Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology
2014, Vol. 20, No. 2, 231–243

1099-9809/14/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/a0035324

Race and Bicultural Socialization in The Netherlands, Norway, and the United States of America in the Adoptions of Children From India

Maureen Riley-Behringer and Victor Groza
Case Western Reserve University

Wendy Tieman
Leiden University and Erasmus University Rotterdam

Femmie Juffer
Leiden University

A cross-national sample of 622 internationally adopted children from India with White parents in The Netherlands (n = 409), Norway (n = 146), and the United States (n = 67) was used to contrast country-specific bicultural socialization (BCS) practices among families of transracial intercountry adoption. The 3 countries vary in their degrees of minority (US > Netherlands > Norway) and Indian populations (US > Norway > Netherlands). The current study examined parental survey trends among BCS practices, children's negative encounters about adoption, racial and positive discrimination, and parental worry about these issues. Country-specific differences were revealed: The United States and Norway (greatest Indian populations) reported the greatest similarity in BCS practices, classmates being a source of negative reactions/racial discrimination, and parental worry. The American sample encountered greater negative reactions to adoption from others; Dutch children experienced the least negative reactions from others overall, yet as in the United States (samples with the greatest minority heterogeneity) they still noted significant experiences of racial discrimination. Country-specific sociopolitical perceptions about adoption, ethnicity/race, and immigration are considered as factors that may have been used to inform parenting practices that facilitate children's biculturalism into family life (i.e., adoptive family stigma, percentages of Indian/minority populations, immigration policy trends). Concluding, cross-national research such as the current study may help intercountry adoption policymakers and practitioners to better understand and inform BCS practices in adoptive families.

Keywords: intercountry adoption, transracial adoption, bicultural socialization, racial discrimination, India

This cross-national study explores bicultural socialization (BCS) practices among White parents who adopted children from India and reside in three countries (The Netherlands, Norway, United States) with varying degrees of ethno-racial-cultural heterogeneity. In the history of intercountry adoption (ICA), there have been over 100 recorded sending and receiving countries (Selman, 2009). India was one of the first countries to allow the promotion of international adoption as a sending nation. The Netherlands and Norway were among the first receiving countries that adopted children from India (Damodaran & Mehta, 2000; Selman, 2009). Historically, when Indian children were adopted by American families in which at least one parent was of Indian origin, it was not considered an international adoption (Damodaran & Mehta, 2000).

Yet, many ICA parents from The Netherlands, Norway, and the United States are not of Indian origin, but are White and of European descent; these adoptions are transnational, transracial, and transcultural in nature (R. M. Lee, 2003; Rosenberg, Adams, & Groza, 2001). In such cases, sending countries and international policies (see Convention on the Rights of Children, 1989) charge transracial ICA (T–ICA) parents with the responsibility of cultivating adoptees' bicultural competence—or the integration of norms, values, and behaviors of a dual heritage, race, and ethnicity to successfully navigate the birth and resident country's dominant culture as an ethnoracial minority (Bailey, 2007). Initially, most White ICA parents can only reference their experiences as a member of an ethnoracial majority, raised in their same-race birth family. Therefore, they must be intentional in their efforts to become competent in their child's culture while gaining an understanding of what it means to be an adoptee and a member of an ethnoracial minority.

Maureen Riley-Behringer and Victor Groza, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University; Wendy Tieman, Centre for Child and Family Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands and Department of Pedagogical and Educational Sciences, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; Femmie Juffer, Centre for Child and Family Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Femmie Juffer is supported by Wereldkinderen. We acknowledge the families who agreed to participate in the studies from the Children of the World–Norway, Bharatiya Samaj Seva in Pune, India, and Wereldkinderen in The Hague, The Netherlands.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Maureen Riley-Behringer, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, 11235 Bellflower Road, Cleveland, OH 44106-7164. E-mail: maureen.riley@case.edu

BCS Practices

Adoption professionals encourage T–ICA parents to help children develop bicultural identity and competence through BCS practices—or how "parents address ethnic and racial issues . . . transmit cultural values, beliefs, customs, and behaviors . . . to which the child internalizes . . . and acquires skills" to competently move back and forth across dual culture lines (R. M. Lee, Grotevant, Hellerstedt, Gunnar, & the Minnesota International Adoption Project Team, 2006, p. 572). In transracially adopted children, BCS has been linked to positive ethnic identity, more optimal emotional adjustment, higher self-esteem, academic achievement, and resilience against discrimination (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; D. C. Lee & Quintana, 2005; Phinney, 1990; Yoon, 2001, 2004).

Based on Tessler, Gamache, and Liu's (1999) work with Chinese adoptees and their American families using the theoretical framework of BCS theory (Valentine, 1971), the current study of Dutch, Norwegian, and American parents with (subcontinent) Indian adoptees were surveyed on the following: the importance parents placed on BCS, whether children participated in BCS activities, parents knowledge of adoptees' negative encounters with others (i.e., about adoption, country of origin, racial discrimination), and parental worry about these negative experiences (Thomas & Tessler, 2007). BCS theory (Valentine, 1971) was formulated from earlier studies of immigrant and minority families and how they related and helped their children learn to successfully navigate their family's culture of origin and their resident country's culture.

Among Indian children adopted by White parents, this becomes more complex, as parent–child differences are physically obvious. Yet, Thomas and Tessler (2007) determined that even when adoptees' and parents' birth cultures differed, children still developed modest levels of bicultural competence. This was particularly so when parents saw competence from a "broader social and cultural context" (Thomas & Tessler (2007), p. 1195) that emphasized the following factors as important to their child's development of cultural competence: Parents having positive attitudes about exposing their children to BCS activities; parents considering the ethnoracial community composition when choosing where to raise their child; and whether parents' social networks included friends who were ethnically, racially, and culturally similar to their child.

When examining the BCS practices of T–ICA families' with children from India, the current study also takes into account the degree of ethnoracial heterogeneity in The Netherlands, Norway, and the United States—specifically each country's minority and subcontinent Indian populations. Based on their study of BCS in White American parents with Chinese daughters, Thomas and Tessler (2007) found that racial diversity on a local community level did not support children's ethnic socialization; what was crucial was the presence of their own ethnic group. In particular, what was influential was the number of adult, Chinese friends within parents' social networks who were likely cultural role models and a gateway to BCS activities.

For the year 2000, the World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency, 2011) reported that Norway was the most ethnoracially homogeneous (i.e., $<$ 6% ethnoracial minorities) of the study's three countries, The Netherlands was more heterogeneous than Norway but less than the United States (i.e., $\approx$ 15% ethnoracial minorities), and the United States was the most heterogeneous (i.e., $\approx$ 35% ethnoracial minorities). Yet, of these three countries, the Overseas Indian Facilitation Centre (OIFC, n.d.) reported that The Netherlands had the lowest percentage of (subcontinent) Indians (0.11%) in their total population; Indians made up 0.14% of Norway's total population; and the United States comprised the largest of the three countries' Indian populations (0.60%; Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs, n.d.).

By examining BCS practices among families from The Netherlands, Norway and the United States, we explore whether BCS theory can be generalized among transnationally, transracially, and transculturally adopted children from India and their families. Testing the current sample across three countries holding varying degrees of ethnoracial heterogeneity allows for fewer confounds in examining the effects of bicultural socialization practices, as the race of both the child and parent will be held constant.

A number of cross-sectional and longitudinal studies with single country designs have explored the impact of BCS practices on the development of cultural competence in T–ICA children (e.g., R. M. Lee, 2003; Tessler et al., 1999; Tessler, Tuan, & Shiao, 2011). Yet, there are gaps in the literature as to whether these findings can be generalized to national and cross-national comparisons—specifically whether results can be generalized to non-Asian, T–ICA families within and outside of the United States. Given the significant role that a broader social and cultural context reportedly contributes to both adoptees' cultural competence and the tenets of BCS theory, further investigation must determine whether previous interpretations would need to be revised that take into account cross-national differences and inconsistencies that could not be uncovered in single-nation research (Kohn, 1987). To date, the most researched T–ICA populations included White parents (from Europe and North America) who internationally adopted female children from East Asia (i.e., Korea, China; R. M. Lee, 2003; Scroggs & Heitfield, 2001; Tessler et al., 1999; Tessler et al., 2011; Thomas & Tessler, 2007). Scroggs and Heitfield (2001) and Hellerstedt et al. (2008) broadened the research to include those adopting from Russia, India, Kazakhstan, and South and Central America—however, only with T–ICA families from the United States.

