University Honors Theses   University Honors College

Spring 6-1-2022

Multiple Identities, Colorblind White Parents, and Persisting Adoption Stigma: Toward an Intersectional Perspective of Asian American Transracial Adoption

Michelle Y. Leipzig
Portland State University

Multiple identities, colorblind White parents, and persisting adoption stigma:

Toward an intersectional perspective of Asian American transracial adoption

by

Michelle Y. Leipzig

An undergraduate honors thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Science

in

University Honors

Psychology

and

Social Science

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Emily Shafer, Ph.D.

Portland State University

2022

Abstract

Asian TRAs' experiences are continually shaped by United States policies that were installed to safeguard the current White dominant power structure. The existential threat of COVID-19 imitates the fear-based conditions that historically galvanized the White dominant majority to execute sinophobic immigration laws, imprison hundreds of thousands of Japanese Americans during World War II, and overturn federal abortion rights for women - in a striking display of relevance, the last example occurred during the development of this thesis. Asian TRAs' proximity to Whiteness through their adoption into White families can prevent them from garnering the tools necessary to navigate a racist society; thus, efforts toward racial/ethnic socialization should surpass superficial cultural tourism practices and additionally incorporate socialization with members of the TRAs' ethnic group who can draw on their firsthand experiences to share coping mechanisms and solidarity.

Asian American transracial adoptees (TRAs) occupy an array of identities that intersect and paradoxically contradict each other. The group is both privileged and stigmatized due to the convergence of their identities, which requires additional research to facilitate a complete understanding of their unique identity composition. Because their dual statuses as adoptees and as ethnic minorities bear substantial joint sociohistorical context rooted in xenophobia, geopolitics, and racial construction, these factors should not be extricated from one another. This thesis argues that examining the origins of Asian transracial adoption can reveal its innately overlapping sociohistorical influences, the sum of which will contribute to contemporary discourse regarding intersectionality and critical race theory.

Keywords: transracial adoption, critical race theory, model minority myth, colorblindness, bionormative

Introduction

Asian American transracial adoptees (TRAs) are situated at the intersection of race and adoption, spanning two categories that are stigmatized in the United States because of their deviations from the norm: White biological families (White et al., 2021). A recent surge in anti-Asian violence evokes an earlier era of Yellow Peril, which began as a xenophobic perception of Chinese people as a threat to American society and eventually grew to encompass other Asian groups, giving rise to housing segregation policies, the internment of over 100,000 Japanese Americans in concentration camps, and discriminatory anti-Asian immigration policies (Gover et al., 2020). Considering Lee's (2003) delineation of a "transracial adoption paradox," referring to the contradictory experiences TRAs face when their ethnic and racial identities are not acknowledged by themselves or others because they were placed in White families, Wing and Park-Taylor commenced a 2022 survey of Chinese TRAs and found that the most recent flood of anti-Asian sentiment stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic "presented as a multilayered threat to Chinese transracial adoptees' physical and emotional well-being and sense of belonging in their adoptive families, extended communities, and in the U.S. at large" (p. 9). Investigating this multilayered threat can offer insight into the unique situation of Asian TRAs in the United States.

American society's widespread reaction to the existential threat of COVID-19 – to broadly emphasize and target Asian otherness – exemplifies the vulnerable position occupied by ethnic minorities who are blocked from group membership to the dominant culture based on narratives embedded in historically racist contexts (Azhar et al., 2022). The tendency for White Americans to conceptualize Asians as a panethnic group fails to recognize the diversity of Asian-Americans, who span "over twenty-four distinct ethnic groups with different languages, cultures,

and customs" (Yi & Museus, 2016, p. 1). Likewise, pinning pandemic-related anxieties on multiple Asian American communities not only reproduces "historically repetitive" othering (Gover et al., 2020, pp. 661) but also ignores the significant cultural differences between China - the purported origin of the virus - and other Asian countries. This tendency to amalgamate diverse Asian cultures exposes a persistent White blindness to unique racial qualities, demonstrating a facet of colorblind worldviews which contend that race does not constitute a significant factor in the United States (Morgan & Langrehr, 2018).

American Race Relations

Asian TRAs seeking identity coherence contend with a dearth of research pertaining to the intersectionality of their identities. Kohatsu et al. (2000) describe Asian Americans as existing in "the neglected middle of the race spectrum" (p. 335), with most research on racial groups spotlighting intergroup tension between White and Black Americans. Transracial adoption also situates TRAs in a "racial and cultural 'no man's land', neither fully accepted by the White majority society nor the cultural/racial community from which they originated" (Tuan, 2008, p. 1850). Interdisciplinary research incorporates the individual composition of transracial adoptees' identities as possessing the potential to elucidate on the numerous unique interlocking factors that impact their identity formation, familial bonds, and racial self-conceptualization. Scrutinizing some of the parallels connecting the origins of Asian transracial adoption to modern Asian TRAs' concerns can facilitate appropriate support for present and future TRAs. Asian Americans comprise the fastest-growing racial group in the United States, numbering an estimated 22.2 million in 2018 with projections to become largest immigrant group in the United States by 2055 (Gover et al., 2020, p. 650), yet historical patterns show a continual othering that divorces their identities from authentic American legitimacy (Azhar et al., 2022).

By exploring some of the underlying mechanisms that privilege the White biological American family model and incorporating historical context into modern social issues for Asian American TRAs, this thesis draws on critical race theory (CRT) to offer a thorough, more nuanced approach to organizing transracial adoptees' intersectional experiences. Asian TRAs face the typical bionormative stigma associated with adoption with an added ongoing negotiation of intersectional racial and ethnic identity issues that invite discrimination, impact identity formation, and encumber societal acceptance. COVID-19 is the most recent and visible fear-based crisis in a string of events throughout America's history that repeatedly alienate Asian Americans from American group membership, including Asian TRAs whose typical exclusion from Asian American research creates space for special attention toward awareness and support.

This paper begins with definitions of key terms followed by an overview of adoption stigma with a focus on the sociohistorical process by which Asian American TRAs came to grapple with alienation from both Asian and American group memberships. Subsequent sections situate the mechanisms of those historical themes within modern concerns. The arguments will conclude with suggestions toward future research directions and touch on modern sociopolitical concerns that buttress the urgency of this paper's objective.

