



Supplementary Information for

Conversations about Race in Black and White U.S. Families: Before and After George Floyd's Death

J. Nicky Sullivan, Jennifer L. Eberhardt, Steven O. Roberts

Correspondence to: J. Nicky Sullivan, Jennifer L. Eberhardt, & Steven O. Roberts
Emails: nsull13@stanford.edu, jleberhardt@stanford.edu, sothello@stanford.edu

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary text
Tables S1 to S8

Other Supplementary Materials for this manuscript include the following:

Data file and code can be found here: <https://osf.io/esbpk/>

Supplementary Information Text

Materials and Methods

Participants. We recruited two samples of parents, one from April 7th through April 12th and one from June 17th through June 28th. Each sample consisted of both Black parents of Black children ($n_1 = 260$, $n_2 = 190$) and White parents of White children ($n_1 = 279$, $n_2 = 234$; see Table S1 for full demographic summary). All participants were recruited via CloudResearch (formerly TurkPrime), an online crowdsourcing platform that ensured participants could not participate in both samples.

Our initial samples consisted of 777 Black adults ($n_1 = 413$, $n_2 = 364$) and 761 White adults ($n_1 = 386$, $n_2 = 375$). We excluded participants without children ($n = 25$), given our focus on parents, participants who reported having completed the survey more than once ($n = 145$), given our focus on independent samples, participants who were non-monoracial parents of non-monoracial children ($n = 168$), given our focus on monoracial Black and White parents, and parents whose oldest child was older than 18 years of age, given our focus on ongoing conversations within the household ($n = 129$). We also excluded parents who were not located in the U.S., who did not provide demographic information, or who provided at least two nonsense answers to demographic questions (e.g., answering ‘White’ when asked what their gender was; $n = 18$). We also excluded all parents who reported their political beliefs as ‘other’ given the difficulty this posed for using political beliefs as a covariate ($n = 33$) and did the same for parents or children whose gender was coded as anything other than male or female ($n = 10$). Finally, we excluded parents who gave more than one answer that was coded as off-topic to a set of three open-ended questions, which served as an attention check ($n = 47$). This left us with our final sample of 450 Black adults ($n_1 = 260$, $n_2 = 190$) and 513 White adults ($n_1 = 279$, $n_2 = 234$).

Procedure. All participants completed an online survey via Qualtrics. The survey consisted of questions about the participant and their children to determine eligibility, then a series of questions about their racial socialization practices, and finally a series of demographic measures at the end. The section on racial socialization practices was further split up into three sections, with each asking parents’ whether and how they talked with their children about a topic: first race, then racial inequality, and finally racial identity. For all questions, participants were told to answer regarding their oldest child (or their only child if they only had one).

In the section on race, all participants were asked “Do you talk about race with your oldest child?”, to which they could answer yes (coded as 1) or no (coded as 0). Participants who answered yes were then asked two more questions. The first asked about frequency of conversations (i.e., “How often do you talk with your oldest child about race?”, 1 = *Never*, 5 = *Daily*). The second was an open-ended question that asked them to recall and report on a recent conversation about race (i.e., “What did you talk about in the recent conversation about race? Please provide as much detail as possible so that we can fully understand the conversation.”). The following two sections had identical structures, except that instead of being asked about their conversations about “race” participants were asked about their conversations about “racial inequality” and then “being Black” or “being White” (e.g., “Do you talk about racial inequality with your oldest child?”). The sections were presented in this fixed order to minimize the extent to which answers in one section would bias answers in later sections, with less provocative topics

(i.e., race) being presented first. Participants also answered two additional questions after completing the racial socialization sections. One question asked parents “How worried are you that your child may be a target of racial bias?” and the other question asked “How worried are you that your child may be racially biased?”. At the end of the survey, participants completed several demographic questions that were included as covariates:

- Conservatism: Average of two questions asking about political attitudes, one regarding social issues and one regarding economic issues. Both questions were on a 7-point scale, where 1 = Very liberal, 2 = Liberal, 3 = Slightly liberal, 4 = Middle-of-the-road, 5 = Slightly conservative, 6 = Conservative, 7 = Very conservative.
- Education: Nine-point scale of the parent’s highest level of completed education, where 1 = Elementary, 2 = Some high school, 3 = High school graduate/GED, 4 = Some college, 5 = Associate/trade/technical degree, 6 = Bachelor’s degree, 7 = Some graduate school, 8 = Master’s degree, 9 = Ph.D./M.D./J.D.
- Income: Twelve-point scale of total income earned in the past year, where 1 = Less than \$10,000, 2 = \$10,000 to \$19,999, 3 = \$20,000 to \$29,999, 4 = \$30,000 to \$39,999, 5 = \$40,000 to \$49,999, 6 = \$50,000 to \$59,999, 7 = \$60,000 to \$69,999, 8 = \$70,000 to \$79,999, 9 = \$80,000 to \$89,999, 10 = \$90,000 to \$99,999, 11 = \$100,000 to \$149,999, 12 = More than \$150,000
- Subjective SES: Participants are shown a ladder and told that the top of the ladder represents people who are the best off, and the bottom of the ladder represents people who are worst off. Participants then report where they think they stand on the ladder on a ten-point scale where each point represents a rung on the ladder.

