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The United States continues to progress toward becoming a nation where individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds feel proud of their heritage and accepted by others. Nevertheless, there are still systemic pressures where individuals feel a sense of exclusion and struggle to assimilate to the dominant culture. African American youth face these pressures as they develop and as their encounters with individuals of different backgrounds increase.

Positive ethnic-racial identity is thought to be a protective element in the development of Black youth, giving them a feeling of belonging and protecting them from stigmas created by outside groups. Through positive ethnic-racial identity, Black youth become proud of their heritage and learn to internalize the positive aspects of being Black. Positive ethnic-racial identity can provide youth with a sense of belonging and acceptance by others of the same race.

Identity development is influenced by friends, family, and close acquaintances, as well as by media and the cultural contexts. Parents play a particularly important role in telling their children about race (Derlan & Umaña-Taylor, 2015). Over the past three decades, scholarly work has emphasized the importance of ethnic-racial socialization and the identity development of Black youth has placed much of its attention on examining and discovering potential developmental outcomes of ethnic-racial identity for adolescents of color. As the number of empirical studies examining the relationship between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity has increased, there are inconsistencies in their results.

This paper presents a meta-analysis that will evaluate the current empirical literature, concerning the effect of ethnic-racial socialization (ERS) on ethnic-racial identity (ERI) among Black youth. It will both assess the magnitude of the association of ethnic-racial socialization with ethnic-racial identity, and also explore factors which mediate this relationship.

**Historical Context of Ethnic-Racial Socialization Research**
Ethnic-racial socialization is the process by which parental messages about race are transmitted to children through overt and covert methods (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Hughes & Chen, 1997). A majority of Black parents engage in racial socialization techniques with their children as a form of socio-emotional protection against racial discrimination (Hughes, 2003).

Current research in the field of psychosocial development of minority children uses the term *ethnic-racial socialization* with reference to all races and ethnicities. These racial and ethnic groups include: African Americans, Caribbeans, Asian Americans, Native Americans and Latinos. Historically, the phrase *racial socialization* was originally used by scholars to study African American parenting practices intended to increase self-esteem and help children cope with barriers that stem from racial injustices or/and discrimination (Hughes et al., 2006). In contrast, the phrase *ethnic socialization* was primarily used when studying Latino and Asian families. Research on these groups focused on teaching children how to cope with the pressures to assimilate to the dominant culture (Hughes et al., 2006). As scholars realized that these two growing bodies of research deal with very similar issues, the term *ethnic-racial socialization* (ERS) has become the dominant term to include all minority groups and to refer to a wide range of issues from assimilation through psychological and physical separation.

This important construct was developed because scholars concluded that parents of color try to teach their children how to live in a society in which they may feel estranged. In particular, the destructive societal messages of racial bias and stereotypes are to hinder healthy individual development in Black youth, such that African American children suffer from psychological problems due to isolation from the larger society based on race (Taylor, 1994).

**An Integrative Model for the Study of Developmental Competencies in Minority Children**
Garcia Coll et al. (1996) proposed an integrative conceptual model which offers insight into the way that social factors (i.e., discrimination and racism) affect the developmental competencies of minority children. This model is innovative because it focuses on the way oppression (e.g. discrimination) directly influences the development of a child of color. Within this model, Garcia Coll and colleagues specifically identify racial socialization within the family as a factor which influences the developmental competencies (e.g. social, cognition, identity) of children of color. Thus for example, African American children are more likely to credit positive characteristics to being Black than are White children, and this is attributed to ERS within the family (Brigham, 1974).

**Ethnic-Racial Socialization for Black Youth**

Some research suggests that ethnic-racial socialization— which usually refers to a positive process—yields several positive outcomes for Black youth, such as lower depressive symptoms (Bannon, McKay, Chacko, Rodriguez & Cavaleri, 2009; Dunbar et al., 2014) and greater academic achievement (Anglin & Wade, 2007; Neblett et al., 2006). In addition, studies indicate there may be gender differences in these socialization practices. Brown, Linver and Evans (2010) have shown that maternal caregivers more frequently relay ethnic socialization messages to their female adolescent children than to their male adolescent children.