Defining Key Terms

This thesis synthesizes interdisciplinary social science fields to present its body of evidence. For the purpose of this thesis, the following definitions will be used:

- Bionormative: Baker (2008) conceptualizes bionormativity as the byproduct of a parental regime based on biology and biological connection that regulates parenthood and codifies family structures (p. 3).

- Stigma: Stigma refers to discrimination stemming from deviation from social norms which regulate and enforce social acceptance (White et al., 2021).

- Colorblindness: Individuals claiming colorblindness refute the influence of race or ethnicity, often in the context of dismissal toward an individual who has experienced racial discrimination (Kim et al., p. 8).

- Intersectional: Intersectionality refers to the interconnectedness and hierarchy of oppressions; its foundational principles draw on Critical Race Theory (CRT), or the conception of racism as systemically baked into American society at every level rather than as individual discriminatory acts or attitudes (Azhar et al., 2021).

- Microaggression: Microaggressions refer to the subtle acts of discrimination disseminated via words, behaviors, and attitudes that are often committed without intent, but oppress the recipient regardless of the motivation (Garber & Groveant, 2015).

- Model minority myth: The model minority myth is a stereotype assigned to Asian Americans that portrays them in an ostensibly flattering light by celebrating their academic and monetary success attributed to stereotypes of industriousness, framing them as a monolithic, hard-working immigrant group in a way that obfuscates the continuing discrimination and intergroup tension that results from this narrative (Yi & Museus, 2016).

Adoption Stigma in the United States

Transracial adoption is fraught with complicated and often contradictory social perceptions, many of which center around adoption itself as inferior to the purportedly intrinsic bonds formed through genetic connection (White et al., 2021). Fisher (2003) cites a national

survey of family growth showing that "15% of all women who had been treated for infertility had sought to adopt," while another survey of California adoptive parents showed that a mere 27% "chose to adopt even though they had no fertility problems;" most reported choosing adoption because of their inability to produce biological children (p. 338). While Americans tend to publicly express support for adoption, there is a behavioral discrepancy – they rarely choose adoption to resolve pregnancies or infertility despite adoptions having mostly favorable outcomes, the availability of inexpensive domestic adoption via foster care, and a $10,000 federal income tax credit to allay the costs of adoption (Fisher, 2003). Van Laningham et al. (2012) cite several studies which deliver contradictory statistics: an overwhelming proportion of respondents reported favorable attitudes toward adoption and agreed that parenting an adopted child could as satisfying or more satisfying than parenting biological children, yet in a 2008 survey of American women between the ages of 18-44, only 1.1% had ever adopted and 1.6% were currently seeking to adopt. In one study, parents admitted they saw adoption as a "backup plan" for unsuccessful fertility treatments; this is corroborated by data showing that over one million Americans seek fertility treatment compared to the 60,000 who adopted children to whom they were not genetically related (Van Laningham et al., 2012), and many couples continue infertility treatments indefinitely at great expense and with little success (Fisher, 2003). Research on infertility and adoption indicates that adoption is generally considered the last resort to having biological children when all other methods to achieve genetic parenthood have failed (Van Laningham et al., 2012).

Adoption's image as an altruistic practice can mask its concurrent stigmatized realities including a secondary status in relation to biological kinship ties, presumptions of more mental and/or physical problems than their non-adopted peers, and fears of biological relatives returning

to claim the child (Fisher, 2003). Additionally, popular media plays a powerful role in distorting the image of adoption "toward the dramatic, the sensational, and the exploitative" (Fisher, 2003, p. 354). Fisher (2003) noted a consistent trend in the number of adoption mentions in both college texts and mass media: they bore the exact same proportions, two negative points about adoption for each positive one. Nearly half of respondents in a 2002 survey indicated that they saw internationally adopted children as potentially more medically and behaviorally problematic than domestically adopted children (Lee, 2008). These factors cause adoptees to have additional contextual stigmatized status as they are devalued by cultural bionormativity that upholds biological relationships as the sole source of authentic familial and parental connections (Fisher, 2003; Garber & Grotevant, 2015).

When directed toward TRAs, adoption-related microaggressions arising from bionormative stigma often incorporate racial microaggressions (Baden, 2016; Branco, 2022; Morgan & Langrehr, 2019; Steinberg, 2018; White et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2019). Pertinent themes to this phenomenon emerge throughout Zhang's (2019) survey of Chinese TRAs' run-ins with microaggressions which the author classifies as follows: Alien In Own Land, Second Class Citizen, Ascription of Intelligence, and Invalidation of Interethnic Differences. The study's findings suggested that adopted and racial microaggressions overlapped within singular events, and as a result, TRAs can end up negotiating multiple microaggression messages at once (2019). Baden (2016) makes an adjacent claim about the layered multiple messages within microaggressions that connect adoption to illegitimacy and failure of the parents while characterizing adopted children of color as rescued out of negative circumstances. The perception of adoptive parents as "damaged" because of infertility conduces to the notion that they are fundamentally unable to truly parent, joined with assertions that their "adopted children

aren't really 'their own'" (p. 18). The study furnishes examples including "How much did you pay for your baby?", "why didn't her REAL family want her" (referring to the adoptee), and comments to adoptees from their adoptive parents suggesting that the adoptee would have been "a prostitute," "living on the streets," or even "dead on the street" had they not been adopted (pp. 5, 10). Baden observes pervading themes that accentuate adoption's transactional qualities which invite hurtful questions that contribute to stereotypes of adoptees as unwanted, question the legitimacy of their non-genetic kinship ties and objectify the child, and transmit invalidating discourse contending that the adoptee's life would have been of destitution without the parent's intervention (2016). Suter and Ballard (2009) further underscore the objectification theme throughout complimentary microaggressions toward Chinese TRAs that liken them to playthings such as China dolls and ask explicit questions about their adoption story; taken together, objectifying microaggressions dehumanize Chinese TRAs and disregard their right to privacy. Baden (2016) and Zhang (2019) describe the potential difficulty for adoptees to recognize some of the problematic comments because they are positively framed, even as the adoptees endure enormous pressure to feel gratitude for being adopted out of their native countries. Baden suggests that depicting TRAs as beneficiaries of their adoptive parents' self-sacrificing rescue from alleged indigence into a better life accordingly connotes racist assumptions about the inferiority of TRAs' native countries and biological parents, enacted by simultaneous processes of denigration and glorification that cooperatively advocate both biological and American superiority (2016).

