

Supplement A

Supplemental reading list

- Benner, A. D., Wang, Y., Shen, Y., Boyle, A. E., Polk, R., & Cheng, Y.-P. (2018). Racial / ethnic discrimination and well-being during adolescence: A meta-analytic review. *American Psychologist*, 73(7), 855–883. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000204>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2002). We are all Americans!: The Latin Americanization of racial stratification in the USA. *Race and Society*, 5(1), 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.racsoc.2003.12.008>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (5thed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019). Feeling race: Theorizing the racial economy of emotions. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418816958>
- Feagin, J. (2020). *The white racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter-framing* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Hagerman, M. A. (2016). Reproducing and reworking colorblind racial ideology: Acknowledging children's agency in the white habitus. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 2(1), 58-71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649215594817>
- Hargarten, (2020). Stark racial disparities remain as police use-of-force rate rises. <https://www.startribune.com/stark-racial-disparities-remain-as-minneapolis-police-use-of-force-rate-rises-george-floyd/568966861/>
- Hagerman, M. A. (2020). *White kids: Growing up with privilege in a racially divided America*. NYU Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv12pnr4t>

THE WHITENESS PANDEMIC

- Helms, J. E. (2020). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a White person or understanding the White persons in your life*. (3rd Edition). Cognella Academic Publishing.
- Jeste, D., V., Lee, E. E., & Cacioppo, S. (2020). Battling the modern behavioral epidemic of loneliness: Suggestions for research and interventions. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 77(6), 553-554. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0027>
- Laurencin, C. T., & Walker, J. M. (2020). A Pandemic on a Pandemic: Racism and COVID-19 in Blacks. *Cell Systems* 11. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2020.07.002>
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137-152.
- Lipsitz, G. (2018). *The possessive investment in Whiteness: How White people profit from identity politics* (Twentieth anniversary ed.). Temple University Press.
- Martinot, S. (2014). On the Epidemic of Police Killings. *Social Justice*, 39, 52-75. doi: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24361622>
- McDermott, M. (2006). *Working-class white: The making and unmaking of race relations*. University of California Press.
- McIntosh, P. (2019) White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work (1988). In P. McIntosh, *On privilege fraudulence, and teaching as learning* (pp. 17-27). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351133791>
- Pahlke, E., Bigler, R. S., & Suizzo, M. A. (2012). Relations between colorblind socialization and children's racial bias: Evidence from European American mothers and their pre- school children. *Child Development*, 83(4), 1164-1179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01770.x>

THE WHITENESS PANDEMIC

- Ross, C. T. (2015). A multi-level bayesian analysis of racial bias in police shootings at the county-level in the United States, 2011–2014. *PLoS ONE*, 10(11): e0141854.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0141854
- Tatum, B. (1997). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. BasicBooks.
- Tropp, L. R., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2019). Are white women showing up for racial justice? Intergroup contact, closeness to people targeted by prejudice, and collective action. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 43(3), 335-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319840269>
- Underhill, M. R. (2018). Parenting during Ferguson: Making sense of White parents' silence. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 41(11), 1934–1951.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1375132>
- Winkler, E. N. (2012). *Learning race, learning place: Shaping racial identities and ideas in African American childhoods*. Rutgers University Press.

Supplement B

Qualitative measurement and coding manual

Open-ended Questions

1. (Survey midpoint): In the last month, how often have you used any of the previously-mentioned strategies when talking to your child about any other current events in the news, whether on TV or online? PLEASE EXPLAIN:
2. (Survey end): Is there anything we didn't ask that you think is important such as other current events that are impacting you and/or your family right now?

Coding Scheme

Content Analysis

1. *White Racial Identity Development Phase (WRID Phase; binary code 0/1)*:
Developmental maturity/sophistication in management of racial stimuli (Helms, 1995).
0 = less advanced (race obliviousness/denial/avoidance/no mention, ambivalence about race, bias against Blacks or against Whites, or awareness of racism (not described as systemic) without understanding White privilege or engaging in antiracist actions; OR
1 = more advanced (real, desired, or intellectualized antiracist actions meaning actions to promote racial equity or dismantle racism, including protesting, having conversations about racism/racial inequality/White privilege, probably explicitly mentions race/racism/unequal police treatment, even if blamed on 'bad white people', etc.)