Data Coding. Responses to the open-ended question asking parents to describe a recent conversation were qualitatively coded using a theoretically driven approach that relied on prior research on racial ideology (1) and racial discussions in Black and White families (2-4). The authors reviewed the responses to come up with an initial list of themes, and then combined this with themes present in prior literature to come up with a coding system. This system was then applied to the data by a team of five research assistants, supervised by the first author. Coders were unaware of the specific topic of conversation (i.e., race, racial inequality, racial identity) but were aware of the race of the participant given that some codes were dependent on the race of the parent. For example, the response “I just let them know about the struggles of being a black man in America” would be coded as a preparation for bias message if given by a Black parent but not if given by a White parent.

For each code, two research assistants independently coded a subset of 20% of the responses to establish reliability, and discrepancies and questions were resolved via discussion between the coders and the first author. Once coders achieved reliability, one of the coders then continued and coded the remaining 80% of responses, with questions resolved via discussion between the first author and the two coders. Interrater reliabilities were very high overall, with Cohen’s kappa scores of 0.66 or higher for all codes (see Table S2). Coding was inclusive, with many responses receiving more than one code.

Data Analysis. Data was analyzed using a combination of logistic regression models (for binary responses) and linear regression models (for non-binary responses). In all analyses, the measure of interest (prevalence of conversations, frequency of conversations, parental worry, or qualitative code) was the dependent variable and child and parent age and gender were included

as covariates, as were education, political views, and subjective social status. Each model had two versions. The first version included parent race and time period as predictor variables, and the second version additionally included the interaction between parent race and time period as a predictor. If this addition of an interaction significantly improved the model the second version was used, otherwise the first version was used. Specific comparisons were also conducted to analyze by race and time period (binomial tests in the case of logistic regression models, t-tests in the case of linear regression models). For models that were collapsed across topic, mixed effects models were used with participants as random intercepts.

Table S1. Parent and child demographics. Demographics of the sample, broken down by parent race (Black or White) and time period (pre-Floyd or post-Floyd). Values are means (unless otherwise noted), with standard deviations in parentheses.

Parent race	Time	N	Sample Demographics								
			Parent age (years)	Child age (years)	Parent gender (% male)	Child gender (% male)	Number of children	Conservatism	Education	Income	Subjective SES
Black	Pre-Floyd	260	37.1(10.8)	10.2 (4.9)	40.8 (4.9)	52.7 (5.0)	1.8 (1.1)	3.5 (1.6)	4.9 (1.6)	5.7 (3.2)	5.7 (2.0)
	Post-Floyd	190	36.7(9.6)	10.3 (5.0)	37.9 (4.9)	55.3 (5.0)	2.0 (1.4)	3.3 (1.5)	5.1 (1.6)	5.9 (3.3)	5.8 (2.2)
White	Pre-Floyd	279	38.3(7.4)	11.2 (5.0)	43.0 (5.0)	58.4 (4.9)	2.2 (2.3)	4.1 (1.8)	5.9 (2.1)	7.7 (3.7)	6.4 (1.9)
	Post-Floyd	234	39.6(8.9)	10.9 (4.7)	39.3 (4.9)	55.6 (5.0)	1.9 (1.0)	4.1 (1.8)	6.0 (1.9)	8.1 (3.4)	6.3 (2.1)

Table S2. Qualitative coding scheme. List of codes used during the qualitative analysis, brief summaries of the definitions of used for each code, and Cohen’s Kappas for each code.

Code	Definition	Cohen’s Kappa
Preparation for bias	Prepares the child for race-based prejudice they may face	0.85
Colorblindness	Minimizes the importance of race, either explicitly or implicitly	0.80
Acknowledges inequality	Acknowledges the existence of present-day inequality that disadvantages people of color	0.80
Advantage	Discusses advantages that come with being a member of their racial group	0.66
Anti-bias	Tells the child not to be biased or gives advice on how not to be biased	0.80
Focus on the self	Focuses on the parent, the child, or their racial group	0.78
Racial pride	Promotes pride in the child’s culture or racial identity	0.84
Racism	Sends an explicitly negative message about another racial group	0.67
No code	Responses that received none of the above codes, mostly because they were too unclear or ambiguous	--

Table S3. Model output for rates of conversation. Model estimate broken down by topic (race, racial inequality, racial identity) with the results of an ANOVA to test for main effects.