Hughes and Chen’s (1997) created a theoretical framework based on interviews, with three dimensions that define the multiple ways parents communicate about race to their children through the construct of ethnic racial socialization. The first dimension, *cultural socialization*, refers to the way parents teach and promote racial heritage and history, cultural customs, and ethnic pride, to their children. For example, parents may discuss significant events in history that led to important milestones for African Americans, or they may encourage their child to attend
informative cultural events. The second dimension, *preparation for bias*, includes messages in which parents raise their children’s awareness of racial discrimination and prepare them to cope with it. Third, *promotion of mistrust*, involves parental messages aimed to promote distrust of other races and of interactions with outgroup members. Subsequently, Hughes et al. (2006) discovered a fourth dimension, *egalitarianism/silence about race*, first regarded as *mainstream socialization* (Boykin & Toms, 1985), as a strategy that encourages children to treat or make judgements about an individual based on his or her personal characteristics rather than race affiliation. This dimension also includes avoiding any discussion about race altogether.

Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor & Davis (2002) re-conceptualized Hughes et al. (2006) four original themes as five components of ethnic-racial socialization. These five components are included in the revised Teenage Racial Socialization Scale and Parental Racial Socialization Scale (TERS & PERS; Stevenson, 1994a), which assesses how often an individual receives ethnic-racial socialization messages (i.e., TERS) or how often a parent engages in racial-socialization practices (i.e., PERS). Stevenson et al. (2002) dissected *cultural socialization* into two distinct dimensions: *cultural pride reinforcement* and *cultural appreciation of legacy*. A variation of *preparation for bias* was renamed *cultural coping with antagonism*. *Promotion of mistrust* was classified as *cultural alertness to discrimination*. Finally, *egalitarianism* closely relates to *cultural endorsement of the mainstream*. This measure is used to assess race-related socialization practices for both youth and parents. This noticeable difference takes into consideration parental perspectives on racial socialization. In addition, Stevenson et al. (2002) advocate for the importance of spiritual and religious mindfulness when coping with discrimination.

**The Importance of Positive Ethnic-Racial Identity for Black Youth**
Erikson’s Theory of Psychosocial Development (1968) states that an individual goes through periods or stages of exploration and commitment to find his or her identity. During the adolescent stage, a conflict between one’s ego identity and role confusion arises. Throughout this stage, there is a psychosocial need for a sense belonging. As a result, each individual begins to explore and ideally further commits to his or her own true identity by the end of this stage. For adolescents of color, this stage involves identification and membership of a racial group. Roberts et al. (1999) conceptualizes ethnic-racial identity (ERI) in terms of two distinct components. The first is a sense of belonging and pride, along with positive feelings about one’s racial group membership. The second is the discovery, involvement and investigation of that specific racial group. Further, Rivas-Drake et al. (2014) also add that African American adolescents can have a wide spectrum of racial identities, all of which influence other dimensions of life such as positive psychosocial functioning.

The Phenomenological Variant of Ecological Systems Theory (PVEST) (Spencer, 1995), which was derived from Erikson’s Psychosocial Theory of Development (1968), strives to explain the relationship between perceptions of cultural socialization and identity development (Spencer, Fegley & Harpalani, 2003). The PVEST also claims that for children of color, social contexts drive the developmental process of racial identity (Spencer, 2006). Similarly, Hughes et al. (2006) indicate that for adolescents of color, ethnic-racial socialization is related to racial identity. Risk factors (e.g., racial discrimination) have a negative influence on Black identity, while protective factors (e.g., ethnic-racial socialization) positively influence Black identity for adolescents (Spencer, 2006). Therefore, it appears that parents’ socialization messages may play a major role in the formation of racial identity for Black adolescents.

Models of Black Ethnic-Racial Identity
A major model for conceptualizing the formation of Black identity is the Nigrescence Model which translates to “the process of becoming Black” (Cross, 1971). Cross’ (1971) original process model, which solely contained five Black identities, followed the pathway by which an individual obtains a Black sense of self. This model is commonly referred to when recalling a foundation for new models created for African American identity stages. The revised Nigrescence Model now contains four stages of sequential development, which include seven dispersed identities of African Americans (Cross, 1991). Another noticeable difference between the original and revised model is that the revised model interprets differences between group and personal identity and how one’s self-esteem is affected (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell & Fhagen-Smith, 2002). Cross (1991) himself indicates that in this model, personal identity has minimal influence on Black identity because being Black or the ideology of Blackness is a socially constructed orientation.

The Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) was created to answer questions concerning the importance and meaning of racial group membership (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley & Chavous, 1998). The model distinguishes four aspects of identity and examines the interaction among them: salience (how relevant race is to self-concept), centrality (one’s self-definition based on race), regard (one’s judgement of his or her race), and ideology (one’s opinion on how group members should act). Although salience and centrality seem similar, centrality is a stable identity. According to Sellers et al. (1998) the MMRI demonstrates that identity can be situational and stable, possess hierarchically-ordered identities, change across one’s lifespan, and finally, that an individual’s self-perception of identity is the most accurate. This model is unique in that its assumptions are testable.

Assessments of Ethnic-Racial Identity
The Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS) was created from an expanded version of the revised Nigrescence Model, in order to adequately measure constructs of the seven Black racial identities within four stages (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). The first of these stages is the pre-encounter stage, which contains two identities (assimilation and anti-Black). An individual with an assimilation identity has a “pro-American” social group membership, also referred to as a reference group orientation (RGO), while an individual with an anti-Black identity possesses self-hatred for being Black. The second stage is the encounter stage. Individuals in this stage experience events that may encourage them to re-think or reflect on their RGO. The third stage is the immersion-emersion stage, which contains two identities identified as, Intense Black Involvement and Anti-White. The final stage is internalization. The three identities in the final stage are; Black Nationalist (empowering of the Black community), Biculturalist (a focus on Black acceptance and one other cultural orientation) and Multiculturalist (a focus on two or more cultural orientations).

A second widely used assessment is the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) uses three of the MMRI dimensions (i.e., centrality, regard and ideology) to capture the unique experience of Black identity and its processes (Sellers et al., 1998). As with the MMRI, two of the three dimensions in the MIBI are composed of multiple subscales: ideology is divided into nationalist, assimilation, minority, and humanist; while regard is divided into public regard and private regard. The factor analysis using African American students found strong support for all three subscales after the regard subscale items were divided into public and private. The regard subscale increased from having weak/modest to now having strong internal consistency. Interestingly, Sellers and colleagues have found evidence for predictability of the MIBI. Specifically, the extent to which one interacts with Black and White individuals has been shown
to predict the each level of the four subscales in the *ideology* dimension (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton & Smith, 1997).

The Multi-group ethnic identity measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) was created to measure racial ethnic identities for multiple races within the U.S. The MEIM is composed of two dimensions. The first is *ethnic identity achievement*. It includes behaviors and attitudes of an ethnic identity, a positive member identity and a focus on racial ethnic traditions and customs. The second dimension is operationalized as an individual’s attitude when interacting with someone of an outside group. Phinney (1992) claims that these attitudes mediate the pathway between ethnic identity and social identity.

**Associations between Ethnic-Racial Socialization and Ethnic-Racial Identity**

As previously stated, ethnic-racial socialization has been conceptualized as a predictor of positive racial identity during adolescence and young adulthood. Hughes and Chen (1997) and Stevenson (1994b) have found evidence for the relationship between one dimension of ethnic-racial socialization (cultural socialization) and positive racial identity. These messages which focus on the promotion of cultural pride and familial history are positively related to the development of ethnic identity (DeCuir-Gunby, Martin & Cooper, 2012; Hughes, 2003; Neblett, Smalls, Ford, Nguyen & Sellers, 2009; Peck, Brodish, Malanchuk, Banerjee & Eccles, 2014).

Furthermore, Peck et al. (2014) indicated that youth self-reports of the volume of ethnic-racial socialization received serve as the most accurate predictor of cultural socialization messages’ influence on youth racial ethnic identity. Peck et al. (2014) further conclude that parent report on their ERS practices is related to youth racial ethnic identity development and is similar to their daughter’s self-report on received ERS messages. When children have little or no socialization (i.e., silence about race) from their parents about how to cope with racial
discrimination, they are at risk for internalizing stigmatized experiences about being African American (Richardson et al., 2015), although, Seaton, Yip, Morgan-Lopez, and Sellers (2012) found that adolescents’ perceptions of racial discrimination were not related to any changes in the status of youths’ racial identity.

**Moderators**

**Age.** The intensity and type of ethnic-racial socialization strategies vary depending on the youth’s cognitive ability, which is highly correlated with age (Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004). Parents accommodate their ethnic-racial socialization practices to their child’s developmental competencies (Hughes et al., 2006). In addition, McHale et al. (2006) found that mothers engaged in more racial socialization with older children. These findings may be an indication that if there is a significant association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity, age may be a defining factor which explains their relationship.

