

Parenting & Privilege: Race, Social Class and the Intergenerational Transmission of Social Inequality

Jeremy Pienik

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Sociology

Chapel Hill
2008

Approved by:

Francois Nielsen

Peggy Thoits

Kenneth Bollen

Guang Guo

Cathy Zimmer

ABSTRACT

JEREMY PIENIK: Parenting & Privilege: Race, Social Class and the Intergenerational Transmission of Social Inequality

(Under the direction of Francois Nielsen and Peggy Thoits)

Drawing on data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics' Childhood Developmental Supplement, I employed structural equation modeling to test four hypotheses derived from Annette Lareau's concerted cultivation theory of the social reproduction of inequality: 1) that an underlying construct, which Lareau labels "concerted cultivation", manifests itself across a number of interrelated parenting practices; 2) that concerted cultivation is tied to social class, with middle-class parents providing more concerted cultivation than working-class and poor parents, and with the working and poor classes providing similarly low levels of such parenting; 3) that, adjusting for social-class status and other potential confounding factors, race is not independently predictive of parenting practices; and 4) that middle-class advantages in positive youth development are significantly mediated by concerted cultivation. Results were supportive of Lareau's claims. Concerted cultivation: 1) could be modeled as a latent construct with acceptable measurement properties; 2a) was found to be greater within the middle class than among the working class or the poor, and b) did not differ between the poor and working class; 3) was not related to race independently of social class; and 4) mediated the relationships between familial social class and youth intellectual skills, along with a wide-range of positive psychosocial developmental outcomes. Limitations and suggestions for future research are considered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CONCEPTUALIZING CONCERTED CULTIVATION.....	13
Parental Values and Attitudes.....	14
Physical/Material Home Environment	24
Parental Behavioral Traits.....	28
Responsiveness	29
Demandingness.....	32
Cognitive Stimulation	35
Hybrid Concepts	39
III. THE CLASS BASIS OF THE CONCERTED CULTIVATION	44
Theorizing the Relationship between Social Class, Socioeconomic Status and Childrearing.....	52
Investment model	54
IV. RACE VERSUS CLASS	58
V. YOUTH OUTCOMES	63
Contributions	70
VI. METHODS.....	72

	Data	72
	Sample	75
	Measures	78
	Testing Latent Variable Measurement Models	84
	Evaluating Concerted Cultivation Measurement Models	86
	Outcome variables	88
	Controls	92
	Analytical Strategy	94
	Model Testing	98
VII.	RESULTS	99
	Hypothesis 1: Concerted Cultivation as a Latent Construct	99
	Hypothesis 2: Social Class and Concerted Cultivation	99
	Hypothesis 3: Race and Concerted Cultivation	100
	Hypothesis 4: Social Class and Youth Outcomes	100
	Hypothesis 5: Mediating Effects of Concerted Cultivation on Relations Between Social Class and Youth Outcomes	101
	Non-Hypothesized Tests for Mediation—Parental Verbal Skill, Parental Education, and Household Income	102
VIII.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	105
	Contributions to Conceptualization and Measurement of Key Concepts	106
	Contributions Concerning Connections between Social Class and Parenting	109
	Contributions with Respect to Race and Concerted Cultivation	118
	Contributions Regarding the Connection between Parenting and Youth Development.....	119
	Concerns and Limitations	122
	Final Thoughts	126

APPENDICES	151
REFERENCES.....	153

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1a. Frequencies and Bivariate Relationships, Social Class and Control, Mediator, and Outcome Variables, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 & 2002/3. (unweighted).....	129
1b. Frequencies and Bivariate Relationships, Social Class and Control, Mediator, and Outcome Variables, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 & 2002/3. (weighted).....	132
2. Confirmatory Factor Analyses: Factor Loadings and Fit Indices for Latent Constructs, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 2002/3	136
3a. Structural Equation Model of the Relationship between Social Class and Concerted Cultivation (Middle Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3.....	137
3b. Structural Equation Model of the Relationship between Social Class and Concerted Cultivation (Working Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3.....	138
4a. Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Middle Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3	139
4b. Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Working Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3.....	142
5a. Mediating Influence of Concerted Cultivation on the Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Middle Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3	145
5b. Mediating Influence of Concerted Cultivation on the Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Working Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3	148

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Why do the children of middle-class parents often end up in positions of privilege themselves, while many from the poor and working-classes struggle to rise in social standing? Do parents who encourage their children to learn to play the piano or participate in Girl Scouts end up providing them with skills that carry over into schooling and other realms of life? Do childrearing practices and strategies differ across racial groups as well as social classes, or are we just as likely to find Black middle-class parents as White middle-class parents shuttling offspring from one activity to the next in the hope of cultivating their child's innermost potential? These are just a few of the questions that have occupied the debate concerning the role that social class and race play in the socialization of offspring and the place families have in providing advantages to children, advantages which some scholars maintain materialize in children's school success, verbal facility, confidence in communicating with adults, and persistence in the pursuit of valued goals.

Social class and racial differences in parenting values and practices have long been of interest to social scientists and policy-makers (Dubois 1908; Frazier 1939; Moynihan 1965; Coleman 1968; Kohn 1976; Lareau 2000; Conger and Elder 1994; McLoyd 1990, 1998) in large part because such differences are thought to contribute to the reproduction of inequality. Indeed a central assumption of the Wisconsin model of status attainment (Sewell and Shah 1968; Sewell, Hauser, and Featherman 1976), Bourdieu's (1981) "cultural capital"

theory of social reproduction, Kohn's (1959; 1977) "class and conformity" hypothesis, the "family stress" models of Elder (1974), Conger and Elder (1994) and McLoyd (1990), Ogbu's (2003) "culture of opposition" theory, and, most recently, Lareau's (2003) "concerted cultivation" model, is that differences in parental involvement with their children's intellectual and socio-psychological development contribute to intergenerational continuity in educational and occupational achievements. By implication, parenting practices associated with children's socio-psychological and cognitive advancement differ systematically by social class and, some scholars assert, by race as well (Kohn 1959, 1967; Coleman 1966; Sewell and Shah 1968; Jencks et al., 1972; Lareau 2000; Ogbu 2003; Cheadle 2008).

Surprisingly little is known, however, about how specific parenting practices associated with children's socio-psychological and cognitive development vary by class and race in the contemporary United States (Murray, Smith, & Hill 2001; Lareau 2003; Chin and Phillips 2004), or whether intergroup differences in achievement are attributable to differential parental "inputs" (Phillips, Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Kiebanov, and Crane 1998; Duncan and Magnussen 2005; Cheadle 2008). The matter of race and/or class differences in socialization-- and the advantages that can accrue to children based on such differences— is a topic that captivated the attention of a number of researchers throughout the 1940s, 50s, and 60s (Davis and Havighurst 1946; Havighurst and Davis 1955; Littman, Moore, and Pierce-Jones 1957; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin 1957; White 1957; Blau 1964; Moynihan 1965) and seems ripe to reemerge as an area of serious scholarly inquiry. Recently, these issues have been pushed to the forefront of sociology studies of the family, in part by the widely read ethnographic studies of anthropologist John Ogbu (2003) and sociologist Annette Lareau (2003). The fact that Ogbu and Lareau's observations diverge in important

respects with regard to whether race acts independently of social class in influencing socialization practices suggests that a closer look, employing a large, nationally representative sample, is appropriate.

Ogbu, who is noted for a lifetime of work developing and refining his cultural-ecology theory of minority achievement, has spent decades attempting to understand the social-structural roots which, he contends, underlie intergroup differences in academic and occupational success. In his highly influential early work, *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Ogbu (1978) laid out his theory of how one's status as a voluntary or as an involuntary minority influenced not only perceptions of opportunities and obstacles, but also levels of effort exerted and, as a result, eventual success, or failure, in educational and occupational pursuits. Involuntary minorities are those individuals who are either brought to a country against their will or who have faced colonization by an outside force.¹ Ogbu developed his theory through careful consideration of the formation and consequences of "involuntary minority" status across a number of nations. Within the United States this group is most clearly represented by Native Americans, who were invaded and then conquered by a foreign force, and African Americans, most of whom can trace their lineage to enslavement. Voluntary minorities, on the other hand, are composed of individuals who freely chose to immigrate to a given country, by and large in the hopes of encountering favorable economic and/or social opportunities. According to Ogbu, the disadvantaged structural origins of involuntary minorities, who encountered enslavement or internal colonization along with subsequent subjection to discriminatory practices and derogatory stereotypes, contributed to the formation of "oppositional"

¹ See, however, Gibson's (1997) for an interesting criticism and elaboration of Ogbu's dichotomous characterization of minorities.

subcultures. As a way of both responding to, and coping with, a paucity of legitimate opportunities, these subcultures reject, or deemphasize, mainstream values, such as the importance of schooling, hard work, and traditional success. Unfortunately, an unintended consequence of this cultural stance has been to further hinder the ability of such groups to reach economic parity with voluntary minorities and non-minorities.