As the country-of-residence itself may serve as a contextual factor in such studies, it is important to determine generalizability of previous findings and challenge whether interpretations take into account the potential influences of specific historical, cultural, or political circumstances (Kohn, 1987). No study to date has conducted a cross-national comparison of BCS and the factors shaping competence in T–ICA families in which race and ethnicity of a non-East-Asian group of children (subcontinent Indian) and parents (White Dutch, Norwegian, and American) were held constant, while degrees of national-level, ethnoracial heterogeneity varied.

ICA: Policy and Practice

International Perspectives

Adoption began as a way of pairing parentless children, mostly war orphans, with childless, White, heterosexual, infertile, married couples (Howell & Marre, 2006). Little importance was placed on the child's origins; adoptees were assimilated into the adoptive

family's culture, ignoring or de-emphasizing their birth, cultural, or racial origin (Baran & Pannor, 1990). Historically, assimilation evolved, influenced by international and country-specific policies related to adoption and immigration (i.e., multiculturalism; integration) within sending and receiving countries (Howell & Marre, 2006) and by adult adoptees joining the debate about race and culture since the 1970s (e.g., Baden, 2010; Hübinette, 2012).

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the Hague Convention of May 29, 1993 on the Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption (the Hague Adoption Convention, 1993), and the United Nations Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children (United Nations General Assembly, 2009) provide a comprehensive child-rights-based framework for understanding adoptions. The Hague Convention is the main international legal instrument and provides the framework for the implementation of core principles outlined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (Vité & Boéchat, 2008). Although the United States has not approved the CRC, by ratifying the Hague Convention, they are in essence agreeing to specific elements of the CRC. According to Article 8 of the CRC (Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989), children have the right to preserve their birth identity and nationality. The CRC also requires adoptive parents to respect a child's birth parents, his or her own cultural/racial identity, language, and values from the country from which he or she may originate (Article 29; Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1993). This right can be more easily exercised when children are being raised within kinship groups or adopted within one's home country, a preferred option according to the Hague Convention as well as the country of India. However, it is more complicated in ICA where children move from one country to another and when adoptive families are not of the same racial background. This means that the adopted child usually moves from one culture to another culture, often joining a family whose race is different from their own (D. C. Lee & Quintana, 2005; R. M. Lee, 2003; Yoon, 2004).

Adoption Policy in India

The Indian Supreme Court Judgment of 1984 (*Laxmi Kant Pandey v. Union of India*) required that 50% of all adoptions take place domestically (Damodaran & Mehta, 2000; Yngvesson, 2002). Certain populations of children (i.e., orphans with special needs or sibling groups) are exempt from this quota, making these populations eligible for ICA; their eligibility hinges on three unsuccessful attempts at adoption presentation to Indian families (Macedo, 2000). A consistent rise in the number of adoptions in India is predominantly related to an increase in domestic adoptions, with ICAs declining in the last two decades. For example, according to the Central Adoption Resource Agency, in 1995, a total of 2,660 adoptions took place in India, and domestic adoptions accounted for 54%. In 2011, a total of 6,494 adoptions took place in India, and domestic adoptions accounted for 5,905 (91%). Currently, ICAs are embraced by the Indian government if families are of Indian descent or practice Hinduism (Central Adoption Resource Agency, n.d.).

Adoption, Culture, Race, and ICA

Feelings related to adoption surface across the adoptee's life cycle as part of normative adoption development (Brodzinsky, Schechter, & Henig, 1992). Additional issues may arise in response to the ethno-racial-cultural differences between adoptees and their adoptive parents' (Juffer, 2006; Juffer & Tieman, 2009; Thomas & Tessler, 2007). For example, internationally adopted children and parents often have physical differences that can act as markers that set them apart. Once aware of these differences, children begin to understand differences whether due to adoption, country of origin, or absence of genetic connection. Stress and/or painful feelings related to awareness of differences can occur (Brodzinsky, Smith, & Brodzinsky, 1998; Juffer, 2006). For example, Juffer (2006) and Juffer and Tieman (2009) found that Dutch adoptees from India, China, Sri Lanka, Korea, and Colombia expressed a "wish to be White" (Juffer & Tieman, 2009, p. 637) as their parents. Dalen and Saetersdal (1987) reported that Norwegian adoptees from Vietnam viewed being adopted as less negative than being identified as a Vietnamese refugee.

An adoptee's identity may be influenced by their developmental age, personal experiences, and exposure to sociopolitical issues surrounding ethnoracial diversity and racism in daily life (Grotevant, Dunbar, Kohler, & Esau, 2000). Few young children seem to identify with their birth cultures (Huh & Reid, 2000), although in middle childhood, children's interest may grow (see Reinoso, Juffer, & Tieman, 2012). In adolescence and early adulthood, approximately equal percentages of adoptees seem to show interest in their ethnocultural origin compared to those who do not (Brottveit, 2003). Parents are charged with facilitating a balance between acknowledging, appreciating, and incorporating the child's ethnoracial/cultural differences in family life, while consciously not placing too much emphasis on differences (Rojewski, 2005).

An approach that focuses exclusively on the adoptee's birth culture could promote a sense of isolation in contrast to cultivating a bicultural identity (Kirk, 1984, 1985; Rojewski, 2005). Much like the approaches that immigration host countries employ, adoptive parents may assimilate (leave child's culture behind), integrate (absorb aspects of the birth culture where some difference is maintained, yet parents and children become one), or practice multiculturalism (blend the child's/parents' cultures into one, creating a new family culture) when it comes to their child's birth culture and culture-of-residence (Tharmalingam, 2011).

Although a dearth of information exists as to specific outcomes related to BCS of Indian adoptees in The Netherlands, Norway, and the United States, findings from Korean transnational, transracial, and transcultural adoption populations were used to inform the current study. In particular, D. C. Lee and Quintana (2005), in their sample of Korean adoptees in the United States, showed that BCS predicted adoptee's awareness of perspectives, attitudes, and experiences shared by Koreans. Cultural exposure had a slightly stronger relation for younger adoptees than older ones. A comparison with nonadopted, native Korean children in the United States suggested that they achieved levels of cultural awareness at earlier ages than did transracially adopted children.

Adoptive families may utilize BCS practices to promote children gaining knowledge and familiarity with the norms, attitudes, behaviors, and celebrations of their two ethnic groups—the one they came from and the one they live in (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Historically, most T–ICA parents socialize their children's ethnoracial identities into existing family cultural practices (Freidlander et al., 2000). However, in recent decades parents have been trying to help their children gain an understanding and

appreciation of the adoptee's ethnic, cultural, and racial origins. Adoptive parents' visits to children's birth cultures prior to adoptive placements are reportedly helpful as it leads to greater awareness of the need for bicultural activities and sensitivity (Altstein et al., 1994). Family BCS is promoted through participating in heritage activities such as culture camps, language of origin classes, celebration of cultural holidays, homeland tours, or attendance of country-specific groups organized for cultural events fostering biculturalism (Howell & Marre, 2006). These activities increase ethnic awareness, pride, values, and strengthen ethnoracial identification (Carstens & Julia, 2000).

Although adoptive families often acknowledge cultural issues, many are unprepared to deal with racial issues (Baden, 2010). Healthy identity formation in children-of-color depends most on whether those around them (i.e., parents, extended family) have positive attitudes, beliefs, and interests in their race or cultural group (Thomas & Tessler, 2007). Discounting as well as the ignoring of race can have a negative impact on children's identity and adjustment (Steward & Baden, 1995). Hollingsworth (1997) suggested that children adopted transracially tend to have less optimal ethnoracial identities and are highly acculturated to White culture. In essence, adopted children may lose a part of their identity or have it underdeveloped. When adoptees leave the family or social network (i.e., to attend college) and if they see themselves as a member of the dominant culture (i.e., White), they may face their racial/cultural identity in a new and negative way, only then without the daily support of their family.