Baden's (2016) taxonomy of transracial adoption microaggressions undertakes an analysis of the positive associations linking adoption to philanthropic stereotypes which can reinforce biological families as normative through emphasizing the adoptive parent's purported

altruism and the optics of adoption itself as charitable, qualities which are not typically attached to non-adoptive parents. The results also differentiate TRAs from domestic same-race adoptees considering that transracial adoption invokes microaggressions reflecting an added dimension of cultural philanthropy, "which refers to American exceptionalism or cultural exceptionalism and is analogous to the belief that adopted people fare better in America when reared by Americans" (p. 11). Parsed for meaning, this belief insinuates a marriage of whiteness and American culture, which reinforces the concealed White supremacist ideology within the positive framing of transracial adoption. Cultural philanthropy is salient to Sue's (2004) claim that ethnocentric monoculturalism, or the "invisible veil of a worldview" that culturally conditions White Euro Americans to espouse a colorblind worldview, perpetuates a myth conflating social standing and success with intrinsic merit and inherent value. Sue (2004) argues that abundant historical evidence connects the dots between the West's history of colonization and the underlying racist idea that other groups are inferior, with an emphasis on the denial of whiteness and White privilege as a mechanism which continually imposes the status quo. Change is difficult to achieve because of this system's invisibility and the reassertion of its own dominant power structure which provides privileges for the dominant group; this discourages acknowledgement of the issue and provides compelling reasons not to enact the systemic change required to treat other groups more equitably (Sue, 2004).

Analyzing the multidimensionality of Asian TRAs' bouts with microaggressions highlights the intersection of race and adoption. The following historical overview of transracial adoption in the U.S. illustrates the practice's role as a "tool of colonization" (Branco, 2022, p. 23) with the goal of showing the connection between the model minority myth, transracial adoption, and modern intergroup race relations.

Manufacturing the Monolithic Model Minority

The sharp escalation of anti-Asian hate crimes in the devastating wake of the COVID-19 pandemic is the most recent in a pattern of fear-based xenophobic scapegoating events throughout U.S. history. Attempts to assuage such fears victimized those who were seen as outsiders to the group identity; for example, Gover et al. (2020) cite how public health officials responded to the 1900 outbreak of the bubonic plague in San Francisco by quarantining Chinese residents in Chinatown, notably "the epicenter of the outbreak, while allowing white merchants to leave" (p. 653), to demonstrate the government's role in enforcing anti-Chinese racism and contextualize it as a recurrent systemic issue. The mass incarceration of Japanese people in internment camps in response to the Pearl Harbor attacks during World War II arises as one of the most noteworthy instances of the U.S. government endorsing anti-Asian discrimination, further underscored by social workers' advocacy of the policies which supported White supremacy (Azhar et al., 2022, p. 59). The shunning and physical relocation of entire Asian populations as reactions to fear epitomizes Asian groups' ideological alienation from White group identity and showcases how defending White safety has repeatedly been privileged above Asian Americans' rights.

The U.S. has historically lumped Asian cultures together with the help of popular culture and media, correspondingly resulting in Asian Americans' treatment as "one menacing group" (Laybourn, 2021, p. 120). The Yellow Peril myth, or the "Western fear of uncivilized, nonwhite Asian invasion and domination" (Tessler et al., 2020, p. 638), was central to the construction of this unified category. Around the late 1890s, an influx of East Asian labor immigration merged with publicized news of overseas Japanese war victories to intensify perceptions of all Asians – domestic and foreign – as dangerous perpetual foreigners who were easily distinguished from

other ethnic groups by immutable phenotypical Asian characteristics and were established as

aliens "who were not to be trusted in the same way as Americans of other ancestries" (Gover et

al., 2020, p. 651). The implicit portrayal of Asian American immigrants as a group of

threatening, unwelcome potential usurpers situated them as ideological opposites to White

culture and elevated previously oppressed minority groups in the U.S. to a higher social status

that was tied to their White European ancestry; Anti-Asian exclusion leagues and labor groups,

notably headed by White European immigrants, underscored their own whiteness as an

intrinsically American quality that "secured them the right of naturalized citizenship, while

Asians were consistently denied naturalization by law and in the courts," legally codifying them

as "aliens ineligible to citizenship" (Lee, 2002, p. 51). White nativism sweeping the country at

the time discriminated against many ethnicities, but unlike groups such as Black Americans,

Asian American immigrants could be barred from entry to the U.S., which fueled their image as

outsiders (Lee, 2002).

The proposed xenophobic solutions to resolve White resentment toward Asian

immigrants included legislation such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Page Act, and

the 1924 Immigration Act which sought to categorically restrict entry to the U.S. for Asian

immigrants and deny them access to naturalized citizenship (Gover et al., 2020). The economic

threat allegedly posed to White American laborers' work supply inspired the implementation of

the nation's first class-based exclusion system that exempted Asian professionals such as

lawyers, teachers, and diplomats from rejection (Lee, 2002). Filtering the population of incoming

Asian immigrants fundamentally altered the composition of Asian American communities in the

United States to overrepresent socioeconomic success; excluding Chinese laborers by permitting

entry only to those Chinese immigrants whose professions were associated with higher standards

of education and earning shaped current restrictive American immigration policies (Lee, 2002).

This procedure also laid the foundation for the model minority myth, which Yi and Museus

(2016) define as the depiction of "Asian Americans as a high-achieving, hardworking, and

intellectually superior monolithic group characterized by universal and unparalleled academic

and occupational success" (p. 1). Regardless of this flattering portrait, subsequent injustices

show that Asian Americans' status as foreigners who could not truly be American remained

unchanged.

World War II worsened Asian Americans' status in the United States despite struggling

for generations to surmount their sociopolitical exclusion. Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor

essentially functioned as the lit match on the sociopolitical tinderbox of mounting deep-seated

resentment and distrust of Japanese American immigrants (Nagata, 1998). The resulting

discrimination exemplifies the recurring systemic and social alienation which are enacted against

Asian Americans and precludes them from true American group belonging. Japanese Americans

as a group endured intense suspicion and harassment in a way that their German American and

Italian American peers did not experience, despite their shared representation in the Axis power

triad that opposed the Allies, and thus the United States (Nagata, 1998). Their internment,

denounced by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) as "the greatest deprivation of civil

liberties by government in this country since slavery," showed that American citizenship was not

enough to avoid scrutiny; Japanese American citizens accounted for over two thirds of those who

were forcibly - and often abruptly - evacuated from their homes with no explanation and

thereafter imprisoned in harsh conditions for as long as two to three years (Nagata, 1998, p. 126).