While Ogbu's early, solo-authored work continues to garner much scholarly and popular attention, his co-authored follow-up study (Fordham and Ogbu 1986) examining peer stigmatization of high-achieving, poor, inner-city Blacks has elicited the most heated reactions and an ever-growing list of responses (see, for example, Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey 1998; Cook and Ludwig 1998; Ferguson 2001; Downey and Ainsworth-Darnell 2002; Farkas, Lleras and Maczuga 2002; Tyson 2002; Horvat and Lewis 2003; Tyson, Darity, and Castellino 2005; Mickelson and Velasco 2006). Ogbu's most recent work, however, is considerably more relevant to the current study as it profiles both students and their parents. Completed shortly before his death in 2003, for this new research Ogbu transferred his focus away from the poor, embattled, urban enclave of Washington, DC (Fordham & Ogbu 1986) which served as the source for his "acting white" hypothesis, to instead concentrate on the racially-integrated, middle-class community of Shaker Heights-- one of the more exclusive suburbs outside of Cleveland, Ohio. After over a year of observation and interviews, Ogbu (2003) came to the controversial conclusion that while both White and Black parents generally held high expectations for their children, Black parents failed to take as active a role as White parents in fostering their children's intellectual growth at home or at school.

Ogbu's findings are, at least in part, challenged by Lareau (2002; 2003), who counters his claims by arguing that cultural models of appropriate parenting differ primarily by social class and not by race.² In her most recent work, *Unequal Childhoods*, Lareau (2003) presents the results of her ethnographically intensive inquiry into how childrearing practices vary among middle-class, working-class, and poor families and how variations in these cultural routines differentially benefit middle-class children in the status attainment process. Lareau mounted her study in part due to her frustration with researchers who perseverate in examining the relations between social class and/or socioeconomic status, and isolated parenting practices (e.g., physical discipline, school involvement, rules, affection), rather than recognizing that these specific practices could be part of a class-based, integrated cultural system. Of the family process models mentioned earlier, certainly the Wisconsin model of status attainment (Sewell & Hauser 1980), which focuses only on parental educational expectations as mediating the relationship between parental SES and their children's eventual status attainment, is susceptible to such criticism, as is Kohn's (1959; 1977) research, seeing that his inquiries were restricted to examining how occupational characteristics relate to specific parental attitudes (e.g., obedience, self-direction).

Lareau (2002; 2003), on the other hand, takes a broader focus. Perhaps as a result, her ethnographically-intensive research³ uncovered that a certain distinguishing aspects of

² Interestingly, Lareau's earlier work largely concurred with Ogbu with respect to a deficit in school involvement on the part of Black parents (see Lareau and Horvat 1999); importantly, however, she attributed differences across races not, as Ogbu did, to a lack of concern with academics or a culture of anti-intellectualism amongst Blacks (see also McWhorter 2001), but rather to Blacks' mistrust of schools and their belief that schools are often not approachable. This was especially true in schools that had a history of resistance to desegregation and among parents who maintained memories of times when these institutions were segregated (Lareau & Horvat 1999).

³ Lareau's sample consisted of families of third graders recruited from two public schools in a Midwestern community, along with additional families enlisted from an urban working-class and a suburban middle-class neighborhood located in and around a northeastern United States metropolitan area.

familial home environments coalesced into what the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1977; 1984; 1990) would call two, relatively distinct, class-based ‘habitus.’⁴ Lareau found that these different habituses were distinguishable mainly by whether children were encouraged to participate in structured extra-curricular activities, along with the amount of educational resources that were available in the home and the amount of time parents spent interacting with them in cognitively stimulating ways. Such familial characteristics tended to hang-together, forming class-based cultural logics of parenting, with middle-class families engaging in what Lareau calls a “concerted cultivation” approach to child-rearing, and the poor and working-class parents adhering to a “natural growth” model.

The core of the middle-class, “concerted cultivation” approach to parenting emphasizes proactive involvement in children’s education and growth. Accordingly, Lareau observed (2000; 2003) adherents of this childrearing ideology who, in the hopes of cultivating their children’s various talents, skills, and abilities, not only energetically intervened in their children’s schools, but generally attempted to turn their entire worlds into classrooms. Pianos, encyclopedias, and the latest computers filled the homes of Lareau’s middle-class subjects, and parents pushed their children to utilize these educational resources as often as possible. Furthermore, concerted cultivation parents ensured their children were actively involved in numerous organized activities (e.g., soccer, piano, debate team, ballet, etc.) and spent significant amounts of time both at home and while traveling to and from these games, lessons, and performances talking with their children. In fact, Lareau found, like

⁴ Although its Latin roots refer to a habitual “disposition,” or “stance,” especially pertaining to the body, Bourdieu uses “habitus” in a way that can be likened to an internal mental structure which, although largely structured through experiences with external social structures, at the same time also serves to structure the external world (Jenkins 1992:74). This internalization of the external structures occurs through repeated experiences in social space in which actors are forced to respond to, and adjust, their habits in accordance with the objective, external constraints and opportunities they encounter.

Hart & Risley (1999), Hoff (2003), and Huttenlocher et al. (2007), “there was quite a bit more talking in middle-class homes than in working-class and poor homes ...” (Lareau 2003: 5). However, while talking was plentiful, directives were rare in these homes; instead parents tended to reason with children, making sure to explain the logic underlying their every action. According to Lareau, while these intensive parenting practices have emerged only recently, they continue to intensify, despite the sacrifices they entail, because of the obligations middle-class parents feel to provide as many opportunities as possible to their children. Furthermore, middle-class parents persist because they generally recognize that the investments they make in their children’s development pay off in the form of larger vocabularies, more confident interactions with adults, feelings of comfort in a variety of institutional settings, and, among other things, the ability, and willingness, of their children to carry on in competitive situations.⁵

The ‘natural growth’ style of parenting, which Lareau (2003) claims characterizes the childrearing habits poor and working-classes, is predicated on the belief that if parents supply safe, clean, and loving environments, children will thrive naturally. With development deemed a natural occurrence, and not something requiring careful cultivation and artificial management, Lareau found that natural growth parents tended to engage their children in fewer prolonged discussions and provided them with fewer educationally-enriching resources (e.g., books, computers, educational toys) than their middle class counterparts. They were also observed to be less likely to monitor their child’s education and to seek out, and conform

⁵ Lareau (2003) reports that none of the parents in her study who were, themselves, raised in middle-class households remembered experiencing such intensive parenting and hyper-scheduling during their own childhood and adolescence. Hays’ (1996) historical examination of parenting ideologies confirms the notion that hyper-intensive parenting is a relatively recent phenomenon.

to, the advice of childrearing “experts.” On the other hand, natural growth parents were considerably more willing to allow their children to engage in unstructured leisure pursuits, generally eschewing the structured activities favored by the middle-classes. Overall, poor and working-class parents maintained significantly stronger boundaries between the worlds of adults and children and, although they appeared to Lareau as devoted to their children and longing for their success, they did not feel the same obligation as middle-class parents to nurture their children’s nascent interests or cultivate their burgeoning talents, nor were they aware of how useful such practices could be in ensuring current and future successes.

While Lareau insists that the natural growth method of childrearing is not inherently inferior to the concerted cultivation model, she also maintains that, at least within contemporary American society, this more minimalist, “hands-off” approach to parenting tends to disadvantage children within institutional settings such as schools. The advantages that accrue to those children raised via concerted cultivation should not come as a surprise, considering that the concerted cultivation model of parenting currently holds favor among most educators and experts.⁶ Lareau elaborates on this point:

“... there is little dispute among professionals on the broad principles for promoting educational development in children through proper parenting. These standards include the importance of talking with children, developing their educational interests, and playing an active role in their schooling. Similarly, parenting guidelines typically stress the importance of reasoning with children and teaching them to solve problems through negotiation rather than with physical force. Because these guidelines are so generally accepted, and because they focus on a set of practices concerning how parents should raise children, they form a dominant set of cultural

⁶ While Lareau appears to be, for the most part, correct on this matter, she fails to mention that there is a vocal minority who contest this prevailing wisdom. For instance, a number of books have surfaced recently which have attempted to criticize the hyper-scheduled, intensive childrearing that has become normative among the middle class. Examples include: *The Over-Scheduled Child: Avoiding the Hyper-Parenting Trap* (2001), *Einstein Never Used Flashcards: How Our Children Really Learn--and Why They Need to Play More and Memorize Less* (2003), *Reclaiming Childhood: Letting Children Be Children in Our Achievement-Oriented Society* (2004).

repertoires about how children should be raised. This widespread agreement among professionals about the broad principles for child rearing permeates our society. A small number of experts thus potentially shape the behavior of a large number of parents” (Lareau 2003: 4; See also pp. 24-6).

It stands to reason, therefore, that children reared according to the dictates of concerted cultivation should mesh better with middle-class dominated institutions, such as schools, stores, medical institutions, and corporations, which share cultural continuities with middle-class home environments.

The advantages of concerted cultivation do not, however, extend to all areas of life. In fact, Lareau mentions a number of ways in which those reared using natural growth methods enjoy benefits that their concerted cultivation counterparts do not. For instance, she observed that poor and working-class children tend to enjoy warmer, less competitive relationships with siblings, more contact and closer ties with extended kin, greater facility in organizing their free time, all while being less likely to suffer from the fatigue that oftentimes plagues over-scheduled middle-class children.