Topic	Variable	Model estimate	ANOVA output	
		β (SE)	χ^2	p
Race	Child age	.21(.02)	102.62	<.001
	Child gender	.17(.18)	.90	.34
	Parent age	-.01(.01)	.28	.60
	Parent gender	.42(.21)	4.05	.04
	Education	.20(.06)	12.17	<.001
	Conservatism	-.09(.06)	2.23	.14
	Subjective status	.05(.05)	.91	.34
	Race	.51(.10)	28.18	<.001
	Time	.02(.09)	.06	.81
	Race x Time	-	-	-
Racial inequality	Child age	.18(.02)	113.6	<.001
	Child gender	-.07(.15)	.19	.67
	Parent age	-.01(.01)	1.46	.23
	Parent gender	.41(.16)	6.28	.01
	Education	.10(.05)	4.53	.03
	Conservatism	-.15(.05)	11.47	<.001
	Subjective status	.03(.04)	.69	.40
	Race	.38(.08)	23.16	<.001
	Time	.20(.08)	7.10	.008
	Race x Time	.21(.08)	7.91	.005
Racial identity	Child age	.16(.02)	77.48	<.001
	Child gender	-.39(.16)	6.04	.01
	Parent age	-.02(.01)	5.35	.02
	Parent gender	.58(.17)	11.97	<.001
	Education	.06(.05)	1.54	.21
	Conservatism	-.17(.05)	13.00	<.001
	Subjective status	.13(.04)	9.91	.002
	Race	.92(.09)	129.88	<.001
	Time	-.10(.08)	1.58	.21
	Race x Time	.18(.08)	5.51	.02

Note: When adding an interaction between race and time did not improve the model, the model without the interaction was used, and so there is no estimate of the race by time interaction included in the table.

Table S4. Model output for frequencies of conversation. Model estimate broken down by topic (race, racial inequality, racial identity) with the results of an ANOVA to test for main effects.

Topic	Variable	Model estimate	ANOVA output	
		β (SE)	F	p
Race	Child age	.01(.01)	1.47	.23
	Child gender	.08(.06)	1.39	.24
	Parent age	-.01(.003)	8.48	.004
	Parent gender	.21(.07)	9.56	.002
	Education	.03(.02)	2.53	.11
	Conservatism	-.05(.02)	7.33	.007
	Subjective status	.04(.02)	5.99	.01
	Race	.10(.03)	8.05	.005
	Time	.11(.03)	11.92	<.001
	Race x Time	.07(.03)	5.64	.02
Racial inequality	Child age	.001(.01)	.004	.95
	Child gender	.08(.08)	.93	.33
	Parent age	-.02(.004)	13.07	<.001
	Parent gender	.25(.08)	8.74	.003
	Education	.01(.02)	.25	.62
	Conservatism	-.07(.02)	10.34	.001
	Subjective status	.07(.02)	13.89	<.001
	Race	.10(.04)	5.83	.02
	Time	.09(.04)	5.74	.02
	Race x Time	.11(.04)	8.67	.003
Racial identity	Child age	-.001(.01)	.02	.89
	Child gender	.08(.09)	.83	.36
	Parent age	-.02(.01)	11.74	<.001
	Parent gender	.18(.09)	3.86	.05
	Education	.04(.03)	2.65	.10
	Conservatism	-.05(.03)	4.56	.03
	Subjective status	.07(.02)	10.91	.001
	Race	.23(.05)	21.26	<.001
	Time	.04(.04)	.61	.43
	Race x Time	.15(.05)	11.78	<.001

Table S5. Frequencies of qualitative codes. Codes are collapsed across conversation topic and broken down by parent race (Black or White) and time period (pre-Floyd or post-Floyd).

Code	Frequency of message (%)			
	Black		White	
	Pre-Floyd	Post-Floyd	Pre-Floyd	Post-Floyd
Preparation for bias	42.9	62.4	1.2	0.8
Colorblindness	5.9	6.3	13.8	20.9
Acknowledges inequality	24.6	40.3	3.4	11.5
Advantage	0	0	1.6	3.9
Antibias	3.9	4.8	14.0	22.2
Focus on the self	56.1	59.7	26.3	18.5
Racial pride	14.8	10.1	3.4	1.3
Racism	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
No code	23.6	16.0	54.0	49.3

Note: Values indicate the percent of conversations that received a given code. Columns sum to more than 100% because codes were not exclusive (e.g., among White parents 48.1% of antibias messages were also coded as colorblind). Percentages are collapsed across conversation topic, patterns are largely similar when broken down by topic and full analyses can be found here: <https://osf.io/esbpk/>.