**Gender.** There are inconsistent findings related to gender as a predictor of ethnic-racial socialization. Several studies have found that gender differences in the way African American children are socialized (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Thomas & Speight, 1999). Thomas and Speight (1999) indicated that boys are more likely to receive messages about coping with racial discrimination and unfavorable stereotypes created by outside group members. However, the current results are inconsistent with Thompson, Anderson, and Bakeman (2000) and Hughes and Chen (1997), who found no significant correlation between ethnic-racial socialization and gender. This inconsistency reveals the need to thoroughly examine gender as an important predictor of ethnic-racial identity.
Assessments. In a recent meta-analysis, which examined the association between ethnic-racial identity (i.e., positive ethnic-racial affect) and adjustment, Rivas-Drake et al. (2014) identified the type of measure used by scholars to assess ethnic-racial identity as a moderator, because there could be variations in measurements. In addition, Rivas-Drake and colleagues found that the MEIM-based measures seemed to be more powerful regardless of the outcomes that are being measured. The most commonly used measure in the current meta-analysis was the MIBI and MEIM. The factor analysis conducted with the MEIM included European Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans, while the factor analysis conducted with the MIBI only included African American students. Unlike the MEIM, the MIBI contains a scale that measures public regard; the way in which they believe African Americans are perceived by outgroup members. Based on these differences and the statements made by Rivas-Drake et al. (2014), the type of ethnic-racial identity assessment utilized is an important moderator to examine.

Region. Findings from the National Survey of Black Americans revealed regional differences in ethnic-racial socialization practices (Hughes et al., 2006). Further, Thornton et al., (1990) indicated that adult Black American men reported more racial socialization practices in the Northeast region than the South. We considered the idea that the region of data collection in the included studies may be a good explanation of the association between ERS and ERI.

Method

Inclusion Criteria

A total of 23 research reports (10 unpublished and 13 published) are included in the current meta-analysis. Studies were included in the current meta-analysis if they met the following criteria: 1) the sample consisted of or included participants who self-identified as
the sample consisted of Black youth during middle childhood through young adulthood, 3) the correlations were taken from one point in time (e.g. same wave), prior to any study interventions, 4) the study contained available data to calculate effect sizes (See Figure 1 and Table 1). There were no studies that met our inclusion criteria prior to 1999 or after 2015, therefore all included studies were published between these years. There were no exclusions based on the year of publication or dissertation/thesis completion.

**Literature Search**

The initial literature search was conducted in February 2016. Studies were obtained through online databases (PsycINFO, Academic Search Premier, ERIC (EBSCO), Social Work Abstracts, Women’s Studies International, International/Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, ProQuest Dissertation & Thesis, and JSTOR). The combination of the keywords used in the database search were: “racial socialization” OR “ethnic socialization” AND “African American” OR “Black” AND “racial identity.” Additionally, reference lists of relevant articles were examined for any remaining studies that might fit our inclusion criteria.

In order to minimize publication bias, a thorough search was conducted; unpublished dissertations and theses were included. An online search of the databases ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis Global was conducted. This search resulted in 8 dissertations and 2 theses. In addition, a search was conducted for reports within three related national conferences (i.e., National Council on Family Relations, Society for Research on Child Development, and Society for Research on Adolescence).

Our literature search is illustrated following Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, and Altman’s (2009) procedures (Figure 1). A total of 240 studies were identified through online database
searches. Four additional relevant studies were added due to scholar recommendation. A full text review of 62 eligible studies were assessed after duplicates and non-pertinent studies (i.e. ineligible sample, missing data for effect sizes, incorrect predictor, qualitative, non-empirical, and longitudinal) were removed. After careful consideration, 39 studies were excluded for one or more of the following reasons: unsuitable sample characteristics, missing data, ineligible predictors, qualitative, non-empirical, or longitudinal designs without concurrent correlation reports.

**Coding Studies**

For all included studies, sample size, race or ethnicity, type of design (cross-sectional or longitudinal), study reporter (self, parent or both), subscales of ERS (i.e. cultural socialization) and ERI (i.e. racial centrality), and effect sizes were coded. To test possible moderators, five variables were also coded. Moderators included three categorical variables: type of racial identity measure used (i.e., MEIM vs. MIBI), region of data collection (northeast vs. southeast), publication status (published vs. unpublished), and two continuous variables: mean participant age and youth gender (proportion of females) (Table 3).