Thus far I have hinted at how Lareau’s ethnographic research offers a potentially compelling addition to the well-established research tradition of examining the role of family processes in perpetuating class-based stratification. Furthermore, her disagreement with Ogbu regarding the relative importance of race versus social class in contributing to these processes holds both theoretical and policy implications. Such implications, along with the fact that their dispute appears open to an empirical test, makes for an intriguing challenge for social scientists working within a quantitative tradition and who can capitalize on the benefits of larger and more representative samples than those employed by qualitative researchers like Lareau and Ogbu.

Unfortunately, most of the prior quantitative research addressing race and/or class-based differences in parenting processes has: 1) employed samples with limited generalizability; 2) focused on isolated parental practices as opposed to attempting to capture the larger, more holistic picture of the home environment that Lareau recommends; 3) applied methods which have not been optimal for capturing complex constructs such as concerted cultivation; 4) examined only a limited purview of possible child outcomes; and/or 5) utilized gradational measures of socioeconomic status rather than discrete classes. This dissertation aims to address these limitations and contribute to the literature with analysis employing structural equation modeling on a nationally representative data set.

This dissertation draws on the unique strengths of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics' (PSID) Childhood Development Supplement (CDS), a nationally representative dataset, to examine diverse measures of parental involvement in the home environment⁷, to determine whether these vary by social class and race, and to explore whether parental investments do, in fact, contribute to the sorts of advantages that Lareau maintains. The CDS includes several key measures of parental involvement which capture Lareau's concerted-cultivation construct along with data on an unusually broad range of intellectual and psycho-

⁷Although Lareau and Ogbu discuss parental involvement with both schools and within the home environments, this dissertation will only focus on the latter. As I demonstrated in an earlier work (see Pienik, Shanahan, & Kaplan under review), without the benefit of a number of measures over time it is difficult to establish the motivation for, or the source of, parental school involvement. Specifically, with the detail available in the sorts of large scale data-sets that most researchers employ, it is difficult, if not impossible, to differentiate between proactive parental involvement (e.g., parent-initiated, strategic interventions on their children's behalf) and reactive interventions (e.g., school-initiated requests to meet). While the first is relevant to Lareau, the latter are not. Therefore, using a single measure of parents' school involvement does not conform to a proper operationalization of concerted cultivation. Another problem with studying parental differences in school involvement is the possibility that schools differ in their receptivity to parental involvement. Since the data that I have available does not sample on schools, but rather on families, it is impossible to control on this important school-level characteristic. Overall then, restricting the study to solely the home environment reduces the chance of (mis)interpreting the source of, or motivation for, parental school involvement and of biasing models intended to capture inter-familial differences in concerted cultivation.

social youth outcomes; additionally, the sample's size and diversity allows for analyses which attempt to isolate the unique contributions of both social class and race to parenting practices and youth outcomes.

Specifically, four questions drive this project: 1) on average, do middle-class parents engage in more intensive childrearing practices, providing additional educational resources, involving their children in more organized activities, and talking and reasoning with them more, than do either poor or working-class parents, and do poor and working class parents exhibit similar, relatively low levels of this sort of intensive parenting?; 2) does race affect parenting practices independently of social class?; 3) to what extent is the intellectual and psychosocial development of adolescents related to social class?; and 4) are social-class and race-based developmental advantages mediated by differences in parenting practices?

The remainder of this introduction is divided into four sections. Considering how crucial the concerted cultivation concept is to Lareau's entire framework, I begin the first section by describing how aspects of her multidimensional concept are either consonant with, or diverge from, the parenting literature's more important conceptualizations of various parenting practices. The second section aims to accomplish two important tasks. First, I examine debates concerning the relative merits of discrete versus categorical measures of socioeconomic inequality, before turning to the important issue of how "class effects" can be identified. Secondly, I review the two main theoretical perspectives which attempt to link social class to childrearing practices: the parental stress model and the investment model. In summarizing these perspectives, I also identify how they apply to Lareau and highlight key findings from the relevant empirical literatures. The third section turns to social-scientific treatments of the Black family, including how Lareau and others have approached the

question of whether or not Black and White families of similar social class and/or socioeconomic status, employ similar childrearing strategies. The fourth, and final, section takes a closer look at the sorts of intellectual and social advantages that Lareau claims come to children reared within concerted cultivation households. Furthermore, I explore some of the existing literature concerning the relationship between household social class and/or socioeconomic status and childhood outcomes and the extent that various parenting practices, some of which capture aspects of concerted cultivation, serve to mediate such relations. This introductory section concludes with a discussion of some of the unique contributions this dissertation makes to the stratification and parenting literatures.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUALIZING CONCERTED CULTIVATION

Theories of optimal childrearing can be traced at least as far back as the advice offered in Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's ancient treatise, *On the Soul*. According to child development and family studies scholar, George Holden (1997), however, it was not until end of the 19th century and G. Stanley Hall's tenure at Clark University that systematic studies exploring links between specific parenting practices and child outcomes began to surface (see, for example, Sears 1899). And it took until the third decade of the 20th century, and the formation of the journal *Child Development*, before a significant body of research began to accumulate (Holden 1997). Since then the number of concepts, theories, and research findings have proliferated considerably, as researchers in fields as diverse as psychology, sociology, anthropology, human development, medicine, and even economics have taken on the challenge of understanding the role that the home environment and parenting practices play in children's development. In this section I outline some of the key concepts that have been created to further knowledge of the home environment and socialization processes, summarizing their distinguishing characteristics and assessing their relationship to Lareau's concerted cultivation construct.

Concerted cultivation, according to Lareau, is a class-based culture of childrearing attitudes and behaviors which entails regular attempts on the part of parents to organize their children's free time in ways which maximize their intellectual and psychosocial

development. Parents aid in their children's acquisition of valuable skills by providing cognitively stimulating material resources such as computers, books, and musical instruments, creating an atmosphere in the home conducive to open-communication and frequent parent-child verbal exchanges, and, among other things, through encouraging enrollment in structured, adult-supervised activities. In order to add clarity to our comparison of Lareau's childrearing models with the multitude of alternatives that exist, I explore the various qualities of the home environment and parenting practices that stand out in the parenting literature. Therefore, the discussion is organized as follows: 1) concepts relating to values and attitudes of parents; 2) concepts capturing aspects of the physical/material home environment; 3) concepts related to behavioral traits of parents; and 4) multi-dimensional constructs which aggregate two or more of the above dimensions.

Parental Values & Attitudes

Lareau's treatment of class-differences in the obligations parent feel toward their children, along with the sorts of expectations they have with respect to their children's interactions with adults and the skills they most hope to provide their children, relate in interesting and subtle ways to both the "culture of poverty" thesis in anthropology (Lewis 1968, 1971) and Kohn's (1977) sociologically-inspired "class and conformity" studies. Additionally, Lareu's discussion of the relatively recent changes in middle-class standards of appropriate parental involvement in their children's development parallels, but also diverges from, Hays' more widely-comparative, socio-historical work on cultures of parenting.

Anthropologists are perhaps best-known within the parenting literature for a number of pioneering inquiries into socialization customs across a variety of exotic locales. Most

relevant to the current study, however, is their “culture of poverty” theory, a loosely bounded set of ideas and theorists which, while peaking in influence during the late 1960s and into the early 1970s, continues to provoke heated reactions from both admirers and detractors (Rainwater & Yancey 1967; Valentine 1968; for a good overview, see Harvey & Reed 1996). Those scholars affiliated, either by choice or assignment, with the culture of poverty perspective generally hold that parents from lower social classes are less likely to become involved in their children’s intellectual development because, for varying reasons, they place less emphasis on education compared to middle-class parents (Miller 1959; Moynihan 1965; Lewis 1968, 1971; Murray 1984; Dalrymple 2001). Since minorities, and particularly Blacks, tend to be over-represented among the poor, many have equated the culture of poverty—typically characterized by traits as fatalism, toughness, street smarts, and a quest for excitement-- with Blacks. After an initial flurry of research, plagued by inadequate data and contradictory findings (Roach & Gurrslin 1967; Parker & Kleiner 1970; Billings 1974; Coward, Feagin, & Williams Jr. 1974; Graves 1974), the following years have generated few systematic inquiries into the question of whether the lower classes have cultivated unique, or relatively unique, value systems regarding childrearing or other important aspects of life. As such, little is known about the extent to which the poor currently hold different values or attitudes than wealthier citizens, nor is much known about whether poor Blacks and Whites share similar worldviews (Jones and Luo 1999). Lareau’s work does, in fact, explore links between race, social class and parenting, however Lareau is curiously closed-mouthed with respect to where she fits within the culture of poverty tradition.⁸ Attempts to place Lareau are

⁸ The only mention Lareau (2003) makes of the culture of poverty is to assert the superiority of Bourdieu’s take on the relationship of culture and social class: “... [Bourdieu’s] sensitivity to the complexity and fluidity of social life makes his theory significantly more persuasive than other theories of social inequality, such as a culture of poverty model” (p. 276).

complicated by the fact that significant variations exist across culture of poverty theorists and because of confusion within Lareau's work with respect to how culture is tied to behavior and what, if anything (e.g., values, mental models, social stressors, social expectations), she believes links social class to parenting behaviors. The most apparent divergence between Lareau and the culture of poverty perspectives would seem to be that while those within the culture of poverty tradition tend to focus a good deal on attitudes, Lareau claims to concentrate more on behavior. A close reading of her work, however, reveals that, at times, Lareau underestimates how important values and attitudes are to her theory and, much to the frustration of readers, she fails to articulate how values and behavior relate to one another with respect to childrearing. I will return to this issue at a later point.