To avoid the biased racial hostility, an atmosphere which recapitulated fear-based anti-

Asian xenophobia and resulted in the mass removal and incarceration of Japanese Americans,

Asian Americans scrambled to distinguish themselves as separate ethnic groups (Laybourn, 2021). Assimilability into U.S. society and cultural proximity to "American ideals of family, patriotism, and work ethic" (Laybourn, 2021, p. 121) became critical features of the coordinated Japanese and Chinese American campaigns to emphasize their American qualities and signal that they were not threatening following the Pearl Harbor attack (Laybourn, 2021; Tessler et al., 2020). Disseminating this message for decades eventually invited narrative comparison between the smooth Asian American assimilation to the socioeconomic plight of Black Americans, whose reception of social welfare funds came to be perceived as an indicator of inherent racial inferiority when situated in the popular racial discourse that upheld Whiteness as the ideal to which non-Whites should strive (Laybourn, 2021). As Laybourn (2021) puts it, "black Americans, white Americans, and Asian Americans were racially triangulated in comparison to one another with whites positioned above both black Americans and Asian Americans, Asian Americans valorized culturally above black Americans, and although they were lauded here for their assimilation, Asian Americans were still experiencing limited social citizenship" (p. 121). The racial triangulation theory produced by this historical process remains visible in transracial adoption today: Black children are adopted less often than are Asian children, and White children are in the highest demand (Jacobsen et al., 2012).

Amid Asian Americans' collective efforts to dodge discrimination, the Korean War and its aftermath presented an opportunity to showcase Asian assimilability by directly integrating Korean orphans and Korean brides of American G.I.s into White American families. The "unique composition" of this wave of immigration "has largely been ignored within Asian American immigration history" (Laybourn, 2021, p. 120). Juxtaposition to earlier examples of sinophobic anti-Asian legislation identifies this wave of immigration's key role as an additional

demographic-altering element in racializing Asian Americans. The United States' involvement in

the Korean War and consequential geopolitical maneuvering operated as the catalyst for the first

major wave of Korean immigration to the country, before which fewer than 10,000 Korean

immigrants - mostly migrant laborers – resided in the United States and Hawaii (Laybourn,

2021). While discrepancies in available data obscure the exact number of Korean children

adopted to the United States since the Korean War, the consensus puts the estimation somewhere

between 110,000 and 150,000, constituting an approximate 10% of the population of present-day

Korean Americans (Lee, 2008). Prior to this influx of Korean children, adoptions in the United

States prioritized placing children in families with matching races and physical characteristics to

minimize differences between adoptees and their families; however, the post-World War II baby

boom increased the demand for babies beyond what domestic same-race adoption could supply

(Kim, 2009). Post-Korean War media heavily influenced the way Korean orphans were pushed

to fill that void, depicted as "waifs of war" in dire need of American humanitarian aid, Christian

benevolence, and protection from potential Communist indoctrination (Laybourn, 2021, p. 121).

Eleana Kim (2009) identifies the media crusade to push the philanthropic narrative as a

"technology of intimacy, producing fantasies of rescue and inspiring Americans to action" (p.

16). Korean transracial adoption initially began as an effort to relocate mixed-race children of

American G.I.s and Korean women who could "never hope to make a place for themselves in

Korean society" due to "a particular form of postcolonial Korean ethnonationalism" that would

preclude them from social acceptance and/or mobility (Kim, 2009, p. 12). This practice, initially

touted as a humane solution for South Korea's social and economic exclusion of mixed race

children, quickly became a way to dispose of children who were of full Korean parentage and,

rather than focusing on "the need for developing indigenous solutions to Korea's welfare needs

at the time" (p. 8), adoption agencies accordingly took on a paternalistic and Christian American stance to sell White families on the idea of including an Asian child in their home. Some of the first families to adopt these "Korean War Orphans" cited motivations such as wanting to "round out" their "natural" (biological) families or "give 'playmates' to their children" (p. 12), touching on persisting adoption stigma that distinguishes adoptive kinship bonds from biological connections. Social agencies at the time prioritized White, middle-class, and heterosexual families, a demographic which continues to overwhelmingly represent adoptive parents of transracial children in the U.S. (Kim, 2009).

Kim's (2009) anthropological perspective of Korean transracial adoption is corroborated by social science research. Laybourn (2021) pinpoints the merging of political and racial ideals as an "ideological whitening" of Korean TRAs, who came to be seen "as possessing a certain racial flexibility, a 'benign...racial difference' that promised both easy assimilability and manageable exoticism" (p. 121). Social work bolstered this ideological whitening in the early decades of Korean adoption by encouraging White adoptive families to "assimilate their Korean children into (white) American culture. No special attention was to be given to their Korean ethnic background" (Laybourn, 2021, p. 122). In this context, consideration should be given to how Asian TRAs "are actually less likely to be racially socialized than Black transracial adoptees in the U.S." (Wing & Park-Taylor, 2022). Kubo (2010) adds that the state's role in practicing repression and exclusion is a defining feature of a racial project; the resulting cultural erasure and its connection to ongoing race relations in the United States illustrates the systemic nature of "the mechanism through which racial meanings and social structure are linked" (Laybourn, 2021, p. 118). The effects of Chinese and Japanese Americans promoting Asian racial exceptionalism as a reaction to war-related xenophobia merged with the socially constructed narratives

surrounding Korean TRAs' perceived racial malleability to form the basis of the model minority myth, creating far-reaching ramifications that continue to impact adopted and non-adopted persons alike today.

Integrating the Past

Hot on the heels of the massive 2020 Black Lives Matter (BLM) protests, CRT has exploded onto the national stage as a source of significant controversy and ire (Morgan, 2022). Recent attempts to ban teaching CRT in schools allude to various misconceptions regarding CRT's divisiveness and purported harmful outcomes which accuse proponents of dredging up the past and trying to make White children feel guilty (Morgan, 2022). CRT suffers from serious misconceptions that White people are to be held personally responsible for racial inequity, counter to its central principles which recognize racism as institutional (Morgan, 2022). Somewhat ironically, the attempts to ban CRT in schools articulate the theory's foundational principles which claim that the origins of social structures are not inherent but constructed (Burton et al., 2010): within this framework, the widespread reaction to CRT can be seen as a self-defensive measure to protect whiteness from inspection and thus prevent potential power destabilization. Examining the process of social construction can offer fruitful paths toward establishing a more equitable society, starting with demystifying the model minority myth.