Effect sizes were calculated as correlations of each subscale of ethnic-racial socialization with each subscales of ethnic-racial identity for each study. Correlations from each study were dependent on the ERI and ERS subscale that the authors chose to assess (e.g., racial barrier awareness with centrality or racial barrier with private regard). Due to there being multiple correlations per study of individual subscales for ERS with individual subscales of ERI, each study’s correlations were averaged in order to obtain one correlation per study.

**Statistical Analysis**
All effect sizes (correlations between subscales of ethnic-racial socialization and subscales of ethnic racial identity) were represented using Pearson’s $r$. No included studies reported correlations using any other metric. Pearson $r$ correlations extracted from the included studies were transformed to Fisher’s $Z_r$ to create a normally distributed scale. $Z_r$ values were then transformed back to $r$ for reporting purposes (Rosenthal, 1991). Average Pearson $r$ correlations were calculated from each study that reported multiple correlations between dimensions of ethnic-racial socialization with dimensions of ethnic-racial identity, to yield one composite effect size for each study. The effect sizes per study were then weighted using the inverse variance weight general equation, $ES = \sum wES / \sum w$. Sample size served as a function for weight, for each included study using the formula, $w = n - 3$ (fixed effects only), for all bivariate correlations (Hayes, 1994). Thus, larger sample sizes carried more weight in the final results.

Significant heterogeneity was determined by $Q$, explained by $\chi^2$ with $df = k-1$ (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). Significant heterogeneity was important for the continuation of the meta-analysis. This initial test would determine whether or not there is variability of effect sizes among studies. Significance would suggest that we proceed with further analysis. If an adequate number of at least five studies with an average effect size were available for each type of study, moderation analyses were conducted (Card, 2012). To test whether any of the three categorical variables operated as a moderator of the relationship between ERS and ERI, ANOVA procedures were used. The heterogeneity of effect sizes, ($Q_{\text{total}}$) was separated into within-group sources ($Q_{\text{within}}$) and between group sources ($Q_{\text{between}} = Q_{\text{total}} - \Sigma Q_{\text{within}}$). Moderation is concluded when there is significant between-group heterogeneity (Card, 2012). To test whether either of the two continuous variables (i.e., gender and mean sample age) operated as a moderator, following Lipsey and Wilson (2001), weighted regression methods were used to regress the $Z_r$s from each
study onto the corresponding moderator. The null hypothesis in these two cases were that there is no difference in effect sizes across each continuous moderator. This regression moderation $Q_{\text{regression}}$ is also evaluated as $\chi^2$ with 1 df (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001).

**Results**

A complete set of results will be reported in four sections. First, I will report on the descriptive results of the research reports used in the present meta-analysis. Second, I will report on the overall mean effects of the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic racial identity. Third, I will examine concerns about any publication biases. Finally, I will report on four possible moderators of the associations of ethnic-racial socialization with ethnic-racial identity.

**Descriptive Characteristics**

For each of the 23 studies included in the current meta-analysis are reported in Table 1. Of the 23 studies, eight are unpublished dissertations, 2 are unpublished theses, and 13 are published journal articles. The sample sizes range from 13 to 566 with a total of 4,191 participants (Mean = 182; SD = 133). The mean participant age in the studies ranged from 9.0 to 20.7 years old, with an average of 15.1 years and a standard deviation of 1.44. The percentage of females in each study ranged from 0 to 100 with an average of 56.6 and a standard deviation of 17.41. All data collection took place in the U.S. and all of the five U.S regions were represented: Southeast (n = 9), Northeast (n = 7), Midwest (n = 4), Southwest (n = 1), West (n = 2) and Unreported (n = 2). The Southeast and Northeast were the only regions that had a sufficient number of studies (i.e. 5) to perform the moderational analysis (Card, 2012). While some studies collected data from multiple regions for their study, the studies that only collected data from one region, either the Northeast or the Southeast, were used in the current moderation analyses. The
MIBI was used by 11 studies, which was the most common form of assessing ethnic-racial identity. Eight studies used the MEIM to assess ethnic-racial identity.