Kohn's research (1959, 1963, 1977) has also faced the criticism of ambiguity with respect to relating values to behavior, however, he remains celebrated among sociologists for a lifetime of work exploring the social-structural roots of parental values. Continuing a tradition (Lynd and Lynd 1929; Duvall 1946) of attempting to understand links between social structure and personality, Kohn theorized that individuals' job characteristics profoundly shape their personalities, attitudes, and values which, in turn, affect the qualities they most value in their children.⁹ More specifically, he claims that those individuals, largely from the middle classes, who experience greater job complexity in the forms of autonomy, independence, self-direction, and creativity, come to value such characteristics in their children. Conversely, working class and poor individuals, whose labor consists largely of

⁹ It should be noted that Kohn recognized that previously held personality characteristics also led to the correlations found between work and personality. Individuals, to some extent at least, self-select into certain types of occupations based upon their values, attitudes, and personality traits which then tend to be reinforced on the job. Kohn maintains that oftentimes a feedback loop sets in during which personality leads to a specific career which then reinforces the personality which, in turn, increases one's commitment to the chosen vocation and so on.

routinized tasks and conforming to authority, come to value obedience in their children.¹⁰

Lareau acknowledges Kohn's influence throughout her work and her observations generally support his major claims. Both in fact were interested in how class-based parenting helps to perpetuate inequality across generations; Kohn, however, was content to focus on parenting attitudes and values, while Lareau chose to concentrate more on concrete behaviors of parents (which may or may not stem from explicitly- acknowledged attitudes and values).

The sorts of resource intensive parenting practices that appear to be so deeply entrenched in middle-class homes turn out, on closer inspection, to be a relatively recent phenomenon, at least according to scholars such as Lareau (2003) and Hays (1996). Hays' sociologically-informed history of parenting highlights the dramatic historical and geographical variability in cultural models of parenting that have held places of prominence across the last several centuries. Beginning with accounts of the neglectful and uncaring parenting that characterized childrearing in the Middle Ages, she soon turns to the starry-eyed sentimentalism and fascination with childhood innocence that emerged among 17th and 18th century middle classes and intellectuals. This period appears to have started the wheels of the movement toward intensive mothering in motion, and the effort it took parents to maintain middle-class respectability only continued to increase when medical doctors and psychologists took over as the leading childrearing experts at the close of the 19th century. Largely replacing the poets, philosophers, and religious zealots who held the ears of loyal listeners in the not so distant past, figures such as Luther Emmett Holt, John Watson, and G. Stanley Hall became household names as new mothers embraced their scientific-sounding

¹⁰ Kohn did not attempt to determine if, or how, these values related to actual parenting behaviors. Luster et al.'s (1989) work, however, established support for a link between values and behavior within their sample.

pronouncements. Increasingly, large sections of the public accepted that the knowledge necessary to parent properly was not innate, but rather could only be acquired through classes, pamphlets, public service campaigns, and books. Furthermore, with physicians and psychologists consulted more readily than pastors and priests, the content of parental concerns began to change— inquires vis-à-vis cognitive development and social skills soon superseded questions about character formation.

Advice continued to proliferate, and experts continued, to be consulted, in the next, “permissive” period; but while the rigid scheduling and Pavlovian-inspired behavioral modification regimes soon surrendered their favored status among many middle-class mothers, this was not accompanied by appreciable reductions in the effort that “responsible” childrearing required. Taking the place of behaviorist techniques was a softer, more child-centered approach which, in some ways, suggested a return to the dreamy days dramatized in Rousseau’s Romantic classic, *Emile* (1956/1762). The intense focus on children’s interests and especially the imperative of conforming to children’s schedules, however, represents a marked departure in focus from earlier models of childrearing which, while demanding on parents, always placed parental affairs above those of their children. It was not long before the child-centered, resource-intensive, permissive style, endorsed by such luminaries as Dr. Benjamin Spock, T. Berry Brazelton, and Penelope Leach, cemented itself as the preferred method. Today its reign remains largely intact, according to Hays, as evidenced by the prevailing attitudes expressed by individuals working within middle-class institutions such as schools, social welfare organizations, and the medical professions alike.

So what, precisely, is it that sets the contemporary ideology of “intensive motherhood”¹¹ apart from earlier philosophies and how, specifically, does Hays’ notion of intensive motherhood compare to Lareau’s concept of concerted cultivation? According to Hays, modern motherhood is characterized by the fact that it is: 1) expert-guided¹²; 2) emotionally, financially, and labor-intensive; 3) child-centered; and 4) removed from market-based logic and the norm of efficiency. It turns out, however, that Hays’ conception of intensive childrearing differs quite dramatically from Lareau’s “concerted cultivation” characterization of intensive childrearing. The primary point of divergence surrounds the significantly lower threshold of childrearing behaviors that Hays warrants worthy of the label “intensive.” By approaching her examination of contemporary childrearing standards from a broader comparative historical and cross-cultural angle, Hays encountered much wider variation in norms and behaviors than Lareau, who confined her work to comparisons across contemporary American social classes and racial groups. For example, when weighed against the parents of the past who thought nothing of shipping their six-year-old children off to mine coal, the seemingly commonplace acts of taking a child to the park or worrying about their general welfare, something Hays observed among contemporary parents of all social classes, suddenly seems to warrant the label of “intensive” parenting.

¹¹ Paradoxically, this philosophy of intensive motherhood exists alongside an alternative ideology which places personal freedom and individualism on a pedestal. Despite the heavy burden it placed upon them, however, the mothers Hays interviewed consistently characterized this demanding, child-centered approach not as a sign of the subjugation of women, but rather as suggestive of social progress. Hays speculates that intensive motherhood flourishes because it serves as an active form of protest and resistance; motherhood stands out as one of the few domains, along with, perhaps, friendship and marriage, where the self-interested, utilitarian, efficient, contractual logic of the market does not reign supreme.

¹² Although consulting expert guidance is part and parcel of intensive mothering, Hays (1996) points out that most mothers are not completely open, non-critical receptacles. Instead, she found that the mothers she interviewed 1) read selectively and did not completely trust experts; 2) often consulted fellow mothers for advice; 3) recognized contradictions in opinion across experts.

In contrast, Lareau's focus on the present exposed her to a relatively restricted range of childrearing philosophies and behaviors and, as a result, seems to have raised the bar with respect to what she was willing to recognize as "intensive." In Lareau's account of class-based parenting practices, she saw intensive parenting as defined by the concerted cultivation approach, involving such things as assisting children in their homework, providing the latest educational toys and tools, and spending several weekends a month at gymnastic meets or traveling to soccer games. The natural growth styles' less "hands-on" approach to parenting was not, in contrast, viewed by Lareau as particularly intensive. Therefore, while Hays would likely perceive the behaviors of both natural growth and concerted cultivation parents as "intensive," Lareau would contend that failing to differentiate between these alternative parenting styles ignores important variations across classes in precisely the sorts of practices that provide middle-class children with significant advantages in the status attainment process.

The conceptualization of intensive parenting is not the only area where Lareau and Hays' works diverge. Although Lareau acknowledges the influence that scholarship by figures such as Hays, and also Kohn, has had on her own, she is unambiguous in asserting what sets her apart. Specifically, while Hays and Kohn focus largely on parental *attitudes and values*, Lareau claims to concentrate primarily on parenting *behavior*: "My study focused much more on behavior than attitudes. If I looked at attitudes, I saw fewer differences; for example, all exhibited the desire to be a good mother and to have their children grow and thrive. The differences I found, however, were significant in how parents *enacted* their visions of what it meant to be a good parent" (2003: 290 emphasis in original).

Whether these claims are completely accurate, however, is a point of contention. Yes, it is true that Lareau spends more time detailing the behaviors of parents than in describing the attitudes which may, or may not, motivate, or guide, their childrearing behaviors; references to values and attitudes, however, are far from absent from her account and the attention Lareau does pay to attitudes appears to belie her intimation that inter-class attitudinal differences would not be substantial--or at least not as substantial as their behavioral differences. A careful reading of her text reveals that the parents' beliefs regarding the parental role differ profoundly if one compares the middle-classes to their poor and working-class counterparts. For example, Lareau writes: "... unlike middle-class parents, these [poor and working-class] adults do not consider the concerted development of children, particularly through organized leisure activities, an essential aspect of good parenting" (2003: 2-3). And "... it is not simply the press of everyday life that prompts poor (and working-class) parents to remain relatively uninvolved in their children's play and not inclined to follow up on children's budding interest in music, art, drama, or sports by enrolling them in organized activities. The sense of an *obligation to cultivate* [emphasis in original] their children that is so apparent among middle-class parents is uncommon among their poor and working-class counterparts" (p. 97 see also pp. 82-3).