The Model Minority Today

The model minority myth, embroiled in the legacy of anti-Asian discrimination and fear, prevails in modern adoption discourse. Kubo (2010) provides compelling data compiled from interviews which indicate that the model minority myth motivated the White adoptive parents who chose to adopt from China and South Korea rather than domestically, communicating stereotypes through coded language that attached negative racial stereotypes to Black birth

mothers. In reference to the "honorary White status" occupied by Asian children, Branco (2021) points out relevant costs that are associated with transracial adoption which manifest the nation's racial hierarchy: agencies reported that adopting a White child cost $22,000 which was matched by Asian and Latin children, compared to the $14,000 in expenses to adopt a Black child (p. 14). Additional research toward persisting intergroup tensions between Black Americans and Korean Americans who are fixated on achieving "the myth of true Americanness" can provide enhanced understanding beyond the typical Black-White paradigm (Yi & Houston, 2020).

A survey of Chinese TRAs' lived experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic echo historical themes as well, with some participants reporting feeling as though their senses of belonging and safety were threatened because of their Asian identity, and others sharing that their White adoptive parents refused to acknowledge their encounters with anti-Asian racism and had failed to prepare them for the realities of living with racism (Wing & Park-Taylor, 2022). The study also offers insight into how the model minority myth operates as an additional layer of suppression: some of the participants discuss that their experiences with racism are minimized and/or dismissed since Asian Americans are perceived as being successful and adjacent to White social standing (Wing & Park-Taylor, 2022). Researchers support the value of adoptive families in recognizing their ethnic minority children's unique heritages and providing a sense of familial security from which to explore their cultural backgrounds (Boivin & Hassan, 2015; Castle et al., 2011). There is promising data to suggest a positive relationship between racial/ethnic identity development and positive adoption outcomes, and while causality cannot be conclusively established, the emerging consensus encourages multiculturalism and cultural competency training for adoptive parents and counselors to combat the potential lack of ethnic, cultural, and racial socialization that TRAs encounter when placed in White adoptive families (Kreider &

Raleigh, 2016; Kubo, 2010; Lee, 2003; Malott & Schmidt, 2012; Moxon, 2019). While these discussions deliver cogent arguments toward developing and implementing strategies to help cultivate stronger racial and ethnic identities, they also reveal blind spots in modern racial discourse.

Omitting the integration of adoption stigma constitutes an oversight because of the demonstrable intertwining of adoption and race, which coexist throughout this thesis's analysis of transracial adoption's historical background and in its overview of microaggressions toward Asian TRAs. Further, a survey of TRA parents found that participants "with strong colorblindness also endorsed lower adoption stigma and were less inclined to view microaggressions and institutional discrimination as forms of racism" (Morgan and Langrehr, 2018, p. 249). In other words, the TRA parents who felt they had been more stigmatized by society for adopting their children showed a greater awareness of what constitutes racism, suggesting that their experiences as adoptive parents may have changed their perceptions by offering a glimpse into the reality of occupying a marginalized social identity, which in turn enhanced their awareness of less overt forms of stigmatizing and discriminatory behaviors (Morgan & Langrehr, 2018). Considering Baden's (2016) unveiling of the hidden racism ingrained in White TRA parents' collective image as altruistic rescuers, citing microaggressions toward Asian TRAs that insult their birth cultures to elevate the act of adoption, it becomes clear that the content of the microaggressions toward TRAs offers insight into the process by which TRAs and their parents navigate issues pertaining to race within their families.

Most transracially adopted children are placed in White families (Hrapczynski & Leslie, 2018), making it pertinent to consider Bonilla-Silva's (2006) exploration of the "white habitus" – or "whites' high level of social and spatial segregation and isolation from minorities" (p. 152) –

in the context of TRAs' racial socialization, racial identity formation, and adopted identity formation. When examining transracially adoptive households, Kreider and Raleigh determined that, despite some adoptive parents' embrace of a multiracial family status, the residential racial diversity for transracially adopted children may more closely resemble that of White monoracial families than of other multicultural families, reflecting the White parents' higher socioeconomic status and tendency to "live in areas with a high proportion of other affluent whites and lower levels of racial diversity" compared to children of interracial couples (2016, p. 1203). These findings reveal a discrepancy between the expected racial residential diversity and the actual amount of racial representation present in Asian TRAs' neighborhoods, which makes it important to investigate how White parents socialize their adoptive children who grow up in primarily White counties. Bonilla-silva (2006) argues that the white habitus produces "a racialized, uninterrupted socialization process that *conditions* and *creates* whites' racial taste, perceptions, feelings, and emotions and their views on racial matters" (p. 152). Contextualizing residential segregation as a key origin of racial social isolation that takes an active role in promoting "a sense of group belonging (a white culture of solidarity) and negative views about non-whites" (p. 152) implies complicated racial dynamics within transracial adoptive families headed by White parents.

The potential impact of the white habitus on both White adoptive parents and TRAs presents a possible explanation for some of the challenges associated with TRAs' ethnic identity formation and cultural socialization. Lacking physical proximity to racial diversity necessarily requires additional effort for these family members to participate in racial, ethnic, and/or cultural socialization on a regular basis; it "may be difficult for White parents because it is not as 'inherent or natural a process as it is for the same-race or same-ethnicity families'" (Godon-

Decoteau & Ramsey, 2017, p. 21). Lee et al. (as cited in Heiden-Rootes et al., 2019) define

cultural socialization as:

> ... the manner by which parents address ethnic and racial issues within the family,
> specifically the ways parents communicate or transmit cultural values, beliefs, customs,
> and behaviors to the child and the extent to which the child internalizes these messages,
> adopts the cultural norms and expectations, and acquires the skills to become a competent
> and functional member of a racially diverse society (p. 247).

