engagement and found that cultural socialization was significantly and positively related to school bonding for African American boys. They also found that adolescents who received more preparation for bias from their parents reported greater school self-esteem. Thus, examining academic functioning among adolescents across ethnic/racial groups might produce meaningful findings when considering the role of ERS in adolescent outcomes.

We found a significant three-way interaction between gender, cultural socialization, and Asian American race/ethnicity, such that cultural socialization was associated with higher grades for Asian American boys. This may indicate a gendered pattern in the effects of ERS, such that cultural socialization had different effects for boys and girls. However, because all of the parents of the Asian American girls in the study were born outside of the United States, there is a potential confounding of gender and nativity effects. Thus, acculturation may have also played a role in parents' ERS in that different patterns of acculturation have different effects on youth's academic achievement even without the influence of other mechanisms (e.g., ERS). For example, Fang (2020) found that integration was positively correlated with youth's academic achievement. While examining the role of acculturation was beyond the scope of the current study, future studies should examine the role of acculturation in adolescent's academic achievement and in parent's ERS practices.

We analyzed ERS practices as reported by parents. However, as with any socialization practice, youth may not recognize or receive messages about cultural socialization, promotion of mistrust, and preparation for bias as intended by parents. Stevenson and colleagues (2002) developed the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization (TERS) scale to capture youth reports of ERS experiences, reporting that adolescents might interpret parent's racial socialization messages based on their own interactions with members from other ethnic/racial groups and not their parent's interactions or experiences. These interpretations, in turn, may have implications for youth's academic outcomes. For example, one study of Black/African American and White/European American early adolescents' reports of received ERS found that their academic outcomes were positively predicted by cultural socialization but negatively predicted by preparation for bias (Hughes, Witherspoon, et al., 2009).

Conclusions

Prior studies have concluded that multiple factors contribute to the academic achievement and success of youth, such as parent's ethnic/racial socialization practices (Grindal & Nieri, 2015; Hughes et al., 2006). Yet, contrary to previous findings, the current study generally found no significant relation between parent's ERS and adolescent's academic outcomes, with one exception. ERS messages are intended to increase youths' self-esteem and protect them from racial bias and discrimination (Atkin et al., 2019; Seaton et al., 2018), and these messages can vary by ethnic/racial group, as found in the current study. ERS messages might also vary by gender, such that boys are more likely to receive preparation for bias and barrier messages, whereas girls are more likely to receive cultural socialization and pride messages (Hughes et al., 2006). In adopting an intersectional approach and considering gender in these practices across ethnic/racial groups, we are hopeful that future research will continue to explore intersectionality in developmental contexts and the possibility of gendered ERS practices.

References

- Abrams, J. A., Maxwell, M., Pope, M., & Belgrave, F. Z. (2014). Carrying the world with the grace of a lady and the grit of a warrior: Deepening our understanding of the "Strong Black Woman" schema. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 38*, 503–518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684314541418>
- Alexander-Floyd, N. G. (2012). Disappearing acts: Reclaiming intersectionality in the social sciences in a post-black feminist era. *Feminist Formations, 24*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2012.0003>
- Atkin, A. L., Yoo, H. C., & Yeh, C. J. (2019). What types of racial messages protect Asian American adolescents from discrimination? A latent interaction model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 66*, 247–254. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000297>
- Banerjee, M., Rivas-Drake, D., & Smalls-Glover, C. (2017). Racial-ethnic socialization and achievement: The mediating role of academic engagement. *Journal of Black Psychology, 43*, 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798416687705>
- Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of Personality, 54*, 106–148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1986.tb00391.x>
- Brown, T. L., Linver, M. R., Evans, M., & DeGennaro, D. (2009). African American parents' racial and ethnic socialization and adolescent academic grades: Teasing out the role of gender. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*, 214–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9362-z>

- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*, 170–180. <https://doi/10.1037/a0014564>
- Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Combahee River Collective. (1982). A Black feminist statement. In G. T. Hull, P. B. Scott, & B. Smith (Eds.), *All the women are White, all the Blacks are men, but some of us are brave* (pp. 13–22). The Feminist Press.
- Constantine, M. G., & Blackmon, S. M. (2002). Black adolescents' racial socialization experiences: Their relations to home, school, and peer self-esteem. *Journal of Black Studies, 32*, 322–335. <https://doi/10.1177/002193470203200303>
- Cooper, A. C., & Sánchez, B. (2016). The roles of racial discrimination, cultural mistrust, and gender in Latina/o youth's school attitudes and academic achievement. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 26*, 1036–1047. <https://doi/10.1111/jora.12263>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, Issue 1, Article 8, 139. <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*, 1241–1299. <https://doi/10.2307/1229039>
- Daga, S. S., & Raval, V. V. (2018). Ethnic–racial socialization, model minority experience, and psychological functioning among south Asian American emerging adults: A preliminary mixed-methods study. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 9*, 17–31. <https://doi/10.1037/aap0000108>
- Dotterer, A. M., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2009). Sociocultural factors and school engagement among African American youth: The roles of racial discrimination, racial socialization, and ethnic identity. *Applied Developmental Science, 13*, 61–73. <https://doi/10.1080/10888690902801442>
- Else-Quest, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2016a). Intersectionality in quantitative research: I. Theoretical and epistemological issues. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*, 155–170. <https://doi/10.1177/0361684316629797>
- Else-Quest, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2016b). Intersectionality in quantitative psychological research: II. Methods & techniques. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*, 319–336. <https://doi/10.1177/0361684316647953>
- Else-Quest, N. M., Mineo, C. C., & Higgins, A. (2013). Math and science attitudes and achievement at the intersection of gender and ethnicity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 293–309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684313480694>
- Else-Quest, N. M., & Morse, E. (2015). Ethnic variations in parental ethnic socialization and adolescent ethnic identity: A longitudinal study. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21*, 54–64. <https://doi/10.1037/a0037820>

- Epstein, M., & Ward, L. M. (2011). Exploring parent-adolescent communication about gender: Results from adolescent and emerging adult samples. *Sex Roles, 65*, 108–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9975-7>
- Fang, L. (2020). Acculturation and academic achievement of rural to urban migrant youth: The role of school satisfaction and family closeness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 74*, 149–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.11.006>
- Friend, C. A., Hunter, A. G., & Fletcher, A. C. (2011). Parental racial socialization and the academic achievement of African American children: A cultural-ecological approach. *Journal of African American Studies, 15*, 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-010-9124-3>
- García Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H., & Garcia, H. V. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development, 67*, 1891–1914. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131600>
- Gonzalez, A. G., Umana-Taylor, A. J., & Bamaca, M. Y. (2006). Familial ethnic socialization among adolescents of Latino and European descent: Do Latina mothers exert the most influence? *Journal of Family Issues, 27*, 184–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X05279987>
- Grindal, M., & Nieri, T. (2015). An examination of ethnic identity and academic performance: Assessing the multidimensional role of parental ethnic-racial socialization among a sample of Latino adolescents. *Race and Social Problems, 7*, 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-015-9154-5>
- Hagerman, M. A. (2017). White racial socialization: Progressive fathers on raising “antiracist” children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 79*, 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12325>
- Hancock, A. M. (2007). Intersectionality as a normative and empirical paradigm. *Politics & Gender, 3*, 248–254. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X07000062>
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis*. Guilford Press.
- Hill, S. (2001). Class, race, and gender dimensions of child rearing in African American families. *Journal of Black Studies, 31*, 494–508. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002193470103100407>
- Hughes, D., & Chen, L. (1997). When and what parents tell children about race: An examination of race-related socialization among African American families. *Applied Developmental Science, 1*, 200–214. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0104_4
- Hughes, D., Hagelskamp, C., Way, N., & Foust, M. D. (2009). The role of mothers’ and adolescents’ perceptions of ethnic-racial socialization in shaping ethnic-racial identity among early adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*, 605–626. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9399-7>

- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology, 42*, 747–770. <https://doi/10.1037/0012-1649.42.5.747>
- Hughes, D., Witherspoon, D., Rivas-Drake, D., & West-Bey, N. (2009). Received ethnic-racial socialization messages and youths' academic and behavioral outcomes: Examining the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*, 112–124. <https://doi/10.1037/a0015509>
- Huynh, V. W., & Fuligni, A. J. (2008). Ethnic socialization and the academic adjustment of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 44*, 1202–1208. <https://doi/10.1037/0012-1649.44.4.1202>
- Kehoe, J. (1994). Basic item analysis for multiple-choice tests. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 4*, Article 10. <https://doi/10.7275/07zg-h235>
- Limperopulos, N. (2015). Our forgotten sons: The underachievement of boys of color in America's urban centers. In M. K. Esposito & A. H. Normore (Eds.), *Inclusive practices and social justice leadership for special populations in urban settings: A moral imperative* (pp. 165–187). IAP (Information Age Publishing).
- Marshall, S. (1995). Ethnic socialization of African American children: Implications for parenting, identity development and academic achievement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24*, 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537187>
- Martinez-Fuentes, S., Jager, J., & Umaña-Taylor, A. (2020). The mediation process between Latino youths' family ethnic socialization, ethnic-racial identity, and academic engagement: Moderation by ethnic-racial discrimination? *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 27*, 296–306. <https://doi/10.1037/cdp0000349>
- May, V. M. (2015). *Pursuing intersectionality, unsettling dominant imaginaries*. Routledge.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*, 1771–1800. <https://doi/10.1086/426800>
- McDermott, E. R., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Martinez-Fuentes, S. (2018). Family ethnic socialization predicts better academic outcomes via proactive coping with discrimination and increased self-efficacy. *Journal of Adolescence, 65*, 189–195. <https://doi/10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.03.011>
- McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., Kim, J. Y., Burton, L. M., Davis, K. D., Dotterer, A. M., & Swanson, D. P. (2006). Mothers' and fathers' racial socialization in African American families: Implications for youth. *Child Development, 77*, 1387–1402. <https://doi/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00942.x>