In fact, Lareau encountered cross-class attitudinal differences not only with respect to what parents felt obligated to provide their children, but also with respect to their beliefs concerning what benefits that these obligatory practices could possibly provide. For instance, Lareau found that "[middle-class] parents ... are conscious of the advantages that such participation brings to their children. Both Mr. and Ms. Tallinger strongly believe that sports teach children crucial life lessons such as knowing 'when to practice and when to perform'

(Lareau 2003: 60). Lareau proceeds to report that it was primarily the middle-class parents she studied, and not the poor and working class parents, who viewed participation in organized activities as fostering maturity and “mental toughness” in their children and as way for youngsters to learn important lessons in how to be “team players.”¹³ Furthermore, notice in the following account how even when the means for concerted cultivation exist, natural-growth parents appear not to be aware of, or care about, employing any of the techniques concomitant of this seemingly foreign ideology: “Similarly, Ms. Brindle [a poor mother] does not seem to think that Melmel needs any special assistance or toys. She appears to see little difference between Melmel’s entertaining himself by pounding on the coffee table, rolling around on the floor, or poking Jenna’s puppy versus playing with his ‘developmentally appropriate’ toys, which except for special occasions, remain neatly stacked in a closet” (Lareau 2003: 101). In another telling passage, Lareau points out that even when working-class parents push their children into organized activities, the values motivating these parents generally fail to fit with concerted cultivation approach to parenting: “... Wendy’s mother [a working class woman] had enrolled her in three organized activities. But this seemed less an effort on her mother’s part to expose Wendy to a range of life experiences than a means of protecting her from the street” (Lareau 2003: 219).

The above passages provide proof that Lareau focuses the attention on both the behaviors *and* beliefs of the parents she studied and that she finds significant social class differences across each dimension. Her self-proclaimed emphasis on behavior, however,

¹³ It is interesting to note that while middle-class parents appear to be aware of the immediate social and developmental advantages that can accrue to those involved in structured activities, Lareau found that ideas concerning potential longer-term benefits were not acknowledged: “neither the benefits nor the costs of the strategies I term *concerted cultivation* seem to be fully understood by parents. For example, the close fit between skills children learn in soccer games or at piano recitals and those they will eventually need in white-collar professional or technical positions goes unnoted” (Lareau 2003: 64).

becomes more understandable upon considering the profound influence that Bourdieu has played in the development of Lareu's general theoretical orientation. While it is frequently noted that Bourdieu's work is replete with allusions to cultural codes, scripts, attitudes, and other mental phenomenon, it is less often understood that he theorizes these to operate, at least at times, below the level of consciousness. In fact, Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* was created, in part, out of his recognition of the role that the unconscious plays in guiding behaviors, and also in the hopes of attempting to transcend the ideational/behavioral duality which serves as a stumbling block for many theoretical systems. Specifically, the *habitus* has been conceptualized as an internalized disposition, "a structuring structure," consisting of patterns of attitudes, behaviors and preferences acquired through a lifetime of social experiences and interactions across a variety of social "fields," or domains. Importantly, much of the constitutive elements of one's habitus are theorized to be outside of the purview of conscious reflection, suggesting that Lareau's preoccupation with the behavioral manifestations of internalized cultural models of parenting is well-conceived.

If, in fact, Bourdieu's formulation of the habitus is correct, then it stands to reason that the most effective means of capturing culturally-based attitudes and values is to make limited use of self-reported survey¹⁴ questions and even in-depth interviews and, instead, observe individuals in the process of acting out the content of their internalized cultural models. Lareau's work exemplifies the natural observation approach and she touches upon the importance of her methodological choice when she points out that: "[a]cross all social classes, child-rearing practices often appeared to be natural. Like breathing, child rearing usually seemed automatic and unconscious. Parents were scarcely aware that they were

¹⁴ It should be noted, however, that Bourdieu's (1984) magnum opus, *Distinction*, relies heavily upon survey data and self-reported attitudes.

orienting their children in specific ways.... While firmly committed to the strategy of concerted cultivation, Mr. and Ms. Williams did not seem especially conscious of their approach. Although both parents mentioned the pleasure they experienced from knowing that Alexander [their son] was curious, they did not appear to link that trait to their own extensive use of reasoning with him” (Lareau 2003: 239). As the preceding quotation reveals, too rigid a distinction between ideas and behaviors may be counterproductive to knowledge accumulation and understanding—a point Bourdieu propounded for years.

To conclude, there are four primary points that readers should take away from this section. First, although Lareau’s work would appear to share connections to the culture of poverty tradition, she remains vague with respect both to how she theorizes the connection between values and behavior and to whether she conceptualizes culture as ideational, behavioral, or both. Second, the threshold for parental practices that Lareau considers “intensive” is higher than for scholars such as Hays who employ more broadly-based comparative perspectives. Third, although Lareau downplays attitudinal differences across classes, evidence that she herself presents suggests that significant differences exist with respect to the obligations that parents feel toward their children, the sorts of characteristics they value in their children, and the behavioral expectations they have for them. Finally, since much of the influence that culture may have over behavior operates unconsciously, research methods which privilege observations of behaviors in natural settings or self-reports of behaviors in surveys may be a better way of capturing various aspects of cultural models than self-reported attitudes and values.

Physical/Material Home Environment

We next turn our gaze from the ideational realm of parental attitudes and ideologies, to some of the concrete, material attributes of the home environment that theoretical works have suggested, and empirical works have found, to influence children's physical, cognitive, and emotional development. Lareau (2002, 2003), for one, claims that the fact that the middle-class, concerted cultivation parenting style is characterized by homes filled with cognitively stimulating materials, has important developmental implications. Middle-class parents, unlike their poor and working-class peers, ensure that encyclopedias, dictionaries, computers, pianos, and an assortment of additional books, toys, and art supplies can all be found close at hand, ready to enrich their children's minds and to foster their growth in ways to maximize their chances of current and future accomplishments.

An examination of the interdisciplinary literature concerning material aspects of home environment reveals that scholars have considered a remarkably wide range of dimensions of the physical home environment. Some of these dimensions, such as access to books and nutrition, are almost too obvious to note, while others, such as exposure to lead (Bellinger and Needleman 2003), mercury (Grandjean et al. 1997), noise (Maxwell and Evans 2000; Lercher et al. 2003; Matsui et al 2004; Stansfeld et al. 2005), and other toxins and noxious stimuli (for overview see Bellinger and Adams 2001; Evans 2006), although not always acknowledged by sociologists, may be even more important to ensuring healthy physical and intellectual development and achieving success in life.

If attempting to understand recent literature regarding the material resources and the physical milieu in which children are raised, a logical place with which to begin is with the highly influential work of Caldwell and Bradley and their Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME) Inventory. Conceived of by Caldwell and

Bradley in 1984, the HOME Inventory uses interviewer observations of the home environment and parent child interactions, along with parent reports in order to “assess the emotional support and cognitive stimulation children receive through their home environment, planned events, and family surroundings” (Linver, Brooks-Gunn, and Cabrera 2004). Over time, different inventories have been created to correspond to four specific age-groups, from infancy to early adolescence.¹⁵ Each of these age-specific inventories contains subscales which capture important dimensions of the physical surroundings of the home (e.g., Learning Materials, Physical Environment) along with subscales relating to behavioral traits of parents (e.g., Acceptance and Responsivity, Regulatory Activities, Variety of Experiences) .¹⁶ Evidence of the influence of the HOME inventory in structuring which aspects of the physical home environment social scientists tend to study can be found throughout the literature regarding the impact of the home environment on childhood and adolescent outcomes, as other indicators are rarely available in large data sets.

Yeung, Linver, and Brooks-Gunn’s (2002) variable, “stimulating learning environment (materials),” for instance, attempts to tap into physical resources that increase the likelihood of cognitively-stimulating, positive parent child-interactions and which are also available for youth to use themselves in order to foster their intellectual growth. Guo and Harris’ (2000) latent variable, “physical environment,” on the other hand, measures the

¹⁵ 1) Infant-Toddler HOME (birth-3 years); 2) Early Childhood HOME (4-5 years); 3) Middle-Childhood HOME (6-9 years); and Early-Adolescent HOME (10-14 years).

¹⁶ The Bradley HOME inventory has been extremely important influence on contemporary research on childrearing and the home environment due to the fact that a large number of data sets based a large percentage of their data collection efforts on questions from the inventory. Since so much of parenting research relies upon these large, oftentimes nationally representative data sets, conceptual work may have been constrained by the variables included in these data sources. The lack of questions in large surveys regarding parents’ attitudes and values may account for the relative paucity of recent work on this aspect of parenting.

extent to which a home is clean, uncluttered, safe, or dark and monotonous, as an environment that is safe, clean, and visually interesting, and is reasoned to prove more conducive to learning and development than its contrary. A number of other constructs, including Guo and Harris' (2000) "cognitive stimulation," Raver, Gershoff, and Aber's (2007) "parent investment," Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell's "cultural capital," and Bradley and Corwyn's (2003) "learning stimulation scale," combine aspects of the physical home environment with parental behaviors and, therefore, are discussed in the next section on "hybrid concepts."