Parents who prepared children for racism/discrimination reported their children as having a greater sense of efficacy or self-confidence (Bowman & Howard, 1985), fewer behavioral problems (Caughy, O'Campo, Randolph, & Nickerson, 2002; Hughes & Johnson, 2001), and decreased depressive feelings (Stevenson, Reed, Bodison, & Bishop, 1997). A home in which identity is free of judgment, racism, and discrimination promotes safety, openness for trouble-shooting when problems arise, and support in dealing with adversity. This family atmosphere reportedly decreases social isolation and struggles with identity for adoptees (Root, 1996).

Tessler & Gamache, (2012) noted strengths and challenges related to Chinese T–ICA adoptees' using processes of ethnic exploration to counter racism and discrimination. Ethnic exploration, or the integration of public behaviors into daily life that normalize a person's difference from others (i.e., about being Asian, an adoptee, born in China), empowered adoptees; however, they also noted greater sensitivity to racial stereotyping, teasing, exclusion, and were more self-conscious about their Chinese appearance (Tessler & Gamache, 2012). Those Chinese ICA adoptees who were rated as having high ethnic exploration were also more likely to report feeling emotionally upset about broader topics related to their differences, extrapolating beyond a personal, family, or community level about such things as China's one child rule and gender preferences toward male children (Tessler & Gamache, 2012).

A Cross-National Study on Adoption

The current study investigates two research questions related to BCS in White Dutch, Norwegian, and American T–ICA parents and their Indian children: (1) Do parents differ in their BCS practices (importance of BCS to parents, children's experiences of BCS activities, parents' number of adult Indian friends); (2) Do parents differ in their reports of children's negative experiences with others (about adoption, origin country, skin color, racial discrimination; with whom did they have negative experiences, i.e., classmates, neighborhood peers, unknown people; parental worry about adoptees' negative experiences)?

This collaboration between Dutch and American researchers focuses on intercountry and transracial adoption in three countries and offers benefits in addressing important adoption research questions (Palacios & Brodzinsky, 2010). The larger sample size within multiple countries increases the ability to differentiate and generalize findings. A second benefit is that the collaborators bring the expertise of several disciplines, conceptual perspectives, and various resources. The final benefit is dissemination. Social science research from more than one country can raise interests in the international scientific and policy communities, promoting higher probabilities of dissemination in more forums, and increasing opportunities to influence policy and practice.

Method

Study Design and Participants

This study used a cross-sectional survey research design to assess the BCS practices reported by adoptive parents living in The Netherlands, Norway, and the United States with adopted children from India. The original dataset is a cross-cultural sample of 698 children. As The Netherlands' sample included only those Indian adoptees between 4 and 16 years of age, the same age ranges were established for cross-cultural comparison in the Norwegian and American samples (total $N = 622$). Family descriptive statistics (i.e., adoptees' age at adoption, parents' age at adoption, age at time of study, and percentage of two-parent families) can be found in Table 1.

In the Dutch sample, all families with Indian adoptees between the ages of 4 and 16 ($n = 409$ families) were approached via Wereldkinderen, the primary adoption agency for Indian adoption to The Netherlands. There was a 53.0% survey response rate; 302 families reported on 409 children (see Table 1). The Norwegian sample consisted of 276 families who adopted children from India through Children of the World–Norway; 142 families completed the survey (52.0% response rate) and reported adopting 192 children from India. Of those 192 adoptees, 146 fell within the age parameters (see Table 1). The American sample consisted of 288 families who adopted children from India via Holt International Children Services. There was a 29.0% response rate of 83 families completed surveys on 95 children. Of those 95 adoptees, 67 fell within this study's age parameters (see Table 1).

Measures

A similar survey was used with the adoptive families across all three countries. Drawing from Dutch researchers (Juffer & Tieman, 2009), items related to cultural identity and discrimination were added as were items predictive of BCS of Chinese children adopted by American families (Tessler et al., 1999). The scales

Table 1
Family Descriptive Statistics Comparing Countries' Samples

Family characteristics	Netherlands[a]	Norway[b]	United States[c]
Gender of adoptee			
Male	22.5% ($n = 92$)	26% ($n = 38$)	29.9% ($n = 20$)
Female	77.5% ($n = 317$)	74% ($n = 108$)	70.1% ($n = 47$)
Adoptee's mean placement age (years) (SD)[d]	1.2 (1.10)	1.6 (0.93)	2.6 (2.60)
Adoptee's mean age (years) at time of study (SD)	10.4 (3.90)	9.66 (3.78)	10.9 (4.00)
Adoptive mother's mean age (years) at adoption (SD)[e]	35.10 (0.20)	34.60 (4.10)	36.5 (3.70)
Adoptive father's mean age (years) at adoption (SD)	37.20 (5.20)	37.80 (4.60)	37.80 (4.60)
Adoptive mother's mean age (years) at time of study (SD)[f,g]	44.50 (4.90)	43.50 (5.70)	47.60 (6.80)
Adoptive father's mean age (years) at time of study (SD)	46.50 (4.80)	46.70 (5.00)	47.60 (6.70)
Mother completed survey	87.8%	74.8%	82.1%
Father completed survey[h]	12.2%	25.2%	17.9%
Two-parent families	96%	91%	83%

[a] $n = 409$. [b] $n = 146$. [c] $n = 67$. [d] U.S. adoptees significantly older at adoption compared to the Netherlands and Norwegian samples. [e] U.S. mothers were significantly older at adoption than were Dutch adoptive mothers, $t(484) = 3.30$, $p < .001$ or Norwegian adoptive mothers. [f] U.S. mothers were older at the time of the study than both Dutch, $t(484) = 4.74$, $p < .001$, and Norwegian adoptive mothers, $t(230) = 4.95$, $p < .01$. [g] Dutch mothers were significantly older than Norwegian mothers at the time of the study, $t(564) = 2.16$, $p < .05$. [h] Significant differences were found between countries for fathers' completion of the survey, $\chi^2(2) = 13.7$, $p < .001$. Bonferroni post hoc comparisons indicated that Norwegian fathers ($M = 1.25$, $SD = 0.44$) completed surveys significantly more than Dutch fathers ($M = 1.22$; $SD = .33$). No significant differences for gender of adoptees, fathers' age at adoption or the time of the study, or family structure.

have been used before but psychometric properties beyond face validity have not been established.

IBSE–P. Ten items were summed to form the Importance of Bicultural Socialization Experiences–Parent Rating scale (IBSE–P) scale; it measures how important adoptive parents felt it was that their children experience specific aspects of Indian culture (e.g., How important is it that your child learns words in Hindi or another Indian language). A 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all important*) to 4 (*very important*) was used. Higher scale scores indicated parents' greater feelings of importance for adoptees to experience Indian cultural activities (possible range = 10–40; Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$). Factor analysis supported the IBSE-P as an unidimensional scale (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003).

APBS scale. A set of eight items with dichotomous response options (0 = *no*; 1 = *yes*) were summed to form the Adoptees' Participation in Bicultural Socialization (APBS) scale. This scale measures parental report of whether adoptees' experienced specific Indian cultural activities (e.g., My child has celebrated Indian holidays). Higher scores indicated greater Indian cultural activities participated in by adoptees (possible range = 0–8; Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$). Factor analysis supported the APBS as an unidimensional scale.

Parents' number of Indian friends. One item measured how many adult Indian friends that parents reported having (How many of your adult friends are Indian?). Item choices ranged were based on a scale ranging from 1 (*none*), 2 (*one or two*), 3 (*three or four*) to 4 (*five or more*), where the higher the number the greater number of adult Indian friends parents had.

Others' reactions to adoption, country of origin, or skin color. Three individual items measured parental report of how frequently adoptees experienced negative reactions about being adopted, their country of origin, or the adoptee's race/ethnicity (e.g., How often did your child experience others having a negative reaction to them about being adopted?). A 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Higher total scores indicated greater negative reactions (3 items scored with a range of 1 to 5).

Adoptees' experiences of racial discrimination. One item measured parents' report of how often adoptees had experiences of racial discrimination (e.g., How often did your child have experiences of racial discrimination?). Reports were rated on a 5-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Higher scores indicated greater experiences of racial discrimination (1 item scored with a range of 1 to 5).