Table S6. Model output for content of conversation. Model estimate broken down by topic (race, racial inequality, racial identity) with the results of an ANOVA to test for main effects.

Code	Variable	Model estimate	ANOVA output	
		B(SE)	χ^2	p
Colorblindness	Child age	-.05(.03)	3.92	.05
	Child gender	.32(.21)	2.24	.13
	Parent age	-.002(.01)	.03	.85
	Parent gender	.14(.23)	.38	.54
	Education	-.20(.07)	9.13	.003
	Conservatism	.003(.06)	.003	.96
	Subjective status	-.006(.06)	.01	.91
	Race	-.84(.12)	47.74	<.001
	Time	.22(.10)	4.76	.03
	Race x Time	-	-	-
Prep. for bias	Child age	.08(.02)	14.45	<.001
	Child gender	.14(.17)	.72	.40
	Parent age	.01(.01)	2.41	.12
	Parent gender	-.20(.17)	1.31	.25
	Education	.11(.05)	4.22	.04
	Conservatism	-.06(.05)	1.14	.29
	Subjective status	-.11(.04)	7.72	.005
	Race	2.66(.20)	177.77	<.001
	Time	.13(.19)	.47	.49
	Race x Time	.36(.19)	3.70	.05

Note: When adding an interaction between race and time did not improve the model, the model without the interaction was used, and so there is no estimate of the race by time interaction included in the table.

Table S7. Model output for parental worry. Model estimate broken down by type of worry (that child will be a target of bias and that child may be biased) with the results of an ANOVA to test for main effects.

Worry that child may...	Variable	Model estimate	ANOVA output	
		β (SE)	F	p
...be a target of racial bias	Child age	.01(.01)	1.89	.17
	Child gender	.09(.09)	1.08	.30
	Parent age	-.01(.01)	5.76	.02
	Parent gender	.10(.09)	1.24	.26
	Education	.08(.03)	9.12	.003
	Conservatism	-.04(.03)	2.46	.12
	Subjective status	-.02(.02)	1.04	.31
	Race	.74(.05)	263.72	<.001
	Time	.09(.04)	4.64	.03
	Race x Time	.12(.04)	8.38	.004
	...be racially biased	Child age	.02(.01)	2.49
Child gender		.10(.09)	1.14	.29
Parent age		-.02(.01)	13.59	<.001
Parent gender		.32(.10)	9.82	.001
Education		.10(.03)	11.00	<.001
Conservatism		-.09(.03)	9.74	.002
Subjective status		-.01(.02)	.22	.64
Race		.32(.05)	42.21	<.001
Time		.04(.05)	.91	.34
Race x Time		-	-	-

Note: When adding an interaction between race and time did not improve the model, the model without the interaction was used, and so there is no estimate of the race by time interaction included in the table.

Table S8. Parental worry as a predictor of rates and frequency of conversations. Outputs from linear mixed effect regression models of type of worry (target: worry that child will be the target of bias; perpetrator: worry that child may be biased) predicting rates and frequencies of conversation by parent race (Black or White).

Parent Race	Worry	Rate of conversation		Frequency of conversation	
		Beta	P value	Beta	P value
Black	Target	.06	< .001	.15	< .001
	Perpetrator	.02	.01	.12	< .001
White	Target	.03	.001	.11	< .001
	Perpetrator	.03	.002	.11	< .001

Note. Models are collapsed across conversation topic, patterns are largely similar when broken down by topic and full analyses can be found here: <https://osf.io/esbpk/>.

SI References

1. V. C. Plaut, K. M. Thomas, K. Hurd, C. A. Romano, Do color blindness and multiculturalism remedy or foster discrimination and racism? *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 27, 200-206, (2018).
2. D. Hughes, L. Chen, When and what parents tell children about race: An examination of race-related socialization among African American families. *Appl. Dev. Sci.* 1, 200-214, (1997).
3. B. Vittrup, Color blind or color conscious? White American mothers' approaches to racial socialization. *J. Fam. Issues.* 39, 668-692, (2018).
4. A. J. Thomas, S. K. M. Blackmon, S. K. M. The influence of the Trayvon Martin shooting on racial socialization practices of African American parents. *J. Black Psychol.* 41, 75-89, (2015).