* Use of the words "murder" or "killing" do NOT clearly imply racism and should not be coded as 1.

THE WHITENESS PANDEMIC

* Merely discussing or explaining George Floyd's murder or protests is insufficient for a code of 1 if it cannot be determined that the conversation has the goal of advancing racial justice (e.g., by decreasing racial bias in a child, educating oneself, etc)

* Saying "Black Lives Matter" without context is coded 0, but discussing BLM or indicating agreement with it is sufficient for a code of 1.

Thematic Analysis

1. *Beliefs/Values (text code)*: what parent perceives as true or as important
2. *Attitudes (text code)*: how parent feels about something, including feeling empathy about a situation
3. *Practices (text code)*: what parent does including parenting behaviors like discussions or media-related parenting, whether intentional or not
4. *Emotions (text code)*: positive and negative emotions, whether explicitly stated or implied

Inter-Rater Reliability of Coders

Content Analysis

To establish inter-rater reliability, content coders met multiple times to discuss and refine the coding scheme by testing it on sample items from the dataset. Then, the first coder coded the entire dataset and the secondary coder coded responses from a random 22% of participants (Campbell et al., 2013). Kappas evaluating inter-rater reliability reflected substantial agreement between coders for the WRID phases (.68) and humanization (.64), and near perfect agreement for COVID-19 (.94) per Landis & Koch's (1977) established guideline (i.e., .41-.60 moderate agreement, .61-.80 substantial agreement, .81-1.00 almost perfect agreement). Coders discussed discrepancies and refined codes, and the second coder coded a new random 25% leading to near

THE WHITENESS PANDEMIC

perfect agreement between coders for WRID phases (.82) and COVID-19 (.95), and substantial agreement for humanization (.76). After a final discussion of discrepant codes (mostly inadvertent errors), 100% agreement was achieved and the first coder corrected final codes.

Thematic Analysis

Inter-code agreement was established consensually. Coders met on multiple occasions to discuss themes and thematic organization, resolve any discrepancies, establish consensus, and to note negative cases in which a minority of participants disagreed with the majority view (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Supplement C

Table C1

Hierarchical linear regression predicting psychological distress (N = 392 full sample)

Variable	Models ^a		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Income ^b	-0.16* (0.07)	-0.16* (0.06)	-0.16* (0.06)
Education level ^c	0.15 (0.13)	0.18 (0.13)	0.19 (0.12)
Age	0.02 (0.03)	0.005 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)
Political affiliation ^d	-0.36** (0.12)	-0.24* (0.12)	-0.20 (0.12)
Distance from GF memorial	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)
COVID-19 daily impact		0.56*** (0.13)	0.50*** (0.13)
Racial silence vs. responsiveness ^b			0.71** (0.26)
Constant	3.85** (1.35)	1.85 (1.40)	1.83 (1.39)
R^2	0.05	0.09	0.11
ΔR^2		0.04***	0.02***

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

^a Unstandardized coefficients are reported here with standard errors in parentheses. ^b 1 = Less than \$25,000; 2 = \$25,000-\$49,999; 3 = \$50,000-74,999; 4 = \$75,000-\$99,000; 5 = \$100,000-\$124,999; 6 = \$125,000-\$149,999; 7 = \$150,000-\$174,999; 8 = \$175,000-\$199,999; 9 = \$200,000 or more. ^c 1 = graduate or professional degree, 2 = attended some graduate school, 3 = Bachelor's degree, 4 = attended some college, 5 = high school diploma, 6 = GED, 7 = some high school. ^d 1 = very liberal; 2 = somewhat liberal; 3 = moderate; 4 = somewhat conservative; 5 = very conservative. ^e Dichotomous variable created to represent whether participants mentioned George Floyd, his killing, or related events like protests in their open-ended responses (i.e., racially "responsive": $n = 184$, 47%), or whether they demonstrated racial silence by responding without mentioning Floyd or related events, stated "No" or "N/A", or provided no open-ended response whatsoever (i.e., racially "silent": $n = 208$, 53%).