In the course of her ethnographic observations of families, Lareau took notice of a number of the physical characteristics of the homes she entered. Some features, such as cleanliness, were only touched upon due to the fact that she did not find significant differences across social classes. Other features, like the occasional food shortages and less nutritious meals of the poor and working classes, were also given little attention, presumably because Lareau did not deem them to be important sources of advantage for some children over others. On the other hand, Lareau counted material advantages in the form of cognitively engaging games, computers, books, and art supplies as part and parcel of her concerted-cultivation construct (Lareau 2000, 2003; Cheadle 2008).¹⁷ Overall, then, it appears we can conclude that Lareau's treatment of the material home environment does not differ appreciably from the standard conceptualization encountered throughout the mainstream sociological and developmental-psychology parenting literatures.

¹⁷ In the following passage, Lareau (2003) makes clear both how the material environment varies across social classes and how these differences relate to cognitive stimulation: "There is no emphasis on providing materials Katie [a young girl from a poor family] might use at home to further develop her creativity. Moreover, because children in poor neighborhoods have relatively few possessions, creating entertainment from makeshift sources is common.... While middle-class homes typically have a nearly inexhaustible supply of paper, crayons, markers, stickers, and assorted other craft supplies for children's use, the Brindle house has none, literally. The family does not own a ruler or marking pens. Paper of any kind is of short supply" (pp. 100-1).

Parental Behavioral Traits

According to Lareau's conceptualization, parental behavior traits constitute the core dimensions of concerted cultivation. For example, plentiful parent-child verbal interaction, careful organization of children's free time, and strategic interventions in institutions in ways that advantage their children are some of the more salient parenting traits that Lareau observed to differ by class and appeared to make significant differences in children's lives.

Paralleling Lareau, the bulk of the childrearing literature focuses upon the behavioral traits of parents, as opposed to the physical home environment or parental values and attitudes. Ranging from survey-based studies of the use of breast-feeding and strategies of toilet training (Davis and Havighurst 1946) to observational studies of parental involvement in the application process to elite private schools (Chin 2000) and of class-based variations in home linguistic environments which require researchers to carefully record and count everything from varieties of sentence types to the average number of noun phrases parents use per sentence (see, for instance, Huttenlocher et al. 2007), the research concerning parental behavioral traits is nothing if not varied. In fact, in a highly influential article, Schaefer (1965) identified twenty-six concepts related to parental behavior, while Holden (1997) noted that "since the 1930s, well over thirty parenting traits have been created by researchers in an effort to describe the nature of parents" (p. 28). Furthermore, five of the seven subscales of The Early Adolescent HOME Inventory refer to behavioral traits of parents—"modeling," "fostering self-sufficiency," "regulatory activities," "variety of experiences," and "acceptance and responsivity" (Bradley, Corwyn, Caldwell, Whiteside-Mansell, Wasserman, and Mink 2000).

Despite the fact that numerous specific parenting traits have been identified, there has been remarkable agreement among scholars that many of the most important of these traits fall along two orthogonal dimensions¹⁸: “demandingness” and “responsiveness” (Maccoby & Martin 1993; Baumrind 2005; see also Darling & Steinberg 1993). Parents scoring high on both these dimensions are often referred to as “authoritative”¹⁹ and, in large part because they have been linked to a myriad of positive behavioral outcomes in children (e.g., academic success, psychosocial maturity, positive affect), have been studied intensely over the years (Baumrind 1966, 1991; Lamborn et al. 1991; Steinberg, Elmer, and Mounts 1989). This section begins by examining how the intersecting parenting elements of responsiveness and demandingness have been conceptualized within the authoritative research tradition and compares important dimensions of each to key aspects of Lareau’s parenting constructs. Next, I examine additional parenting behaviors, such as those relating to cognitive stimulation which, while more relevant to Lareau’s focus, have been curiously deemphasized by most scholars working within the traditional authoritative parenting framework.

Responsiveness

¹⁸ Reviewing over a half century of literature on parenting styles, Darling and Steinberg (1993) were shocked at the consistency with which scholars coming from much different theoretical traditions identified similar dimensions as constituting the core organizing structures of commonly encountered parenting styles: “For Symonds (1939), these dimensions included acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission; for Baldwin (1948), emotional warmth/hostility and detachment/involvement; for Schaefer (1959), love/hostility and autonomy/control; for Sears et al. (1957), warmth and permissiveness/strictness; and for Becker (1964), warmth/hostility and restrictiveness/permissiveness” (p. 489).

¹⁹ While it has often been theorized that the optimal parenting style, authoritative parenting, consists of high levels of responsiveness coupled with high levels of demandingness, Baumrind added a wrinkle to this conventional thinking in her 1991 piece “Effective Parenting during the Early Adolescent Transition.” Here she conjectures, but is unable to test, that *moderate* levels of responsiveness and demandingness may produce the most advantageous developmental results during adolescence. Drawing on this Baumrind piece, Kurdek and Fine (1994) speculate that thresholds of both responsiveness and demandingness may be reached beyond which additional benefits may diminish.

“Responsiveness” has typically been used to denote how sensitive and attuned a parent is to a child’s needs²⁰, and how consistently and appropriately he or she responds to cues signaling such needs (see Holden 1997). Such a broad definition leaves ample room for differences in interpretations, as evidenced by the multitude of ways that responsiveness has been operationalized. Consequently, determining how Lareau’s parenting conceptualizations fit with respect to responsiveness and the research surrounding authoritative parenting presents a formidable challenge.

The majority of scholars who employ the concept of responsiveness work within the authoritative parenting tradition and perceive it as a positive attribute, especially when it is accompanied by similarly high levels of demandingness (Baumrind 1966; Maccoby and Martin 1983; Steinberg 2001). Research falling under the loose banner of “responsiveness” has focused primarily around parental behaviors that are perceived as vital to fulfilling various emotional and psychological needs of children, including requirements for warmth and affection, sympathy, and acceptance. For example, parent or child reports, or direct observations of demonstrations of physical affection, have been employed as measures of how responsive parents are to a child’s need for warmth and affection. Children’s responses to questions regarding how often their parents cheer them up when they are feeling down are, on the other hand, commonly used to capture responsiveness to emotional needs, such as sympathy. Finally, whether parents are responsive to needs for acceptance is attained through questions asking how often parents praise or compliment their children and how frequently they engage in mutually rewarding activities together.

²⁰ In practice scholars working within the responsiveness/authoritarian parenting literature have focused primarily on emotional and psychological “needs” and have generally taken for granted basic physical needs. Furthermore, they deemphasized needs surrounding the development of a full range of intellectual and cognitive skills.

Since parental sensitivity to children's emotional and psychological requirements remains the most typical way of conceptualizing "responsiveness," it seems obvious that Lareau, whose work ignores extended discussions of the emotional climates of the homes she observed, has little to contribute to an understanding of the construct. Tellingly, the index to *Unequal Childhoods* does not include an entry for love, physical affection, warmth, or any emotion, for that matter, with the exception of boredom. In fact, Lareau's silence with respect to the emotional climate of parent-child relations is far and away where her work divergences the most from the scholarship of psychologists such as Baumrind, Maccoby, and Steinberg, who tend to see the emotional climate of parenting as the foundation over which all other parenting behaviors play out (see Darling & Steinberg 1993).

However, claiming that Lareau's work fails to offer insights into aspects parental responsiveness may, in spite of the obvious absence of discussions of parent-child emotional exchanges, be premature. Lareau's silence with respect to the emotional home environment does not, necessarily, attest that Lareau's account is devoid of descriptions of parental responsiveness. If, contrary to the authoritative parenting tradition, one conceives of responsiveness in terms other than the purely emotional or psychological, such as how much parents respond to children's "needs" to cultivate the sorts of skills necessary to interact comfortably and succeed within middle-class dominated institutions, then Lareau's model of parenting practices overlaps considerably with the concept. As noted earlier, Lareau's conceptualization of "concerted cultivation" addresses, among other things, parental attempts to engage their children in cognitively stimulating conversation, to intervene in institutions (such as schools) in ways that advantage their children, and to organize their children's schedules by enrolling them in structured activities. While Lareau does not couch her

discussions in the language of “responsiveness,” many of the behaviors she describes as characteristic of “concerted cultivation” can also be interpreted as “responsive” to children’s needs to acquire important intellectual and social skills. If children have needs for parents who are sympathetic, warm, and emotionally-available, they may also require parents who are sensitive to their current needs to foster the habits and abilities likely to lead to advantages in places like classrooms, as well anticipating their more distal needs to acquire the sorts of skills useful in setting themselves apart from others when they are ready to enter cutthroat labor markets.

Demandingness

“Demandingness,” along with responsiveness, forms one of the two orthogonal dimensions which scholars such as Maccoby & Martin (1983), Dornbusch et al 1987, and Baumrind (1991) have considered instrumental to understanding and classifying different parenting styles. The literature surrounding demandingness reveals a complex, multi-dimensional concept which, like responsiveness, has been conceptualized and operationalized in numerous ways. And while rarely examined in full, treatments of the construct have focused on various combinations of the following elements: 1) rules and regulations; 2) enforcement patterns; and 3) monitoring/surveillance. While there may not be complete consensus, demanding parents are generally held to be those who expect high standards of behavior, consistently enforce such standards (while resisting child’s attempts at coercion), and effectively monitor their children (while avoiding intrusiveness) (Baumrind 1967, 1971, 1991).