Parental worry about negative reactions or racial and positive discrimination. Two items measured whether adoptive parents worried about their children having experienced negative reactions or racial discrimination (e.g., Do you worry about racial discrimination?). Item responses ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*); higher scores indicated greater parental worry (2 items scored with a range of 1 to 5).

With whom adoptees' experienced negative reactions. A set of three individual items with dichotomous response options (0 = *no*; 1 = *yes*) measured parental report of whether adoptees' experienced negative reactions from classmates, neighborhood peers, or unknown people (e.g., Classmates expressed negative reactions?). Lower scores indicated fewer negative reactions (3 items scored as 0 or 1).

With whom adoptees' experienced racial discrimination. Three individual items with dichotomous response options (0 = *no*; 1 = *yes*) measured parental report of adoptees experiences of racial discrimination by classmates, neighborhood peers, or unknown people (e.g., Classmates expressed racial discrimination?). Lower scores indicated fewer racial discrimination experiences (3 items scored as 0 or 1).

With whom adoptees' experienced positive discrimination. A set of three individual items measured parental report of adoptees' experiencing positive discrimination by classmates, neighborhood peers, or unknown people (e.g., Unknown people expressed positive discrimination?). *Positive discrimination* was defined as receiving (positive) special treatment (e.g., receiving extra gifts or

treats) related to adoptees' transracial adoptive status. Lower scores from dichotomous response options (0 = *no*; 1 = *yes*) indicated fewer experiences of positive discrimination (3 items scored as 0 or 1).

Procedures

In all three countries, Human Subjects Approval was received by the authors' universities. In The Netherlands, minor revisions were made to the questionnaire following a pilot with two adoptive families. Dutch families received a mailed questionnaire. If families had not replied, a second mailing followed in 60 days. In Norway, a pilot of six families who adopted from other countries than India was conducted; minor questionnaire revisions were made based on pilot feedback. Norwegian families were mailed a questionnaire; a second followed 30 days later. A version of this questionnaire had been used in adoptive family studies for over 20 years in the United States (Rosenthal & Groze, 1992); therefore, a pilot was not conducted with the U.S. sample. American families were mailed a questionnaire, a second followed 30 days later.

Statistical Analyses

A preliminary analysis of the data was examined by conducting descriptive statistics to validate the assumption of normality (i.e., skewness < 2; kurtosis < 7) (Curran, West, & Finch, 1996). Factor analyses (i.e., principal component analyses [PCA] with oblimin rotations) were conducted as part of the formation of the IBSE–P and the APBS scales. For interval-level data, means and standard deviations were reported; for categorical data, data percentages were reported. In bivariate analysis for categorical data by country, Pearson's chi-square analyses with Bonferroni correction checked for adequate cell size for each sample and determined which pairs of proportions were significantly different (Jaccard & Becker, 2010). For interval level data by country (i.e., child/family characteristics, IBSE–P scale, APBS scale), *t* tests or a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare mean differences between countries at the $p < .05$ level and post hoc comparisons were made using the Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD). Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 20.

Results

Preliminary Outcomes

To compare each country's sample, child and parent characteristics are described in Table 1. Adoptees' gender was not significantly different among the three countries. Adoptees from the United States sample were significantly older at adoption compared to Dutch and Norwegian samples (see Table 1). American mothers were significantly older at adoption and at the time of the study than were Dutch or Norwegian adoptive mothers; Dutch mothers were significantly older than Norwegian mothers at the time of the study (see Table 1). There were insignificant results between countries' related to adoptive fathers' age at adoption or time of the study.

Adoptive mothers mostly completed surveys, but a chi-square analysis did indicate a greater probability of Norwegian fathers completing the study's surveys as compared to Dutch fathers, but not United States fathers (see Table 1). No significant differences between countries were found for family structure (two-parent households).

BCS Practices by Country

IBSE–P scale. A one-way, between-groups ANOVA was used to explore the impact of country on parents' ratings of importance of BCS experiences as measured by the IBSE–P (see Table 2). There were significant differences in IBSE–P scores for the three countries. Country differences were moderate (medium effect size; Cohen, 1988). Post hoc comparisons indicated that American parents expressed greater importance in BCS experiences than did the Dutch but not Norwegian parents. Norwegian parents found greater importance in exposure to BCS activities than did the Dutch parents.

APBS scale. A one-way, between-group ANOVA explored the impact of country on parents' reports of children's experiences of BCS activities as measured with the APBS scale (see Table 2). There was a statistically significant difference in APBS scores for the three countries in which post hoc comparisons indicated that the Netherlands group was significantly lower than the United States and the Norwegian groups. The actual difference in mean scores between countries was small to moderate (effect size was moderate). There were nonsignificant differences in BCS experiences between the United States and Norwegian samples.

Parents' numbers of adult Indian friends. Significant differences existed between countries on parents' report of the number of Indian friends they had (see Table 2). Post hoc comparisons indicated that the United States had significantly greater number of adult Indian friends than did both the Norwegian and the Dutch groups. The actual difference in mean scores between countries was large in size (large effect size).

Parents' Reports of Children's Negative Experiences by Country

Negative reactions to adoption, country of origin, or skin color. A one-way, between-group ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of country on parents' report of children's experiences of negative reactions to being adopted, country of origin, or skin color (see Table 2). There was a significant difference in experiences of negative reactions to being adopted for the three countries. The actual difference in mean scores was small in size (small effect size). Post hoc comparisons indicated that the mean score for the U.S. group was significantly greater than Dutch group, but not the Norwegian group. No significant differences for negative reactions to being adopted existed between the Dutch and Norwegian samples.

There was a significant difference in negative reactions to birth country for the three countries (see Table 2). The actual difference in mean scores between countries was small (small effect size). Post hoc comparisons indicated that the mean score for the U.S. group was significantly greater than Dutch and Norwegian groups; there were no significant differences between the Dutch and Norwegian groups. There were no significant differences in negative reactions to skin color for the three countries.

Negative experiences of racial discrimination. A one-way, between-group ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of

Table 2
An Analysis of Variance of Scores on the IBSE–P, the APBS, Parents' Number of Adult, Indian Friends, Adoptees' Experiences of Negative Reactions From Others (About Adoption, Country of Origin, and Skin Color), Parental Report of Adoptees' Experiences With Racial Discrimination, and Parental Worry (About Others' Negative Reactions and Positive Discrimination) by Country

Variable	Country			*df*	*F*	*p*	e^2
	Netherlands	Norway	United States				
IBSE–P							
M	20.4	23.1	25	2,566	26.0	<.001	0.08
SD	5.4	5.3	7.1				
APBS							
M	3.3	4.1	4.3	2,600	12.8	<.001	0.04
SD	1.9	1.9	2.1				
Parents number of adult, Indian friends							
M	1.24	1.44	2.31	2,611	57.7	<.001	0.16
SD	0.60	0.87	1.13				
Negative reactions from others—adoption							
M	1.6	1.6	1.8	2,611	3.14	<.05	0.01
SD	0.7	0.8	0.9				
Negative reactions from others—country of origin							
M	1.5	1.5	1.8	2,610	4.8	<.01	0.02
SD	0.8	0.7	0.9				
Negative reactions from others—skin color							
M	1.6	2.0	2.2	2,610	2.3	*ns*	0.01
SD	0.9	0.9	1.0				
Adoptees' experiences—racial discrimination							
M	1.6	1.4	1.7	2,603	4.5	<.01	1.00
SD	0.8	0.7	0.8				
Parental worry—negative reactions from others							
M	2.0	2.6	2.8	2,536	28.5	<.001	0.02
SD	0.9	1.1	1.0				
Parental worry—experiences of racial discrimination							
M	2.2	2.6	2.7	2,486	9.7	<.001	0.04
SD	0.9	1.1	1.0				

Note. IBSE–P = Importance of Bicultural Socialization Experiences–Parent Rating scale; APBS: Adoptees' Participation in Bicultural Socialization scale.

country on parents' reports of children's experiences of racial discrimination (see Table 2). We found a significant difference in children's experiences of racial discrimination for the three countries. The actual difference in mean scores between countries was small (small effect size). Post hoc comparisons indicated that the mean score for the U.S. group was significantly greater than the Norwegian group but not the Dutch group; significant differences existed between the Dutch and Norwegian groups, with the Dutch noting higher rates of racial discrimination than the Norwegians.