In this context, an Asian TRA growing up in the white habitus can develop more affinity with the

dominant White culture in which they are socially and geographically immersed than with their

birth culture. This "racial and ethnic dissonance" can cause TRAs to feel "frustrated and

fragmented" when negotiating the challenges associated with racial and ethnic identity formation

(Godon-Decoteau & Ramsey, 2017, p. 20). Research shows that some TRAs "rejected their

racial background by showing no interest or by exhibiting shame" while others reported wishing

to be "a different race;" as many as 78% of surveyed Korean adults "reported they considered

themselves to be or wanted to be white as children" (Laybourn, 2016, p. 3). Lee (2003) coins the

incongruity as the "transracial paradox," which encapsulates the inclination for society to treat

TRAs as though they are members of the White majority even though they are racial minorities.

TRAs may accordingly choose not to share their experiences with discrimination with their

White parents in anticipation of the parents' dismissal or discomfort, which in turn can lead to

emotional distance between the family members, impaired identity formation, and

unpreparedness to face racial events (Chang et al, 2017; Docan-Morgan, 2010).

Godon-Decoteau and Ramsey (2017) ascribe a portion of TRAs' inner conflict to White

adoptive parents' superficial ethnic socialization efforts. Boivin and Hassan (2015) argue that

TRA parents inherently cannot replicate the full experience of being raised in the child's heritage culture because the TRA parents were not "socialized within these cultures" (pp. 1098-1099). Lee (2003) notes that White parents may not have the lived experience needed to adequately prepare their children for life in society as a racial/ethnic minority. Sincere attempts to ethnically socialize TRAs without sufficient depth, characterized as "cultural tourism" because of its emphasis on superficial traditions and customs, "may increase feelings of marginalization by emphasizing how adoptees are distinct from their White families and peers but not giving them the skills to form relationships with members of their birth communities (Godon-Decoteau & Ramsey, 2017, p. 21). Mere exposure to diverse populations can facilitate ethnic identity formation for TRAs by helping them to develop a "nonwhite or minority group identity," and adoptive parents can further this development by providing "a variety of cultural socialization experiences that include exposure to diverse cultural/ethnic/racial groups" (Basow et al., 2008, p. 474, 478). However, studies record a tendency for White parents to become defensive or avoid talking about racism altogether, and those who do engage in racial discussions may not respond in a way the TRA finds comforting or helpful (Chang et al., 2017; Docan-Morgan, 2011). These findings reiterate the importance of bringing awareness to Asian TRAs' intersectional identities.

Modern Relevance and Future Research

This thesis submits that TRAs seeking coherence between their adoptive and birth identities can be impeded by well-meaning White parents who do not fully understand the scope of the endeavor, making intersectionality an indispensable feature of advancing research toward Asian transracial adoption. A study cited by Laybourn (2016) found that "many of the adoptive parents reported that they saw 'no color or race or nationality in their adopted foreign children and felt they were just like their own'" (p. 3) regarding their TRA children, an attitude which

simultaneously propagates adoption stigma and reiterates the post-Korean War social workers'

instructions to White parents of Korean adoptees to ignore their child's ethnic background in

favor of assimilation. Colorblind attitudes, some of which are rooted in idealistic notions of

"humanitarian outreach that [affirms] human community over ethnic and racial difference"

(Kubo, 2010, p. 269), disregard the extant power structure that is unjustly weighted toward

White privilege along with its impact on racial and ethnic minorities. Bonilla-Silva (2006)

observes an inclination for White people to view themselves as innocent of race, despite

whiteness's social construction and systemic enforcement; this suggests that White parents who

erroneously believe they can pass on the benefits of their White privilege to their TRA children

are ignorant of the mechanisms responsible for their privilege, which underscores the invisibility

of whiteness even to its recipients.

Sue (2004) explicates on the invisibility of whiteness and shares that acknowledging its

existence can be a daunting task because its steady denial, whether consciously or unknowingly,

allows the dominant group (White Americans) to continue to benefit from an imbalanced power

structure by rejecting the notion that the structure exists at all. The author's interviews reveal

how concealing whiteness simultaneously endorses White supremacy and protects whiteness

from scrutiny; the illusion of equality automatically thwarts any attempts to challenge the

existing framework. Chang et al. (2017) invoke Robin DiAngelo's concept of "white fragility" as

a factor in Asian TRAs' decisions not to tell their White parents about their experiences with

racism. Hill et al. (2021) define white fragility as a state of stress that is easily activated by

minimal racial influence and triggers a "range of defensive moves" (p. 1812). Korean TRAs

reported learning to stop sharing their upsetting experiences with racism "following repeated

instances of parents getting upset, defensive, or otherwise unable to respond in constructive

ways" which "help to reestablish the White normative framework of color blindness and racial erasure" (Chang et al., 2017, p. 318).

The tendency for whiteness to sidestep a racialized status is unmistakably consistent beyond TRA families. For example, U.S. Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene interviewed mere hours before this thesis was submitted and expressed the opinion about public opinion: "White supremacy shouldn't be the main target. We should be more concerned about the illegal invasion at the border, the crime happening every single day on our streets, especially in cities like Chicago. We should go after criminals that break the law and not pursue people based on their skin color" (Papenfuss, 2022). Greene claims her statement is not about skin color, but she pointedly refuses to acknowledge the recent surge of violence associated with White supremacy, and instead chooses potent cases heavily laden with racialized significance without naming the associated ethnicities (i.e. Mexican immigration being labeled an "invasion" at the border and Black Americans in Chicago being stereotyped as violent), after which she incongruously concludes that it "shouldn't be about race" (Papenfuss, 2022). It appears that contemporary White supremacy is quick to react to the threat of direct confrontation by activating this self-protective camouflaging act.

Adoption Policies

Brooks et al. (1999) chronicle how Congress came to pass the Multiethnic Placement Act (MEPA) of 1994 and the Removal of Barriers to Interethnic Adoption of 1996 in order to reduce the stress on an overwhelmed foster care system and avoid racial discrimination. The authors construe the adoption policies as emerging from a crisis; at the time, half a million children were in foster care, and children waited a median of nearly three years to be adopted. These legal mandates, which are still in effect today, prohibit publicly funded welfare agencies from using

race, culture, or ethnicity "as the basis to deny or delay foster or adoptive placements" (p. 171).