**Associations of Ethnic Racial Socialization with Ethnic Racial Identity**

I hypothesized that there would be a relationship between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity. All 23 studies were used to consider the magnitude of the association of ethnic racial socialization with ethnic racial identity. The bivariate correlation of ethnic racial socialization and racial identity will be presented first (Figure 2). The test for heterogeneity show \(Q(22) = 33.66, p = .053\). Although, the test for heterogeneity did not reach statistical significance, it was exceptionally close. A random effects model was used so that we would not assume that there is one overall effect size, but a distribution of effect sizes among studies (Hedges & Vevea, 1998). The random effects model indicates \(\bar{r} = .171; 95\% \text{ CI} .13 \text{ to } .21\). Thus, there is a small, significant positive relationship between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity.

**Publication Status**

In order to assess possible publication bias, defined as the process in which journals are more likely to publish studies with statistically significant effects, a moderation was tested (Card, 2012). I hypothesized that the studies would not differ in their effect size in reference to their publication status. All 23 studies were used with a total of 4,191 participants. Of these studies, 10 were identified as unpublished (i.e., dissertations or theses) and the remaining 13 were identified as published journal articles. Mean results in Table 2 indicate published studies \(\bar{r} = .170, \bar{z}r = .172\) and unpublished studies \(\bar{r} = .184, \bar{z}r = .186\). Overall, an analysis of variance revealed that publication status did not significantly moderate \(Q(1) = 0.20, \text{ ns}\) the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity. Based on the non-significant Q,
under the null hypothesis of no moderation, the value of Q is not large enough to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we conclude that the groups do not differ in their effect sizes. There is no evidence of publication bias shown in this meta-analysis.

**Moderation Analyses**

**Type of ethnic-racial identity measure used.** Nineteen studies with a total of 3,734 participants were included in the analyses that tested whether the type of ERI measure moderated the association between ethnic racial socialization and ethnic racial identity (Table 2). This moderation included two measures that were most commonly used to assess ERI: the MIBI, used in 11 studies, and the MEIM, used in 8 studies. Because of the insufficient number of studies that used other ethnic-racial identity measures [i.e., RIAS (n = 2), CRIS (n = 1), ASBL (n = 1)], four studies were excluded from this moderation analyses. Overall, an analysis of variance indicated that the type of ethnic-racial identity instrument did not moderate the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity (Q(1) = 1.80, p = .179; MIBI: $\bar{r} = .155, \bar{Zr} = .156$; MEIM: $\bar{r} = .197, \bar{Zr} = .200$). Based on the non-significant Q, we accept that the assessment used to examine ethnic racial identity was not a significant moderator and that the groups did not differ in their effect sizes.

**Region of data collection.** Thirteen studies were used for examining region of data collection as a moderator of the link between ethnic racial socialization and ethnic racial identity. Seven studies were conducted in the Northeast and six studies were conducted in the Southeast. Overall, an analysis of variance revealed that data region (Q(1) = 1.21, p = .271; NE: $\bar{r} = .128, \bar{Zr} = .129$; SE: $\bar{r} = .174, \bar{Zr} = .176$) did not significantly moderate the association between ethnic racial socialization and ethnic racial identity (Table 2). Results indicate non-significance.
Therefore, we accept that Southeast and Northeast do not differ in their effect sizes and is not a significant moderator.

**Proportion of females.** All 23 studies were used to examine the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity, with the proportion of females in each sample as a moderator (Table 2). The proportion of female participants was used as a continuous moderator. In the current meta-analysis, the proportion of female participants was extracted from each article (n = 23), none were unreported. Overall, regression analyses indicated that the proportion of females in a sample did not significantly moderate ($Q_{(1)} = 1.244, p = .264$) the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity (Table 2). Based on the non-significant Q, the proportion of females does not uniquely predict effect size.

**Mean participant age.** All 23 studies with a combined total of 4,191 participants were used to examine the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity, with mean participant age as a moderator (Table 2). Overall, regression analyses indicated that the mean sample age did not significantly predict this association ($Q_{(1)} = .033, p = .856$). Therefore, mean participant age does not predict effect size of the overall association.

**Discussion**

Scholars have focused their efforts on trying to evaluate the importance of ethnic-racial socialization as a predictor of ethnic-racial identity in Black youth. The goal of the current study was to empirically evaluate and synthesize existing research that has examined the association between ethnic-racial socialization and Black American youth’s ethnic-racial identity. This meta-analysis was conducted in hopes of informing policy on mental health and positive Black youth development. We will first discuss the results of this meta-analysis, next, consider the strengths and difficulties conducting this meta-analysis posed, and finally, we will advise on the
future of this body of literature and where researchers and policy makers in the mental health field should continue.