Parental worry. A one-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference in parental worry about children's experiences of negative reactions from others for the three countries (see Table 2). The actual difference in mean scores between countries was large (large effect size). Post hoc comparisons indicated that mean scores for the U.S. and Norwegian groups were significantly greater than for the Dutch group. The United States and Norway did not differ. There was a significant difference in parental worry about children's experiences of racial discrimination from others for the three countries. The actual difference in mean scores between countries was moderate in size with a small to medium effect size. Post hoc comparisons indicated that the mean score for the U.S. group and the Norwegian group was significantly greater than the Dutch group. No significant differences existed between the U.S. and Norwegian groups regarding parental worry related to racial discrimination.

Negative reactions from classmates, neighborhood peers, or unknown people. A chi-square analysis was conducted to explore the impact of country on parental report of adoptees' experiences of negative reactions from classmates, neighborhood peers, and unknown people (see Table 3). A chi-square analysis indicated that American parents noted that their adoptees had a greater probability of negative reactions to adoption by classmates when compared to Norwegian and Dutch adoptees. Norwegians had significantly greater negative reactions with classmates when compared to the Dutch. Norwegian parents relayed that their adoptees experienced greater negative reactions from neighborhood peers than did American adoptees, but not the Dutch. No significant differences existed between countries regarding adoptees' experiencing negativity regarding adoption from unknown people.

Discrimination with classmates, neighborhood peers, or unknown people. A chi-square analysis of parents' report of children's experiences of racial discrimination indicated that American and Norwegian adoptees had significantly more experiences of racial discrimination with classmates than those in the Dutch sample (see Table 3). Norwegian parents noted that their children had significantly greater experiences of racial discrimination with neighborhood peers than did Dutch adoptees. There were no significant differences for the American sample related to neighbor-

Table 3
Percentages (Indicating Yes) and Chi-Square Analyses of Adoptees Experiences

Parental Report of Negative Experiences of Adoptees	Netherlands[a] (%)	Norway[b] (%)	United States[c] (%)	Netherlands versus Norway (χ^2)	Netherlands versus United States (χ^2)	United States versus Norway (χ^2)
Adoptee experienced negative reactions to being adopted from						
Classmates?	25.4	37.8	58.0	4.85*	22.9***	4.88*
Neighborhood peers?	16.3	23.0	8.50	1.95	2.35	4.76*
Unknown people	34.0	39.2	34.0	0.72	0.00	0.34
Adoptee experienced racial discrimination from						
Classmates?	14.9	47.2	55.9	23.9***	35.7***	0.47
Neighborhood peers?	9.40	19.4	5.90	3.65*	0.47	2.87
Unknown people?	29.9	33.3	38.2	0.18	1.03	0.18
Adoptee experienced positive discrimination from						
Classmates?	10.6	10.1	17.1	0.16	0.19	0.19
Neighborhood peers?	5.70	3.80	4.90	0.46	0.45	0.80
Unknown people?	64.0	86.1	78.0	14.8***	3.26	1.25

[a] $n = 409$. [b] $n = 146$. [c] $n = 67$.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

hood peers. Norwegian parents reported adoptees as having significantly greater experiences of positive discrimination with unknown people than did Dutch adoptees. The American sample had no significant differences related to positive discrimination.

Discussion

This cross-national study among families of T–ICA with White Dutch, Norwegian, and American parents and their Indian children provided a large sample size ($N = 622$) in which to contrast earlier interpretations of single-country BCS studies and allowed us to examine how adoptees' country of residence may serve as a contextual factor in BCS practices (Kohn, 1987). Main outcomes indicated the following: Adoptees' exposure and subsequent experiences of BCS activities were rated as significantly more important to Norwegian and American parents (living in countries with the greatest Indian populations) when compared to the Dutch parents; they also shared significantly greater worry than the Dutch parents about children's experiences of negative reactions from others and racial discrimination, particularly related to adoptees' classmates. Parents from The Netherlands reported the least negative experiences of all three samples, with the only exception to children's experiences of racial discrimination when compared to the Norwegian sample. The Dutch and American parents (living in countries with the greatest percentages of minority populations) shared children's overall experiences of racial discrimination.

Based on Thomas and Tessler's (2007) work that examined the influences of minority and Asian demography on BCS practices, the current study took into account the degrees of minority and Indian populations in the Netherlands, Norway, and U.S. samples. The United States and Norway had the highest percentages of subcontinent Indians in their population and the United States and The Netherlands had the highest percentages of minorities in their populations. The Hague Convention charges T–ICA White parents of Indian adoptees with the responsibility of fostering children's knowledge about birth family history and culture. When supporting children in that right through BCS, cultural competence, and the building of necessary coping skills to deal with the problems of racism and inequality are fostered. Sending countries question T–ICA parents' BCS commitments, racial discrimination awareness, and whether social factors relate to families' choices about BCS. American Chinese T–ICA families reported social-cultural contextual factors such as parental attitudes about BCS, community-level ethnoracial heterogeneity, and parents' social networks as key elements in shaping cultural competence (Thomas & Tessler, 2007). Yet, gaps remain as to whether these contextual factors can be generalized to other American T–ICA families and how American BCS practices compare cross-nationally to White parents from The Netherlands and Norway adopting children from India. The purpose of this study was to fill these gaps.

Results indicated that the three countries viewed BCS differently, as they varied in attitudes and practices. Overall, the results from Norwegian families consistently fell between the U.S. and the Dutch samples. Norwegian and American samples appeared to share the most similarity in BCS practices of the three countries, despite their stark differences in ethnoracial, minority-based heterogeneity. For example, the Dutch and American samples were the least similar on 87.5% (7 out of 8) and Dutch and Norwegian samples significantly differed on 75% of the variables studied (6 out of 8). Yet, Norwegian and U.S. samples significantly differed on only 25% (2 out of 8) of the variables examined.

BCS Practices Across Countries

Dutch parents found it least important to expose children to BCS; their children subsequently experienced the least BCS activities of the three countries. Norwegian and American parents' placed higher levels of importance on BCS, their children experienced greater numbers of BCS activities, and these parents had significantly more adult Indian friends than Dutch parents. These results validated the earlier findings of Freidlander et al. (2000); R. M. Lee (2003), and Thomas and Tessler (2007) that parental attitudes about BCS predicted children's BCS activity participation. It remains unclear as to why these differences were found across countries, but four contextual factors are discussed as possible explanations.

First, mothers' completed the majority of surveys. Research has indicated that when mothers complete BCS surveys (as compared

to fathers), it was linked to higher scores of BCS. Parental influences on BCS survey completion have reportedly been related to the following: mothers having greater daily knowledge about their children's experiences, particularly when in traditional child rearing roles (Lareau, 2000; Tessler et al., 1999); mothers often being the keepers of cultural traditions within the family (Killian & Hegtvedt, 2003); and mothers placing greater weight on understanding adoptees' birth culture/diversity as opposed to fathers who emphasized resident country socialization (Scroggs & Heitfield, 2001; Vonk & Massatti, 2008;). Given these commitments, mothers may also be more likely to extend themselves in friendship to adult Indians that may expose children to BCS activities and informal mentoring.

However, Bergquist, Campbell, and Unrau (2003) found no significant gender differences between parents completing BCS-based surveys. In the current study, even though Norwegian fathers were found to have significantly higher survey completion rates than Dutch fathers (but not U.S. fathers), had participants' genders influenced outcomes, the results in the Norwegian sample for "parental importance of BCS" and "children's experiences of BCS" would likely have resulted in slightly lower not higher scores than the Dutch sample. Therefore, this study's outcomes were unlikely to have been significantly influenced by participant gender or the differences between Dutch and Norwegian fathers, supporting the earlier findings of Bergquist et al. (2003).