In comparing Lareau's concerted cultivation concept to "responsiveness" it emerged that any congruence between the two is dependent upon whether or not one chooses to stick to the rather narrow notion of responsiveness found within the authoritative parenting literature or expand the term to include parental sensitivity to a broader range of current and future needs. A similar situation arises with respect to demandingness; for example, if we take the typical approach of interpreting rules and regulations to concern parental attempts to establish minimal standards of conduct through explicit directives, then it is difficult to call forth points of convergence with Lareau (Steinberg, Elmer, and Mounts 1989; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch 1991).^{21 22} However, the rules and regulations dimension of demandingness emerges as much more applicable to Lareau if one includes not only parent's use of *explicit* rules aimed at avoiding problem behaviors but also the *implicit* rules and *expectations* that parents use to inspire high standards in their children and to foster excellence in their behavior. If we take this more expansive conceptualization, significant class differences emerge. Natural growth and concerted cultivation parents directly contradict one another, for example, with respect to the expectations each have for how their children should, ideally, interact with adults: Poor and working-class parents expect their children to obey adult directives unconditionally--without "back-talk," while middle class parents encourage their children to be at ease with, and openly engage, the adults they encounter. Similarly, while middle-class parents expect their children to look adults in the

²¹ The only real mention Lareau makes of rules and regulation concerns the tendency for parents to place greater restrictions on the ability of females to stray far from home.

²² Presumably this absence is due to the fact that Lareau failed to find that social class strongly determined the sorts of basic expectations parents hold for their children and the sorts of rules they establish with respect to domains of life such as where they can play, chores, how late they can stay up, and rules regarding when homework is done. Lareau did, however, mention that the television was constantly on in poor and working class homes and not in middle class homes, which could indicate rules about such activities being more likely in the latter homes (or it could just indicate that middle class children were largely too busy to watch much television).

eyes, shake their hands, and to interact as relative equals (resulting in growing sense of “entitlement”), poor and working parents demand that their children adhere to the age-old adage of “not speaking until spoken to” and that they treat adults with the utmost in deference (resulting in a growing sense of “constraint”). Finally, Lareau found significant class differences with respect to parental encouragement of, and expectations for, demonstrations of competitiveness and high performance from their children. Middle class parents not only insisted on a full schedule of skill-cultivating activities, but also expected their children to deal with the pressures inherent in performing on soccer fields, during gymnastic meets, and at piano recitals. Lareau found that working class and poor parents, although largely uninterested in their children’s leisure, expected their children’s play to remain carefree and noncompetitive.

At first blush, the enforcement²³ and monitoring components of demandingness also appear to have little overlap with, or relevance to, Lareau’s treatment of parenting. Lareau, after all, makes little mention of parental attempts to enforce rules or to solicit details from their children about where they have been or what they have been doing, nor does she describe children differentially volunteering such information. It would be inaccurate, however, to assume that this suggests working class and poor parents are privy to the same amount of information about their respective children. With so much of their children’s time spent in organized, adult-structured (and monitored) activities, middle class parents could not help but to know more about their children’s whereabouts than working class and poor parents who permit their children to freely plan much of their own free time. Additionally,

²³ Lareau does mention that she observed corporal punishment employed more frequently in poor and working-class homes.

this increased involvement in their children's schooling and extracurricular activities (e.g., attending events, volunteering, etc.), makes middle-class parents also more likely to acquire information from the teachers, coaches, and fellow parents that they inevitably encounter at such events (Horvat, Weininger, & Lareau 2003; Lareau 2003). Finally, although not explicitly acknowledged in her account, it would seem reasonable for readers of Lareau's ethnography to suppose that the open communication typical of the middle-class homes she observed is more conducive to self-disclosure than the relatively constrained interactions which tend to transpire in poor and working class homes.

In conclusion, it appears to take a considerable amount of effort and creativity to find parallels between Lareau's concerted cultivation and natural growth parenting constructs and the responsiveness and demandingness concepts, at least as they have been interpreted within the authoritarian parenting literature. Fortunately, it is considerably easier to establish connections with the cognitive stimulation literature, which we turn to next.

Cognitive Stimulation

Unlike the literature surrounding responsiveness and demandingness, which has been limited mainly to psychologists, sociologists, economists, and psychologists alike have contributed to the research surrounding parental "investments" in their children's cognitive development. Unfortunately, while parental attempts at promoting the cognitive development of their children have received a good deal of empirical attention, the literature on the topic has generally not reached the same level of conceptual development as we have seen with respect to responsiveness and demandingness. Take, for instance, the ever-growing research

surrounding extracurricular activity involvement.²⁴ Largely-empirically driven, researchers exploring children's participation in organized activities have, aside from Lareau, hardly attempted to theorize whether, and how, children's participation in such activities is linked to larger, potentially class-based, cultures of parental strategies to provide children with advantages in skill development. Even Dumais (2006), who links her research exploring structured activity participation (i.e., music lessons, dance lessons, art lessons, performing arts, athletics, and clubs) among elementary school children to Lareau's theory of class cultures of concerted cultivation, only examines one dimension of Lareau's concerted cultivation construct.

Another potential problem with the research on extracurricular activity involvement is the extent to which it is appropriate to include it in a section concerning *parental* behavioral traits. Depending upon the developmental stage or age of the child and the nature of the activity, it may or may not make sense to include children and youth's activity involvement under the realm of "parental behaviors." The best case for inclusion would come at younger ages due to fact that during those stages of the lifecourse parents are likely to be "behaviorally" involved through providing: 1) permission and/or encouragement; 2) transportation; and 3) financial support. However, even during adolescence parents are likely to be involved, although perhaps to a lesser degree, and are especially likely to be instrumental in aiding activity involvement if the child is participating in activities outside of school settings which are more likely to require financial investments and transportation.

While it may be debatable whether a child's enrollment in extracurricular activities is, necessarily, an example of *parental* behavior, other potential examples of parental

²⁴ See, for instance, Marsh (1992), Hanson and Kraus (1998), and Broh (2002).

involvement in the cognitive stimulation of their children are significantly less ambiguous. For example, Yeung et al. (2002), whose two physical capital measures, “physical home environment” and “cognitively stimulating materials,” sum-up some of the key material (i.e., financial) investments parents make in their children’s development, also created a third construct, “nonmonetary parental investment,” in order to tap into parental investments in time and energy. Solving puzzles together, taking trips to museums, and reading stories are examples of some of the indicators Yeung et al. (2002) used to capture the sorts of skill-cultivating stimulation that parents differentially provide their children.

A realm of research which counters my earlier criticism of underconceptualization in the cognitive stimulation arena is that pertaining to parent-child linguistic interactions. I have already mentioned that Lareau’s sociologically-informed study of class-based cultures of childrearing focused a good deal of attention on the rather limited parent-child verbal interactions she witnessed within poor and working-class households as compared to the much more extensive and open communication she observed in middle-class homes. Most inquiry into home language environments and linguistic development, however, is conducted by psychologists.²⁵ An early example is Bee et al.’s (1969) research examining maternal teaching strategies and the speech patterns mothers’ use when interacting with their children. In order to do justice to the deceptively complicated exchanges which readily occur between

²⁵ While most of the current work on linguistic environments is conducted by psychologists, some significant, pioneering work linking language and social class came out of sociology. For instance, one of Britain’s leading sociologists, Basil Bernstein (1975), developed a conflict theory of communication, proposing two ideal types of linguistic codes which corresponded closely with social class: “restricted codes,” which prevailed among the lower classes and “elaborated codes” which were more prevalent among the middle and upper classes. The “elaborated code,” which is favored by schools, government, corporations, and other middle-class, “official” institutions relies upon more detailed, explicit forms of expression and does not assume much knowledge from the interactional partner. There is a greater tendency to use more modifiers and subordinate clauses and for language to “stand on its own,” rather than taking for granted that others share background information with the speaker. A “restricted code,” on the other hand, is characterized by greater egocentrism and reliance upon common-- group or community-- understandings, hence it is a linguistic style geared towards “locals” as opposed to one readily understandable to “cosmopolitans” (see also Schatzman and Strauss 1955).

parent and child, Bee et al. (1969) considered everything from mean maternal sentence lengths and adjective/verb quotients to the percentages of personal pronouns mothers employed and the syntactic complexity of their utterances. Today, this research agenda continues to incorporate the sorts of micro-measures used by Bee et al. (1969) to capture parent-child interactions, while adding additional elements such as the number and diversity of words spoken in the home in order to capture the overall talkativeness and the richness of vocabulary, respectively (See, for example, the highly influential work of such scholars as Hart & Risley (1992, 1995); Hoff (2003), & Huttenlocher (2007).

As alluded to earlier, what sets the research relating to home linguistic environments apart from the larger cognitive stimulation literature is the level of conceptual refinement it has reached (as indicated by the finely detailed aspects of communication that it considers), along with the richness of the data and the amount of resources required for its collection. Not surprisingly, data of such quality is hard to come by and has, to this point, been limited to small, non-representative (e.g., snowball and convenience) samples. Nationally representative data sets, which generally rely upon self-reports of parent-child verbal interactions, cannot possibly register the same level of nuance as the natural observation-based research reported above.