The Findings of this Meta-Analysis

The first goal of this meta-analysis was to examine the inter-correlation of ethnic-racial socialization with ethnic-racial identity. This overall effect size was important to include because to date, scholars have not yet computed this average correlation nor made implications for further research on mental health for children of color or new policies on Black parenting. We found a small association between ethnic-racial socialization with ethnic-racial identity. This main finding was surprising due to its small effect because past research has shown larger significant results. The current results are consistent with Derlan and Umana-Taylor (2015) who suggested that for Black youth, familial socialization was important in facilitating a sense of belonging toward their group membership. These current findings are also consistent with Cross (1991) who stated that an African American child can be socialized in order to adopt a Black identity. Demo and Hughes (1990) did not find a significant association between ERS and ERI among Black Americans adults, which could suggest that socialization methods are less internalized over time and that there is another variable to consider that influences ERI for adults.

The second goal of this meta-analysis was to examine possible moderators of the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity. Of the four moderators (region of data collection, age, gender and ethnic-racial identity measure used) in this meta-analysis, none were found to be significant. There were no significant sources of variability between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity. This may be influenced by the small association between ERS and ERI.
Strengths and Limitations of the Current Meta-Analysis

The current meta-analysis responds to a major concern about racial socialization literature. Hughes et al. (2006) claimed that the literature on ethnic-racial socialization is new, and that the research lacked any complex methods of analysis found in other areas of developmental science. This meta-analysis uses multifaceted techniques to progress beyond any concerns; such as that this body of literature has not been accumulated to keep further research informed on effective mental health policies for Black youth and positive Black parenting practices.

Despite its strengths, this meta-analysis does have some limitations. After much examination of the methods, analysis and the conceptualization of both ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity, there is one known limitation of the current meta-analysis. The only limitation is due to a limited number of studies that focus on the multidimensional model of ethnic-racial socialization. Hughes et al. (2006) proposed that ERS is a multi-dimensional construct and called for researchers to examine the developmental implications of each ERS dimension instead of focusing on a global assessment of ERS. While we agree with Hughes et al. (2006) and recognize the importance of examining the association of each dimension of ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity, the scant number of existing studies precluded us from evaluating the association of individual ERS dimensions to ERS (Card, 2012).

Future Directions

As indicated in this meta-analysis, the association between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity is small, but statistically significant. The number of studies available to compute this effect is minimal. Hughes et al. (2006) implied that we need to continue to assess other contextual factors as moderators. More research studies on ethnic-racial socialization for
Black youth need to be conducted in order to fully understand its effects on ethnic-racial identity. The correlation between the two variables is significant but small, so other moderating variables that may be of interest need to examined, such as, the gender of parent practicing socialization techniques or socioeconomic status to help explain this relationship.

A limitation of the literature itself is a lack correlations of ethnic-racial socialization with ethnic-racial identity. Ten studies had to be excluded from this meta-analysis because the data needed to compute effect sizes were missing from the original studies (Figure 1). It is imperative that scholars properly display all pertinent data to effectively communicate their results to its readers and other researchers (American Psychological Association, 2009).