Second, American (compared to Dutch and Norwegian) mothers were significantly older at adoption and older at the time of the study. Mothers completed 81% of the U.S. sample surveys and indicated significantly higher mean scores on the IBSE–P, ABSE, and parents' number of adult Indian friends when compared to Dutch and Norwegian samples. As these variables were previously linked to the building of cultural competence, results validated Thomas and Tessler's (2007) earlier findings of a positive relationship between American's "parental age" and T–ICA children's development of cultural competence via BCS. Yet, the comparisons between Dutch and Norwegian mothers' ages did not support earlier findings—the Dutch mothers were significantly older at the time of the study than were Norwegian mothers, rated BCS as least important, and children experienced the least activities. These mixed results may indicate that results were either culturally specific to American T–ICA parents or that another culturally relevant factor moderated results.

Third, although developmental outcomes were outside of the study's scope, it is important to examine how children's age at adoption may have impacted BCS and children's negative experiences. As age at adoption is positively related to children's risk for developmental challenges (i.e., attachment problems, stunting/growth delays, academic and behavior difficulties; see Van IJzendoorn & Juffer, 2006), the fact that the U.S. sample was significantly older at adoption than the other samples likely placed them at greater risk for developmental challenges, a factor previously found to be a personal barrier to attending BCS activities. Researchers noted that ICA families whose children had significant physical, emotional, and/or behavioral issues were less likely to participate in BCS practices (e.g., postadoption groups; R. M. Lee et al., 2006; Paulsen & Merighi, 2009).

Yet, the current study's results indicated the opposite: of the three groups, the U.S. parents reported significantly higher BCS activities than the Dutch; although differences between the American and Norwegian samples were not significant, the U.S. sample still experienced a greater number of activities than the Norwegians. Results did not support the findings of R. M. Lee et al. (2006) and Paulsen and Merighi (2009). Possible influences may relate to pre-adoption care differences in children's countries-of-origin (i.e., types/levels of pre-adoption care in China, Guatemala, Romania, and Russia vs. India).

Fourth, although children's mean age at the time of the study was not significantly different across samples, if comparing results to other BCS studies whose adoptees' mean ages were older or younger, comparisons may yield varying results. For example, the types/numbers of activities children experienced are reportedly dependent on age, developmental/cognitive skills, social availability, and that the emphasis that parents place on BCS has been found to change as children grow older (Scroggs & Heitfield, 2001; Thomas & Tessler, 2007). Scroggs and Heitfield (2001) also noted that, as adoptees aged, BCS activities can wane, reflective of older children's competing demands in extracurricular activities (e.g., sports) found prevalent in American, middle–upper income ICA families. Increased involvement in extracurricular activities also exposes children more to their community-at-large (i.e., outside of family and neighborhood) where they may be first perceived as an ethnoracial minority versus a member of the White majority via their adoptive family membership. Whether these socialization patterns can be generalized across countries is unknown, but they may influence what exposure children have with negative experiences to adoption, birth country, skin color, and racial and positive discrimination as well as with whom adoptees may have these encounters.

Children's Negative Experiences

The Dutch sample reported the least negative reactions from others overall. Children's negative experiences with others, and with whom they had those experiences, may have been influenced by cultural or political contextual factors. For example, this may relate to The Netherland's long-standing, historical reputation as one of the most tolerant and liberal European countries; Zick, Pettigrew, and Wagner (2008) noted Dutch tolerance as particularly relevant when dealing with issues related to immigration and integration.

Second, outcomes may have been influenced by the fact that Indian adoptees physically resemble members of a highly integrated Dutch Caribbean minority group—the Surinamese. Many Surinamese are second and third generation citizens from immigration, are often well-educated and with favorable standing in the labor market, and are more accepted in Dutch society than other immigrant groups (i.e., Turks; Moroccans; Michon & Vermeulen, 2013). Subsequently, Dutch T–ICA parents of Indian adoptees may perceive/see others perceive their children as being Surinamese-like in reference to success in Dutch culture. In the current study, this perception may have impacted why Dutch parents worried significantly less about children's negative experiences than the Norwegian and U.S. samples. Moreover, it may have also influenced parents' original decision to internationally adopt a child from India versus another sending country.

Third, differences may relate to the Dutch significant political shift in immigration practices/policies over the last two decades—from an approach of multiculturalism to one of integration. In the

early 1980s, Dutch multiculturalism policies originally funded cultural "maintenance efforts, exemptions from certain laws and regulations that might disadvantage minority groups, and antiracism legislation that recognizes diversity and [took] affirmative steps to overcome discrimination" (Wright & Bloemraad, 2012, p. 78).Yet, debate arose in the 1990s as to whether multiculturalism undermined immigrants' sense of membership in Dutch society, as immigrants faced even greater economic and social disparity since the policies' institution (Semyonov, Raijman, & Gorodzeisky, 2008). Following, Dutch policies moved toward civic integration of the country's immigrant populations (Akkerman & Hagelund, 2007; Joppke, 2007).

If a public message was that the promotion of immigrants' biculturalism was actually hindering social and economic success in Dutch society—and parents felt that their Indian children were being seen by others as immigrants—greater focus on BCS may have been perceived by parents as a possible impediment for children's success in mainstream culture. Dutch parents may have extrapolated these cultural experiences to inform their parenting practices—a message that emphasis on birth culture must be well balanced with residence culture, as overemphasis may disadvantage and set children apart within themselves and others in their culture.

American parents reported that adoptees had significantly greater negative reactions from classmates about their adoption and birth country than the Dutch or Norwegian adoptees. This may relate to the physical obviousness of T–ICA children's adoptive status with classmates paired with living in a country in which adoption has been known to be stigmatizing (i.e., United States). Adoptive family stigma is a phenomenon referred to in the North American adoption literature, relaying a societal view that it is somehow less desirable or normal to build a family through adoption versus biological means (see Brodzinsky & Pinderhughes, 2002; Kirk, 1964; Wegar, 2000). The international adoption literature wrongly supports adoption stigma by emphasizing it from a loss or child-deficits perspective (van IJzendoorn & Juffer, 2006). Leon (2002) argued that this loss perspective reinforces the American myth about the "normal" family, an idea that may be further influenced by the media's negative portrayal of adoption (Kline, Chatterjee, & Karel, 2009).

As in other studies (Thomas & Tessler, 2007; Lareau, 2000), classmates appeared to be a source of negative experiences for American T–ICA adoptees related to children's significant encounters with racial discrimination. If parents conceptualized BCS as a way to cope with adoption stigma and racial discrimination, it may have influenced why American parents reported more use of BCS practices when compared to the Dutch and Norwegian samples. This is consistent with R. M. Lee (2005) and Branscombe et al.'s (1999) findings, identifying BCS as a tool that strengthened American T–ICA adoptees' ethnic identities while fostering resilience in the face of racial discrimination.

For Norwegians, classmates were also a source of negative reactions to the issue of adoption when compared to the Dutch sample. Norwegian parents additionally noted greater negative reactions from neighborhood peers when compared to the American parents. This may relate to Thomas and Tessler's (2007) premise about a middle–upper income (American) child rearing practice in which children are socialized less in neighborhoods and more in the community-at-large through participation in organized, extracurricular activities (Lareau, 2000). Subsequently, results may be influenced by access—Norwegians may socialize children more in their neighborhoods where T–ICA children and neighborhood peers have more opportunity for encounters of all kinds, not just negative ones.

Adoptive families and children live in an age of globalization and exposure to multiple cultures, races and ethnicities. A strong cultural identity offers strength-building opportunities for families (Groza, Houlihan, & Wood, 2005) and is consistent with how many countries interpret implementation of the Hague Convention on ICA. Parents are charged with the responsibility of fostering adopted children's cultural identity formation and competence through a tender balance between cultivating their cultures-of-origin and cultures-of-residence. A bicultural identity may result in more complex responses to the issues adoptees encounter across the life cycle, specifically in adult life (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006). Parents who share ethnic socialization experiences with their young adopted children may enhance positive parent–child relationships (i.e., increased communication and emotional connectedness within the dyad) during childhood and adolescence (Yoon, 2001), and a positive parent–child relationship results in an array of positive psychosocial child outcomes (i.e., increased self-confidence, positive mental health, and well-being) (Noy-Sharav, 2005; Stams, Juffer, & Van IJzendoorn, 2002).