- Myers, L. W. (1989). Early gender role socialization among Black women: Affective or consequential? *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, *13*, 173–178.
- Neblett, E. W., Phillip, C. L., Cogburn, C. D., & Sellers, R. M. (2006). African American adolescents' discrimination experiences and academic achievement: Racial socialization as a cultural compensatory and protective factor. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *32*, 199–218. <https://doi/10.1177/0095798406287072>
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2004). *Learning for tomorrow's world: First results from PISA 2003*. Author.
- Rivas-Drake, D., Hughes, D., & Way, N. (2008). A closer look at peer discrimination, ethnic identity, and psychological well-being among urban Chinese American sixth graders. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*, 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9227-x>
- Rodriguez, J., Umaña-Taylor, A., Smith, E. P., & Johnson, D. J. (2009). Cultural processes in parenting and youth outcomes: Examining a model of racial-ethnic socialization and identity in diverse populations. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *15*, 106–111. <https://doi/10.1037/a0015510>
- Scott, K. E., Shutts, K., & Devine, P. G. (2020). Parents' role in addressing children's racial bias: The case of speculation without evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*, 1178–1186. <https://doi/10.1177/1745691620927702>
- Seaton, E. K., Gee, G. C., Neblett, E., & Spanierman, L. (2018). New directions for racial discrimination research as inspired by the integrative model. *American Psychologist*, *73*, 768–780. <https://doi/10.1037/amp0000315>
- Skinner, O. D., McHale, S. M., Wood, D., & Telfer, N. A. (2018). Gender-typed personality qualities and African American youth's school functioning. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *48*, 680–691. <https://doi/10.1007/s10964-018-0919-1>
- Spencer, M. B. (2006). Revisiting the 1990 special issue on minority children: An editorial perspective 15 years later. *Child Development*, *77*, 1149–1154. <https://doi/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00925.x>
- Stevenson, H. C., Cameron, R., Herrero-Taylor, T., & Davis, G. Y. (2002). Development of the teenager experience of racial socialization scale: Correlates of race-related socialization frequency from the perspective of Black youth. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *28*, 84–106. <https://doi/10.1177/0095798402028002002>
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Hill, N. E. (2020). Ethnic–racial socialization in the family: A decade's advance on precursors and outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *82*, 244–271. <https://doi/10.1111/jomf.12622>
- Wang, M.-T., Smith, L. V., Miller-Cotto, D., & Huguley, J. P. (2020). Parental ethnic-racial socialization and children of color's academic success: A meta-analytic review. *Child Development*, *91*, e528–e544. <https://doi/10.1111/cdev.13254>

- Whaley, A. L. (2009). Stereotype threat paradigm in search of a phenomenon: A comment on Kellow and Jones's (2008) study. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 35, 485–494. <https://doi/10.1177/0095798408329986>
- Wong, C., Eccles, J., & Sameroff, A. (2003). The influence of ethnic discrimination and ethnic identification on African American adolescents' school and socioemotional adjustment. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 119–1232. <https://doi/10.1111/1467-6494.7106012>
- Woo, B., Maglalang, D. D., Ko, S., Park, M., Choi, Y., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2020). Racial discrimination, ethnic-racial socialization, and cultural identities among Asian American youths. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 26, 447–459. <https://doi/10.1037/cdp0000327>
- Zucker, J. K., & Patterson, M. M. (2018). Racial socialization practices among White American parents: Relations to racial attitudes, racial identity, and school diversity. *Journal of Family Issues*, 39, 3903–3930. <https://doi/10.1177/0192513X18800766>