Current research shows an inconsistency in shared terminology. Although creating the coding database, we did realize that a few of the studies do compare each dimension of ethnic-racial socialization to ethnic-racial identity, there is still lack of consistency in terminology. Hughes et al. (2006) warned scholars about the difficulty this would pose for interpretation. For example, some studies may name a certain socialization practice *preparation for bias* (French & Coleman, 2013; Riina & McHale, 2012; Hughes et al., 2006), while other studies may refer to the same practice as *racial barrier awareness* (Harps, 2005) or *alertness to discrimination* (Stevenson & Arrington, 2009). This in fact makes it difficult to group together like dimensions of ethnic-racial socialization when conducting a meta-analysis. It is problematic when there are different terms are used to reference the same dimension. If the current authors group terms that are seemingly similar, this may bias results, especially when other scholars try to duplicate or conduct the same meta-analysis in the future. These definitions of constructs need to be more transparent to enable the proper grouping of terms for data analyses.
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Figure 1. Diagram of Literature Search Process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Author (Year)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Region (U.S.)</th>
<th>Age (M ± SD)</th>
<th>% Girls</th>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of Design</th>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>ERS Measure &amp; Alpha</th>
<th>RI Measure &amp; Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglin (2007)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>20.6 ± 3.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>TERS α=.88</td>
<td>CRIS α=.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (2011)</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>12.4 ± 1.04</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>RSQ-T α=.70</td>
<td>MIBI α=.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cort (2007)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17 ± 1.55</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>TERS α=.91</td>
<td>RIAS-B α=.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (2012)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Midwest, Southeast</td>
<td>15 ± 1.22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>TERS α=.91</td>
<td>MIBI α=.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derlan (2015)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>15.57 ± 1.22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self &amp; Parent</td>
<td>FESM α=.80</td>
<td>MEIM α=.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (2013)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>West (Southern California)</td>
<td>18.63 ± 1.23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94% African American; 6% African American/White</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Hughes &amp; Chen’s (1997) RS Scale; Fisher et al. (2000)</td>
<td>MEIBI α=.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harps (2005)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>15.51 ± .56</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>ARRS</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudgens (2009)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>10.9 ± .70</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Hughes &amp; Chen’s (1997) RS Scale</td>
<td>MIBI α=.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones (2003)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>SORS-A α=.82</td>
<td>MEIM α=.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller (1999)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9 ± 1.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>RSAS α=.18</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neblett (2013)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>20.73 ± 1.90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>RSQ-T α=.74</td>
<td>MIBI-S α=.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Author (Year)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Region (U.S.)</th>
<th>Age (M ± SD)</th>
<th>% Girls</th>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of Design</th>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>ERS Measure &amp; Alpha</th>
<th>RI Measure &amp; Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raines (2015)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.75 ± 1.81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>African American, 9.5% Caribbean, 6% Black/White, .9% African, 7% Other African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>SORS-A</td>
<td>MIBI-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson (2015)</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Southeast (Maryland)</td>
<td>14 ± 1.60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>PRDS</td>
<td>MIBI α=.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riina (2012)</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>12.21 ± 1.60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self, Mother &amp; Father</td>
<td>Hughes &amp; Chen’s (1997) RS Scale α=.82</td>
<td>MEIM α=.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (2003)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Southeast (Northern Alabama)</td>
<td>15.6 ± .96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>RRSI Scale α=.84</td>
<td>MIBI α=.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton (2012)</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>13 ± 1.91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Brown et al. α=.88</td>
<td>MEIM α=.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (2005)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>South &amp; West</td>
<td>14.5 ± 1.55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>TERS α=.88</td>
<td>MEIM α=.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson (2009)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>20.56 ± 8.2</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>TERS α=.92</td>
<td>MIBI-T α=.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (2000)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>16.75 ± 1.81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77% African American, 9.5% Caribbean, 6% Black/White, .9% African, 7% Other African American</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>TERS α=.92</td>
<td>RIAS α=.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Author (Year)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Region (U.S.)</th>
<th>Age (M ± SD)</th>
<th>% Girls</th>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of Design</th>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>ERS Measure &amp; Alpha</th>
<th>RI Measure &amp; Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whaley (2010)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Northeast (Brooklyn, NY)</td>
<td>14.31 ± 2.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Caribbean Decent</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>SORS-A; TERS</td>
<td>ASBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams (2013)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Midwest (Michigan)</td>
<td>12.41 ± 1.04</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>87.5% African American, 12.5% Biracial</td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>RSQ-T α=.63</td>
<td>MIBI-T-Short α=.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TERS=Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization; RSQ=Racial Socialization Questionnaire; CRIS=Cross Racial Identity Scale; MIBI=Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity; RIAS-B=Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale, FESM=Familial Ethnic Socialization Measure; ARRS=Adolescent Report of Racial Socialization Scale; MEIM=Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, RSAS=Racial Socialization of Adolescent Scale; SORS=Scale of Racial Socialization; PRDS=Proactive Responses to Discrimination Scale, RRSI=Racial-Related Socialization Influences; ASBL=Adolescent Survey of Black Life; d = dissertation; ′ = thesis
Table 2
Summary of Meta-Analytic Results of Correlations between Ethnic Racial Socialization and Ethnic Racial Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical Moderators</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Zr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERI Assessment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Data Collection (U.S.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Status</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (% Female)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Sample Age</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of Heterogeneity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Zr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship Between ERS and ERI (r)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0 3 4 5 6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0 2 2 3 7 8 9 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1 3 5 7 7 7 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Stem-and-Leaf Plot of Intercorrelations between ethnic-racial socialization and ethnic-racial identity
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