Limitations

Limitations of the current study include the following: There were different sampling strategies between countries and there was a low response rate for American adoptive families as compared to Dutch and Norwegian samples. Further, there was a lack of standardized measures with established psychometric properties beyond face validity. Data was gathered from parents versus directly from children and second hand report may over or underestimate children's negative experiences for a variety of reasons (i.e., social desirability, child may not tell parent about all of their negative experiences). Even with these limitations, this study represents a major step forward in adoption research. All surveys used in the three countries had the same pertinent questions and the study is, to our knowledge, the first collaboration across countries evaluating similar issues in the same population of adopted children and families.

Implications for Future Research

In future research of transnational studies of T–ICA family BCS practices it would be extremely informative to compare responses of children and parents to determine how similarly the dyads report about children's experiences with others related to adoption, racial discrimination, and positive discrimination (see Reinoso et al., 2012). Further studies should also explore how adoptive parents' ethnoracial-cultural and/or sociopolitical blind spots may hinder awareness, impact parenting choices, and affect parent–child relationships (e.g., whether children are emotionally open with parents about classmates negative reactions).

Also, future research may view ethnoracial heterogeneity in a way that includes an Indian diaspora perspective to determine the role of adoptees resemblance to other specific immigrant populations (as in our study, the Indian adoptees in The Netherlands resembled the Surinamese immigrants). Attention should be given in future studies to the use of standardized instruments. As a number of studies have used these same BCS questions, future studies may look at standardizing the IBSE–P, APBS, the negative reactions questions, and the questions about parental worry. Benefits of the current and future studies will inform adoption professionals and mental health providers as to how to guide adoptive parents in preparing and supporting children when faced with ethnoracial-cultural and adoption challenges and racial discrimination.

References

Akkerman, T., & Hagelund, A. (2007). "Women and children first!" Anti-immigration parties and gender in Norway and the Netherlands. *Patterns of Prejudice, 41,* 197–214. doi:10.1080/00313220701265569

Altstein, H., Coster, M., First-Hartling, L., Ford, C. Glasoe, B., Hairston, S., . . . Grier, A. (1994). Clinical observations of adult intercountry adoptees and their adoptive parents. *Child Welfare, 73,* 261–269.

Baden, A. (2010, July). *Forcing the conversation: Racial and cultural issues in adoption*. Keynote address at the 2010 international conference on adoption research, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Bailey, J. (2007). A practice model to protect ethnic identity of international adoptees. *Journal of Family Social Work, 10*(3), 1–11. doi:10.1300/J039v10n03_01

Baran, A., & Pannor, R. (1990). Open adoption. In D. Brodzinsky & M. D. Schechter (Eds.), *The psychology of adoption* (pp. 316–331). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bergquist, K., Campbell, M., & Unrau, Y. (2003). Caucasian parents and Korean adoptees: A survey of parents' perceptions. *Adoption Quarterly, 6*(4), 41–58. doi:10.1300/J145v06n04_03

Bowman, P. J., & Howard, C. (1985). Race-related socialization, motivation, and academic achievement: A study of Black youths in three-generation families. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24,* 134–141.

Branscombe, N., Schmitt, M., & Harvey, R. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 135–149. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.135

Brodzinsky, D. M., & Pinderhughes, E. (2002). Parenting and child development in adoptive families. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 1. Children and parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 279–311). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brodzinsky, D. M., Schechter, M., & Henig, R. (1992). *Being adopted: The lifelong search for self*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Brodzinsky, D. M., Singer, L., & Braff, D. (1984). Children's understanding of adoption. *Child Development, 55,* 869–878. doi:10.2307/1130138

Brottveit, A. (2003). *Ethnic identity among adult intercountry adoptees in Norway*. Paper presented at the International Adoptions Conference, Korea Klubben, The meaning of roots: Ethnic identity and biological heritage, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Carstens, C., & Julia, M. (2000). Ethnoracial awareness in ICA: U.S. experiences. *International Social Work, 43,* 61–73.

Caughy, M. O., O'Campo, P., Randolph, S., & Nickerson, K. (2002). The influence of racial socialization practices on the cognitive and behavioral competence of African American preschoolers. *Child Development, 73,* 1611–1625. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00493

Central Adoption Resource Agency (CARA). (n.d.). *Adoption statistics*. Available at http://adoptionindia.nic.in/Resources/Adoption-Statistics.html

Central Intelligence Agency. (2007). *World factbook 2007*. Available at https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html

Central Intelligence Agency. (2011). *Population (2000) by country*. Available at http://www.NationMaster.com/graph/peo_pop-people-population&date=2000

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Convention on the Rights of Children. (1989). *United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights website*. Retreived from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx

Curran, P., West, S., & Finch, J. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to non-normality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 1,* 16–29. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.1.16

Dalen, M., & Saetersdal, B. (1987). Transracial adoption in Norway. *Adoption & Fostering, 11*(4), 41–46. doi:10.1177/030857598701100413

Damodaran, A., & Mehta, N. (2000). Child adoption in India: An overview. In P. Selman (Ed.), *International adoption: Developments, trends and perspectives* (pp. 405–418). London, England: British Agencies for Adoption and Fostering.

Farver, J. M., Narang, S., & Bhadha, B. (2002). East meets West: Ethnic identity, acculturation, and conflict in Asian Indian families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16,* 338–350. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.16.3.338

Freidlander, M., Larney, L., Skau, M., Hotaling, M., Cutting, M., & Scham, M. (2000). Bicultural identification: Experiences of internationally adopted children and their parents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 187–198. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.2.187

Grotevant, H., Dunbar, N., Kohler, J., & Esau, A. (2000). Adoptive identity: How contexts within and beyond the family shape developmental pathways. *Family Relations, 49,* 379–387. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00379.x

Groza, V., Houlihan, L., & Wood, Z. (2005). Overview of adoption. In G. Mallon & P. Hess (Eds.), *Child welfare for the 21st century: A handbook of practices, policies and programs* (pp. 432–451). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Hague Adoption Convention. (1993). *The Hague convention of 29 May 1993 on protection of children and co-operation in respect of intercountry adoption*. The Hague Conference on Private International Law website. Retrieved from http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=text.display&tid=45

Hellerstedt, W. L., Madsen, N., Gunnar, M., Grotevant, H., Lee, R., & Johnson, D. (2008). The international adoption project: Population-based surveillance of Minnesota parents who adopted children internationally. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 12,* 162–171. doi:10.1007/s10995-007-0237-9

Hollingsworth, L. D. (1997). Effect of transracial/trans-ethnic adoption on children's racial and ethnic identity and self-esteem: A meta-analytic review. *Marriage & Family Review, 25,* 99–130. doi:10.1300/J002v25n01_07

Howell, S., & Marre, D. (2006). To kin a transnationally adopted child in Norway or Spain: The achievement of resemblances and belonging. *Ethnos, 71,* 293–316. doi:10.1080/00141840600902679

Hübinette, T. (2012). Post-racial utopianism, white color-blindness and "the elephant in the room": Racial issues for transnational adoptees of color. In J. L. Gibbons & K. S. Rotabi (Eds.), *Intercountry adoption: Policies, practices, and outcomes* (pp. 221–230). London, England: Ashgate.

Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63,* 981–995. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00981.x

Huh, N., & Reid, W. (2000). Intercountry, transracial adoption and ethnic identity: A Korean example. *International Social Work, 43,* 75–87.

Jaccard, J., & Becker, M. (2010). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Joppke, C. (2007). Transformation of immigrant integration civic integration and antidiscrimination in The Netherlands, France, and Germany. *World Politics, 59,* 243–273. doi:10.1353/wp.2007.0022

Juffer, F. (2006). Children's awareness of adoption and their problem behavior of families with 7 year old internationally-adopted children. *Adoption Quarterly, 9,* 1–22. doi:10.1300/J145v09n02_01

Juffer, F., & Tieman, W. (2009). Being adopted. Internationally adopted children's interest and feelings. *International Social Work, 52,* 635–647. doi:10.1177/0020872809337682

Killian, C., & Hegtvedt, K. (2003). The role of parents in the maintenance of second generation Vietnamese cultural behaviors. *Sociological Spectrum, 23,* 213–245. doi:10.1080/02732170309214

Kirk, D. (1984). *Shared fate: A theory and method of adoptive relationships* (2nd ed.). Brentwood Bay, Canada: Ben-Simon.

