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Overview of Presentation

- Examine the disagreement of racial identification between different respondents in a study of children having contact with the child welfare system
- Identify factors that contribute to the disagreement
“In 1997 Tiger Woods became the first African-American golfer to win the Masters.”

Encyclopedia Brittanica

“Tiger Woods was the first Masters winner of African-American or Asian-American descent.”

Wikipedia

“Growing up, I came up with this name: I'm a ‘Cablinasian’ as in Caucasian-Black-Indian-Asian.”

Tiger Woods on the Oprah Winfrey Show in 1997
Importance of Race in Research

- Race is a key variable in medical research, especially regarding disparities in health care and epidemiology.
- Race is commonly used in the social sciences as an independent variable in multivariate models.
Variability in Race Reporting

- Review of literature shows that reporting of race varies by:
  - Reporter (Gomez et al, 2004; West et al, 2005)
  - Context (Harris & Sim, 2002)
  - Time (Blustein, 1994; Hahn et al, 1992)
  - Age (Hitlin et al, 2006; Herman, 2004)
Overall Findings from Literature

- High agreement for White and Black
- Low agreement for American Indian
- Caution against using administrative data for racial classifications and recommend using self-reported race data
Factors Predicting Agreement in Racial Identification

- Predictors studied only for administrative medical records versus adult self-report
- Factors that predict agreement
  - Age (+/-)
  - Race (White +)
  - Education (-)
  - Services (More inpatient stays +)
  - Marital status & living situation (+/-)
  - Foreign born vs. native (foreign born +)
The National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-being (NSCAW)

- Sponsored by: Administration for Children and Families
- First nationally representative longitudinal study of children and families in the child welfare system
- Sample: children having contact with child welfare system within 15-month period starting in October 1999
- CAPI interviews: children, caregivers, and caseworkers
  PAPI interview: teachers
- Four full waves of data; preparing data for the 5th wave of data collection
Why use NSCAW data?

- Child’s race was included as a standard demographic variable.
- Child’s race was asked of three different respondent types:
  - Caseworker
  - Caregiver
  - Child (if 6+ years old)
Study Aims

- To assess rate of agreement for identification of the child’s race across the three respondent types
- To explore predictors of agreement on race identification
Methods

How race is asked in NSCAW:

- Patterned after the 2000 Census which allowed for multiple races to be selected for the first time.
- Hispanic ethnicity questions preceded the question about race.
- Race was asked of all caregivers and children 6+ years in multiple waves.
- Only the investigative caseworker in Wave 1 was asked to identify the child’s race.
- Caseworkers were encouraged to refer to the child’s case file during the interview.
Caregivers and Caseworkers First Asked Ethnicity

1. CAREGIVER: Now thinking about [CHILD]. Is he/she Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino? CASEWORKER: Is [CHILD] Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

2. (IF YES) Which group best describes [CHILD]. Would you say he/she is:
   a. Mexican, Mexican-American, or Chicano
   b. Puerto Rican
   c. Cuban, or
   d. Something else?
Caregivers and Caseworkers Then Asked Race

3. Please look at CARD 1. What is [CHILD]’s race? You may pick one or more groups from the card.

1. AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE
2. ASIAN
3. BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN
4. NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER
5. WHITE
6. OTHER
Children Were Only Asked Race

What race are you?  CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

1. AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE
2. ASIAN
3. BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN
4. NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER
5. WHITE

NOTE: IF CHILD CANNOT REPORT HIS/HER RACE CODE “DON’T KNOW.” DO NOT CODE RACE BASED ON YOUR OBSERVATION
Incidence of Child “Don’t Know”

Percent of Children Responding “Don't Know" to Race by Wave

- Wave 1: 30.7%
- Wave 3: 30.8%
- Wave 4: 36.6%
Incidence of Child “Don’t know”

Children Responding "Don't Know" to Race: Percent by Age
Analysis Limited to Comparing Caregiver and Caseworker Reports of Child’s Race