The government's answer to the foster care problem is reminiscent of the Korean War-related

response to the humanitarian crisis of Korean war orphans; in both undertakings, the United

States opted to transgress racial and ethnic barriers to expedite adoption placements rather than

prioritizing remedial protocols toward social welfare. The success of these policies is

questionable given the staggering number of children who continue to rely on foster care - a

sampling from a 2019 report by the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System

(AFCARS) shows that almost 424,000 children were in foster care, and one third of children

entering the system that year were ethnic minorities.

The demonstrated predilection for the U.S. government to engage the needs of White

adoptive parents before managing the systemic origins of children who need homes is also a

major factor in right-wing rhetoric concerning anti-abortion laws as a solution to the "Great

Replacement Theory," a conspiracy which posits that Whites in America are being replaced with

people of color, especially by those groups who have higher birth rates than Whites (Siegel &

Hosie, 2019). Race inextricably connects abortion rights with immigration law and adoption,

especially when one considers recent events: a former U.S. President publicly commended

"procreation, not immigration" policies (Siegel & Hosie, 2019), a prominent conservative

political activist considers overturning *Roe v. Wade* an appropriate route to resolving the U.S.'s

immigration "problem" (Aguilera & Abrams, 2022), and a U.S. Supreme Court Justice's opinion

in favor of banning abortion includes a citation stating that "the domestic supply of infants

relinquished at birth or within the first month of life and available to be adopted had become

virtually nonexistent" (Joyce, 2022). Jacobsen et al. (2012) offer observable family trends that

confirm the intertwining of these sociopolitical components; their research indicates a clear

preference for White parents to adopt phenotypically similar children, noting that Black babies are "cheaper" and that"the market for White babies is very tight" (p. 84). The undercurrents of objectification and dehumanization reappear in this commodifying language, and pairing these remarks against chronically dire foster care statistics lays out the racial bias that is implicitly carried out by adoptive parents who illustrate through market demand that it is not a lack of babies, but a paucity of *white infants* that is being used to justify forcing mothers in the United States to give birth. The relationships between adoption, abortion, and racism are worthy of further investigation because of their collective salience to modern events that impacts the future bodily autonomy of every person in America who can bear a child.

Conclusion

The sociohistorical building blocks of racial relations established during the Korean War's aftermath remain visible and impactful in research dedicated to exploring Asian TRAs' experiences living in White American families. Conceptualizing Korean transracial adoption as a racial project reveals the underpinnings of how Asian Americans came to be racially stratified into a conditional "honorary white status," which the White majority retains the power to confer and remove. Consideration should therefore be given to the sociohistorical roots underlying the relationships between races, and similar research should be undertaken for distinct TRA populations to ensure a more complete and holistic understanding of their unique experiences.

This thesis does not seek to condemn White parents or abolish transracial adoption, nor does it intentionally discount the many positive outcomes or ramifications resulting from the practice. Instead, the objective is to shed light on a historically overlooked population with the goal of expanding comprehension of the complicated interlocking structures that went into creating Asian TRAs' current lived reality in the hopes of capturing a more nuanced portrayal to

facilitate support in diverse social science fields for parents and counselors. The COVID-19 pandemic threw into sharp relief the perpetual foreignness that Asians experience, and applying an intersectional methodology toward investigating that insurmountable alienation brought to light how Black Americans were additionally victimized by the model minority myth. By expounding upon Asian American TRAs' historical background, systemic exclusion, and intersectional identity, this thesis aims to bolster awareness of their unique situation and provide routes for future research.

References

Aguilera, J., & Abrams, A. (2022). What the Buffalo tragedy has to do with the effort to overturn

  Roe. *Time.* https://time.com/6178135/buffalo-shooting-abortion-replacement-theory/

Azhar, S., Alvarez, A. R. G., Farina, A. S. J., & Klumpner, S. (2021). "You're so exotic

  looking": An intersectional analysis of Asian American and Pacific Islander stereotypes.

  Affilia, *36*(3), 282–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/08861099211001460

Azhar, S., Farina, A., Alvarez, A. R. G., & Klumpner, S. (2022). Asian in the Time of COVID-

  19: Creating a Social Work Agenda for Asian American and Pacific Islander

  Communities. *67*(1), 11.

Baden, A. L. (2016). "Do you know your *real* parents?" and other adoption microaggressions.

  Adoption Quarterly, *19*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2015.1026012

Baker, K. (2008). Bionormativity and the construction of parenthood. IIT Chicago-Kent College

  of Law. https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/fac_schol/49

Basow, S. A., Lilley, E., Bookwala, J., & McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. (2008). Identity development

  and psychological well-being in Korean-born adoptees in the U.S. *American Journal of*

  Orthopsychiatry, *78*(4), 473–480.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. Peeking inside the (white) house of colorblindness." *Racism*

  without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the

  United States, 151-177. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. "Are all whites refined Archie Bunkers? An examination of

  white racial progressives." Pp. 179-197 in *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism*

  and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States, 179-197. Lanham,

  Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Branco, S. F. (2022). Relational–cultural theory: A supportive framework for transracial

adoptive families. *The Family Journal*, *30*(1), 22–29.

https://doi.org/10.1177/10664807211028986

Brooks, D., Barth., R., Bussiere, A., & Patterson, G. (1999). *Social Work, 44(2),* 167-178.

Chang, D. F., Feldman, K., & Easley, H. (2017). "I'm learning not to tell you": Korean

transracial adoptees' appraisals of parental racial socialization strategies and perceived

effects. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, *8*(4), 308–322.

https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000091

Docan-Morgan, S. (2011). '"They don't know what it's like to be in my shoes"': Topic

avoidance about race in transracially adoptive families. *Journal of Social and Personal

Relationships*, *28*(3), 336–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407510382177

Fisher, A. P. (2003). Still "not quite as good as having your own"? Toward a sociology of

adoption. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *29*(1), 335–361.

Garber, K. J., & Grotevant, H. D. (2015). " *YOU* were adopted?!": Microaggressions toward

adolescent adopted individuals in same-race families. *The Counseling Psychologist*,

43(3), 435–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000014566471

Godon-Decoteau, D., & Ramsey, P. G. (2018). Positive and negative aspects of transracial

adoption: An exploratory study from Korean transracial adoptees' perspectives. *Adoption

Quarterly*, *21*(1), 17–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2017.1387209

Gover, A. R., Harper, S. B., & Langton, L. (2020). Anti-Asian hate crime during the COVID-19

pandemic: Exploring the reproduction of inequality. *American Journal of Criminal

Justice*, *45*(4), 647–667. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-020-09545-1

Heiden-Rootes, K., Miller, B., & Moore, R. (n.d.). Cultural socialization in transracial adoption:

Adoption support, multicultural experiences, perceptions of discrimination, and positive

feelings toward racial minority groups. *Adoption Quarterly, (22)4,* 247-264.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2019.1627447

Hrapczynski, K. M., & Leslie, L. A. (2018). Engagement in racial socialization among

transracial adoptive families with white parents: Engagement in racial socialization.