Kirk, D. (1985). *Adoptive kinship: A modern institution in need of reform* (2nd ed.). Port Angeles, WA: Ben-Simon.

Kirk, H. D. (1964). *Shared fate: A theory of adoption and mental health*. London: Glencoe, NY: Free Press.

Kline, S. L., Chatterjee, K., & Karel, A. (2009). Healthy depictions? Depicting adoption and adoption news events on broadcast news. *Journal of Health Communication, 14,* 56–69. doi:10.1080/10810730802592254

Kohn, M. (1987). Cross-national research as an analytic strategy. *American Sociological Review, 52,* 713–731. doi:10.2307/2095831

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114,* 395–412. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.114.3.395

Lareau, A. (2000). My wife can tell me who I know: Methodological and conceptual problems in studying fathers. *Qualitative Sociology, 23,* 407–433. doi:10.1023/A:1005574724760

Laxmi Kant Pandey v Union of India, SC 469 (AIR 1984)

Lee, D. C., & Quintana, S. (2005). Benefits of cultural exposure and development of Korean perspective-taking ability for transracially adopted Korean children. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11,* 130–143. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.11.2.130

Lee, R. M. (2003). The transracial adoption paradox: History, research, and counseling implications of cultural socialization. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 711–744. doi:10.1177/0011000003258087

Lee, R. M. (2005). Resilience against discrimination: Ethnic identity and other-group orientation as protective factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 36–44. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.36

Lee, R. M., Grotevant, H., Hellerstedt, W., Gunnar, M. R., & the Minnesota International Adoption Project Team. (2006). Cultural socialization in families with internationally adopted children. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20,* 571–580. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.20.4.571

Leon, I. G, (2002). Adoption losses: Naturally occurring or socially constructed? *Child Development, 73,* 652–663. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00429

Macedo, N. (2000). A home away from home: The experience of an Indian child welfare programme. In P. Selman (Ed.), *International adoption: Developments, trends and perspectives* (pp. 419–433). London, England: British Agencies for Adoption and Fostering.

Michon, L., & Vermeulen, F. (2013). Explaining different trajectories in immigrant political integration: Moroccans and Turks in Amsterdam. *West European Politics, 36,* 597–614. doi:10.1080/01402382.2013.773727

Noy-Sharav, D. (2005). Identity concerns in ICA-immigrants as adoptive parents. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 33,* 173–191. doi:10.1007/s10615-005-3531-2

Overseas Indian Facilitation Centre (OIFC). (n.d.). Ministry of Overseas Indian Facilitation website. Retreived from http://www.oifc.in/Diaspora/Facts-on-Indian-Diaspora

Palacios, J., & Brodzinsky, D. (2010). Adoption research: Trends, topics, outcomes. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 34,* 270–284. doi:10.1177/0165025410362837

Paulsen, C., & Merighi, J. (2009). Adoption preparedness, cultural engagement, and parental satisfaction in intercountry adoption. *Adoption Quarterly, 12,* 1–18. doi:10.1080/10926750902791540

Pett, M., Lackey, N., & Sullivan, J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis. The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 499–514. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.499

Reinoso, M., Juffer, F., & Tieman, W. (2012). Children's and parents' thoughts and feelings about adoption, birth culture identity, and discrimination in families with internationally adopted children. *Child & Family Social Work, 18,* 264–274. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2206.2012.00841.x

Rojewski, J. (2005). A typical American family? How adoptive families acknowledge and incorporate Chinese cultural heritage into their lives. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal, 22,* 133–164. doi:10.1007/s10560-005-3415-x

Root, M. (Ed.). (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rosenberg, K., Adams, K., & Groza, V. (2001). Transracial adoptions. In V. Groza & K. F. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Clinical and practice issues in adoption: Bridging the gap between adoptees placed as infants and as older children* (Rev., pp. 167–186). Westport, CT: Bergen & Garvey.

Rosenthal, J., & Groze, V. (1992). *Special needs adoption: A study of intact families*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Scroggs, P., & Heitfield, H. (2001). International adopters and their children: Birth culture ties. *Gender Issues, 19,* 3–30. doi:10.1007/s12147-001-1005-6

Selman, P. (2009). The rise and fall of ICA in the 21st century. *International Social Work, 52,* 575–594. doi:10.1177/0020872809337681

Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., & Gorodzeisky, A. (2008). Foreigners' impact on European society's public views and perceptions in a cross-national comparative perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 49,* 5–29. doi:10.1177/0020715207088585

Stams, G.-J., Juffer, F., & Van IJzendoorn, M. (2002). Maternal sensitivity, infant attachment, and temperament predict adjustment in middle childhood: The case of adopted children and their biologically unrelated parents. *Developmental Psychology, 38,* 806–821. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.38.5.806

Stevenson, H., Reed, J., Bodison, P., & Bishop, A. (1997). Racism stress management: Racial social beliefs and the appearance of depression and anger in African American youth. *Youth & Society, 29,* 197–222. doi:10.1177/0044118X97029002003

Steward, R., & Baden, L. (1995). *The cultural-racial identity model: Understanding the racial identity and cultural identity development of transracial adoptees*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Tadmor, C., & Tetlock, P. (2006). Biculturalism: A model of the effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37,* 173–190. doi:10.1177/0022022105284495

Tessler, R., & Gamache, G. (2012). Ethnic exploration and consciousness of difference: Chinese adoptees in early adolescence, *Adoption Quarterly, 15,* 265–287. doi:10.1080/10926755.2012.731031

Tessler, R., Gamache, G., & Liu, L. (1999). *West meets East: Americans adopt Chinese children*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tessler, R., Tuan, M., & Shiao, J. (2011). The many faces of international adoption. *Contexts, 10*(4), 34–39. doi:10.1177/1536504211427866

Tharmalingam, S. (2011). Towards integration in Norway: Dynamics of cultural incorporation in the context of transnationalization. *International Migration & Integration, 14,* 1–18.

Thomas, K., & Tessler, R. (2007). BCS among adoptive families: Where there is a will, there is a way. *Journal of Family Issues, 28,* 1189–1219. doi:10.1177/0192513X07301115

United Nations General Assembly. (2009). *The promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights including the right to development. Human Rights Council, Eleventh Session, Agenda Item 3*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/aids/files/UN_Guidelines_for_alternative_care_of_children.pdf

Valentine, C. (1971). Deficit, difference, and bicultural models of Afro American behavior. *Harvard Educational Review, 33,* 813–822.

Van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Juffer, F. (2006). The Emanuel Miller memorial lecture 2006: Adoption as intervention. Meta-analytic evidence for massive catch-up and plasticity in physical, socio-emotional, and cognitive development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47,* 1228–1245. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01675.x

Vité, S., & Boéchat, H. (2008). Article 21 adoption. In A. Alen . (Eds.), *A commentary on the United Nations convention on the rights of the child. Leiden,* The Netherlands: Nijhoff.

Vonk, M., & Massatti, R. (2008). Factors related to transracial adoptive parents' levels of cultural competence. *Adoption Quarterly, 11,* 204–226. doi:10.1080/10926750802421966

Wegar, K. (2000). Adoption, family ideology, and social stigma: Bias in community attitudes, adoption research, and practice. *Family Relations, 49,* 363–369. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00363.x

Wright, M., & Bloemraad, I. (2012). Is there a trade-off between multiculturalism and socio-political integration? Policy regimes and immigrant incorporation in comparative perspective. *Perspectives on Politics, 10,* 77–95. doi:10.1017/S1537592711004919

Yngvesson, B. (2002). Placing the "gift child" in transnational adoption. *Law & Society Review, 36,* 227–256. doi:10.2307/1512176

Yoon, D. (2001). Casual modeling predicting psychological adjustment of Korean-born, adolescent adoptees. *Journal of Human Behavior in Social Environment, 3*(3/4), 65–82.

Yoon, D. (2004). ICA: The importance of ethnic socialization and subjective well-being for Korean-born adopted children. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 13,* 71–89. doi:10.1300/J051v13n02_04

Zick, A., Pettigrew, T., & Wagner, U. (2008). Ethnic prejudice and discrimination in Europe. *Journal of Social Issues, 64,* 233–251. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00559.x