- Caregiver and caseworker race questions are the same
- High percentage of children responded “Don’t Know” to race. Currently exploring at what age children can give an answer when asked “What is your race?”
- Using caregiver report as proxy for self-report and caseworker report as proxy for administrative data
Child’s Race Distribution

Child's Race: Percent Reported by Caregivers and Caseworkers

- White: 59\% (Caregiver), 60\% (Caseworker)
- Black: 30\% (Caregiver), 27\% (Caseworker)
- Asian: 1\% (Caregiver), 1\% (Caseworker)
- Nat Hi/Pac Isl: 1\% (Caregiver), 1\% (Caseworker)
- Am Ind: 5\% (Caregiver), 1\% (Caseworker)
- Other: 11\% (Caregiver), 12\% (Caseworker)
- Multiple Race: 7\% (Caregiver), 3\% (Caseworker)
Sensitivity: Caregiver as Referent

# of Caseworkers reporting YES to [Racial category X]

# of Caregivers reporting YES to [Racial category X]
Positive Predictive Value: Caseworker as Referent

# of Caregivers reporting YES to [Racial category X]

# of Caseworkers reporting YES to [Racial category X]
Sensitivity and Positive Predictive Values

Child Race Agreement between Caregivers and Caseworkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Positive Predictive Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat H/Pac Isl</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Ind</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Indian and Other Races

Race Combinations of American Indian Race

- Am Ind Only: 35%
- Am Ind + White: 49%
- Am Ind + Black: 42%
- Am Ind + White + Black: 12%
- Other Combinations: 6%
- Caregiver: 9%
- Caseworker: 1%

www.rti.org
Caregiver Reporting American Indian: Caseworker Race Combinations

![Graph showing race combinations for caregivers reporting American Indian.]

- 49.3% Black Only
- 14.4% White Only
- 14.6% Other
- 5.3% Other Combinations
- 2.8% Don't Know/Ref
- 3.6% Am Ind + White
- 5.9% Am Ind Only
Predictors of Disagreement: Sensitivity (Excluding White and Black Races)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=219)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child out of home</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG relationship a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child gender</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At/below poverty line</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG age</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG Education</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Referent = Bio/Adopt/Step parent; b Referent = 11+
## Predictors of Disagreement: Positive Predictive Value (Excluding White and Black Races)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=94)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child out of home</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG relationship $^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child gender</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At/below poverty line</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG age</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age $^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG Education</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Referent = Bio/Adopt/Step parent; $^b$ Referent = 11+
Conclusions

- The younger the child, the more likely he/she will not be able to answer the race question.
- Caregivers are more likely to report a child as multiracial than caseworkers.
- Caregivers are more likely to report a child as being American Indian than caseworkers.
- A child from a family that has received child welfare services is more likely to have a caseworker agree with the child’s caregiver about minority race identification.
- Caseworkers are more likely to agree with older caregivers (+35) about the child’s race.
Implications

- For survey researchers
  - Age at which children can respond to race and/or ethnicity questions
  - Use of administrative vs. self-report data in analyses
- For the child welfare system
  - Given the level of caseworker / caregiver disagreement, need to consider the best source of race data
  - Consider ways to reduce caseworkers’ under-reporting of American Indian and multiple races
Areas of Further Study

- In-depth review of the children’s self-report data by age and consistency across time
- Patterns of agreement of children’s self-report data with caregiver and/or caseworker data
- Consistency in caregiver report of child race over time
- Further exploration of the “Other” category of race identification, especially in relation to ethnicity
- Expanding model to include non-demographic variables
Final Recommendation

“In all medical reporting, race and ethnicity must be carefully defined, and the use of race, ethnicity, sex and age as variables must be justified on the basis of good science.”

-Editorial: “Scientific reporting of ethnicity, age, sex and race”

*Canadian Medical Association Journal (2000)*
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