Family Relations, *67*(3), 354–367. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12316

Hrapczynski, K. M., & Leslie, L. A. (2019). Do preparation for bias and cultural socialization

protect against discrimination for transracially adopted adolescents? *Adoption Quarterly*,

22(2), 116–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2019.1579136

Joyce, K. (2022.) Adoption means abortion just isn't necessary, SCOTUS claims: That's even

worse than it sounds. *Salon.* https://www.salon.com/2022/05/03/adoption-makes-

abortion-unnecessary-claims-the-right-thats-even-worse-than-it-sounds/

Killian, C., & Khanna, N. (2019). Beyond color-blind and color-conscious: Approaches to racial

socialization among parents of transracially adopted children. *Family Relations, 68,* 260-

274.

Kim, Eleana. (2007). Our adoptee, our alien: Transnational adoptees as specters of foreignness

and family in South Korea. *Anthropological Quarterly*, *80*(2), 497–531.

https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2007.0027

Kim, G. S., Suyemoto, K. L., & Turner, C. B. (2010). Sense of belonging, sense of exclusion,

and racial and ethnic identities in Korean Transracial adoptees. *Cultural Diversity &

Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*(2), 179–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015727

Kreider, R. M., & Raleigh, E. (2016). Residential racial diversity: Are transracial adoptive

families more like multiracial or white families?: Residential racial diversity. *Social*

Science Quarterly, *97*(5), 1189–1207. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12242

Kubo, K. (2010). Desirable difference: The shadow of racial stereotypes in creating transracial

families through transnational adoption: The shadow of racial stereotypes. *Sociology*

Compass, *4*(4), 263–282. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00274.x

Laybourn, S. M. (2021). Adopting the model minority myth: Korean adoption as a racial project.

Social Problems, *68*(1), 118–135. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz060

Laybourn, W. M. (2017). Korean transracial adoptee identity formation. *Sociology Compass*,

11(1), e12444. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12444

Lee, R. M. (2003). The transracial adoption paradox: History, research, and counseling

implications of cultural socialization. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(6), 711–744.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000003258087

Lee, E. (2002). The Chinese exclusion example: Race, immigration, and American gatekeeping,

1882-1924. *Journal of American Ethnic History, 21(3),* 36-62.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/27502847

Leslie, L. A., Smith, J. R., Hrapczynski, K. M., & Riley, D. (2013). Racial socialization in

transracial adoptive families: Does it help adolescents deal with discrimination stress?

Family Relations, *62*(1), 72–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00744.x

Morgan, H. (2022). Resisting the movement to ban critical race theory from schools. *The*

Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas, 95(1), 35-41.

https://doi-org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/10.1080/00098655.2021.2025023

Morgan, S. K., & Langrehr, K. J. (2019). Transracially adoptive parents' colorblindness and

discrimination recognition: Adoption stigma as moderator. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic*

Minority Psychology, *25*(2), 242–252. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000219

Moxon, E. (2019). Fostering racial and ethnic identity for transracial adoptees: The importance of culturally competent transracial adoption training programs for white adoptive parents. Portland State University. https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.804

Nagata, D. K. (1998). Intergenerational effects of the Japanese American internment. In Y. Danieli (Ed.), *International Handbook of Multigenerational Legacies of Trauma* (pp. 125–139). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-5567-1_8

Siegel, R., & Hosie, D. (2019). Trump's anti-abortion and anti-immigration policies may share a goal. *Time.* https://time.com/5748503/trump-abortion-immigration-replacement-theory/

Steinberg, A. (2018). Adoption as a diversity factor: 5 practical guidelines for eliminating a pathology driven conceptualization of adoption in the practice of psychology. In *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering 78(9).* https://www.proquest.com/docview/1958350023/A6DC73EC94F54E3EPQ/69

Sue, D. W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the "invisible" visible. *American Psychologist*, *59*(8), 761–769.

Suter, E. A., & Ballard, R. L. (2009). "How much did you pay for her?": Decision-making criteria underlying adoptive parents' responses to inappropriate remarks. *Journal of Family Communication*, *9*(2), 107–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15267430902773253

Tan, T. X., & Nakkula, M. J. (2004). White parents' attitudes towards their adopted Chinese daughters' ethnic identity. *Adoption Quarterly*, *7*(4), 57–76. https://doi.org/10.1300/J145v07n04_03

Tessler, H., Choi, M., & Kao, G. (2020). The anxiety of being Asian American: Hate crimes and negative biases during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*(4), 636–646. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-020-09541-5

Tuan, M. (2008). Domestic and international transracial adoption: A synopsis of the literature.

Sociology Compass, *2*(6), 1848–1859. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00164.x

Van Laningham, J. L. (2012). Social factors predicting women's consideration of adoption.

Michigan Family Review, *16*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.3998/mfr.4919087.0016.101

Watkins Liu, C. (2018). The anti-oppressive value of critical race theory and intersectionality in

social movement study. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *4*(3), 306–321.

https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649217743771

White, E. E., Baden, A. L., Ferguson, A. L., & Smith, L. (2021). The intersection of race and

adoption: Experiences of transracial and international adoptees with microaggressions.

Journal of Family Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000922

Wing, H. M., & Park-Taylor, J. (2022). From model minority to racial threat: Chinese transracial

adoptees' experience navigating the COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian American Journal of

Psychology.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/aap0000283

Yi, V., & Museus, S. D. (2015). Model Minority Myth. In A. D. Smith, X. Hou, J. Stone, R.

Dennis, & P. Rizova (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and

Nationalism* (pp. 1–2). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118663202.wberen528

Zhang, E., Zhang, X., & Pinderhughes, E. E. (2019). "Your skin's not as good as us":

Microaggressions among Transracially-Adopted Children from China. *Adoption

Quarterly*, *22*(4), 284–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2019.1675837