Similarly, Lareau, who attempted to explore the broadest possible range of class-differentiated childrearing practices, was incapable of capturing as comprehensive a range of linguistic routines as that of Bee, Hoff, Huttenlocher and others, whose work was much more narrowly focused, concentrating solely on parent-child verbal interactions. Despite of being significantly less intent on looking at language usage within the home, Lareau still managed to uncover significant class-based differences. In line with others who have studied the topic

(i.e., Bee , Hoff, Hart & Risley, and Huttenlocher), Lareau found that poor and working class parents preferred using directives when speaking to their children, while offering few conversation-eliciting questions and providing relatively little assistance in building their children's vocabulary. Meanwhile, and quite tellingly, "Talk, Talk, Talk: The Importance of Language Use in Middle-Class Families" heads a section outlining the middle class, concerted-cultivation approach to parenting. Overall then, although Lareau may not add much to the existing literature on home linguistic environments, she should be commended for her ability to sensitize scholars to the idea that verbal interactions could be tied to larger class-based cultural logics.

Looking back on this section comparing Lareau's concepts of concerted cultivation and natural growth to the existing literature on parental behavioral traits, a number of points are worth reiterating. For one, Lareau's work shares little overlap with the highly influential authoritative parenting literature as each currently stands. On the other hand, Lareau's work is much more closely aligned with work that researchers have done with respect to parental investments in their children's cognitive stimulation. Existing research, with respect to children's extracurricular involvement, joint parent-child activities, and linguistic exchanges within the home, shares significant similarities to Lareau's treatment of concerted cultivation. Where the concerted cultivation approach to parenting differs, however, is in its complexity and inclusiveness, as it incorporates aspects of the material home environment. This brings us to our next section examining prior attempts to link multiple spheres of parenting and the home environment into unified, multi-dimensional constructs.

Hybrid concepts

Thus far I have organized the social scientific literature regarding elements of the home environment into three broad sections: 1) parental values and attitudes; 2) physical/material characteristics of the home environment; and 3) parental behavioral traits. In this fourth and final section, I now turn to hybrid concepts, constructs which aggregate two or more of the above elements of the home environment into multidimensional scales, indexes, and constructs.

Scholars differ regarding the issue of whether they prefer to maintain multiple unidimensional concepts in their models of childrearing or, alternatively, create more complex, multidimensional constructs. Earlier we saw that Yeung et al. (2002), a “splitter,” chose to separate material dimensions of the home environment from investments in time. Other researchers are “lumpers,” opting to create “hybrid” constructs in the hopes of capturing, within a single measurement model, a more comprehensive picture of the various resources parents differentially provide their children. For example, Brooks-Gunn, Klebanov, & Duncan (1996), whose research focused on children younger than Lareau’s, used a variety of indicators of parental involvement in stimulating activities with the child (e.g., reading stories to the child) along with a measure of the learning materials available to the child (e.g., toys which require the learning of new skills) in an attempt to capture the overall level of cognitive stimulation within the home. Similarly, Guo and Harris’ (2000) “cognitive stimulation” construct contains items covering how often mothers read to children, whether they frequent museums together, the number of books a child has, and the number of magazines a family receives. Raver, Gershoff, and Aber (2007), take a similar approach, but add some confusion by employing a different name, “parent investment,” to a construct consisting of items remarkably similar to Guo and Harris’s (2000) and Brooks-Gunn et al.’s

(1996) “cognitive stimulation.” “Parent investment” (Raver et al. 2002) incorporates elements of both physical (e.g., investment in cognitively stimulating materials) and nonphysical investments (e.g., extracurricular activities outside the home; school involvement; parent-child activities outside the home). Finally, with Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell’s (1999) “cultural capital,” we encounter yet another example of similar indicators of behaviors and physical resources wrapped in a different label. Their Bourdieuan-inspired construct, “cultural capital,” is operationalized as a combination of “household educational resources” (e.g., magazines, books, newspaper, encyclopedia), “cultural trips” (e.g., attending museums), and “cultural classes” (e.g., non-school lessons in activities such as art, dance, and music).

Lareau’s concerted cultivation is, likewise, properly conceptualized as a hybrid concept, including both parental behavior traits and material resources which aid in children’s cognitive development.²⁶ There have been, thus far, two quantitative attempts at testing Lareau’s theory and each has incorporated both material objects and behavioral patterns in constructing their measures of concerted cultivation (Bodovski and Farkas 2008; Cheadle 2008). Using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten (ECLS-K), Cheadle (2008) was able to create a higher-order latent construct capturing three dimensions of concerted cultivation: 1) parental participation in educational institutions²⁷; 2)

²⁶ As discussed earlier, it is arguable as to whether, and exactly which, parental attitudinal measures apply. Lareau suggests that she is mostly concerned with behaviors. However, I believe her writings indicate otherwise. Unfortunately, the data I employ are bereft of attitudinal measures anyway. However, future research should consider including parental attitudes and values in operationalizing the concerted cultivation construct.

²⁷ Attended an open house or back to school night; attended a PTA or PTO meeting; attended a regularly scheduled parent-teacher conference; attended a school or class event; volunteered at school or served on a committee; participated in a school fundraiser.

child activities²⁸; and 3) material resources.²⁹ In a promising first step toward verifying the correctness of Lareau's conceptualization, confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the lower order constructs all loaded strongly on the second-order construct of concerted cultivation. Unfortunately, data restrictions prevented a complete operationalization of Lareau's intentions, as Cheadle lacked indicators of the sorts of parent-child communication which is so central to construct.³⁰

Bodovski and Farkas (2008), also using data from the ECLS-K, operationalized concerted cultivation as the sum of the z-scores of three sub-scales: 1) parental school involvement; 2) parental perceptions of their responsibilities toward their children; 3) children's use of leisure time, along with the number of children's books in the home. Considering that Bodovski and Farkas (2008), like Cheadle (2008), employed data from the ECLS-K, it is not surprising that they also could not include measures of parent-child verbal interactions.

In line with both Cheadle (2008) and Bodovski and Farkas (2008), I conceptualized concerted cultivation as a continuous variable. Families scoring low with respect to concerted cultivation can be treated, in Lareau's words, as "achieving natural growth." Building primarily on Cheadle's promising latent variable measurement model of concerted

²⁸ Dance lessons; organized athletic activities; clubs or recreational programs; music lessons; art classes or lessons; organized performing arts programs.

²⁹ Books.

³⁰ However, Cheadle (2008) correctly suggests that, due to the fact that he was able to model three elements of concerted cultivation, and these three elements should, according to Lareau, be closely connected to the fourth, omitted, element, the addition of this fourth element would not likely add much explanatory power to the analyses: "the latent variable measure is identified by the relationships among the indicators of concerted cultivation, and these correlations are considerable, so to the extent that linguistic patterns are also tied to children's participation in activities, parental participation with school, and children's reading materials, then at least some of the linguistic components of parent-child relationships were captured with the measure that was used" (p. 24).

cultivation and given the multidimensional aspects of Lareau's central concept, my first hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 1: *Concerted cultivation is a latent construct manifested across a range of parenting behaviors including: verbal stimulation, skill cultivation/Involvement, provision of material educational resources, and involvement of children in organized extra-curricular activities.*

CHAPTER III

THE CLASS BASIS OF THE CONCERTED CULTIVATION

As the preceding section demonstrates, numerous concepts have been created in order to aid scholars in understanding diverse dimensions of the home environment, including parental attitudes, childrearing behaviors and linguistic styles, and physical resources. In this section I turn to some of the many efforts attempting to link these concepts to social class and/or socioeconomic status. Importantly, a key idea emerging from Lareau's observational research, and a central component of Lareau's theoretical position, is her claim that distinct social classes do, in fact, exist. This stands in contrast to the majority of contemporary scholars who prefer a more continuous conceptualization of socioeconomic status. Lareau's contention that classes exist is based in large part on her observations that parents she classified as poor and working class provided different home environments and adhered to different parenting philosophies than their middle class counterparts: Middle class parents pay particular attention to providing as many skill-cultivating resources as possible to their children, while poor and working class parents are generally content to provide essentials and to let their children "accomplish natural growth." However, before considering the extent to which existing literature supports the claim that class is tied to cultures of childrearing, we must first address a number of complicated issues concerning the conceptualization of "class." And although, or perhaps because, it has been largely ignored by Lareau, particular

attention must be paid to the sorts of evidence necessary to support the contention that social and economic inequality is best conceptualized categorically, as opposed to continuously.

With roots reaching back to foundational texts by Marx and Weber, and extending forward to the contemporary debates between scholars such as Goldthorpe (1987), Wright (1985; 1996), Kingston (2000), and Pakulski and Waters (1996), the issue of whether socioeconomic inequality is more accurately conceptualized from within a framework of discrete classes or, alternatively, as “multi-runged” ladders of continuous gradation has proven to be a source of prolonged and divisive battles. Lareau, for one, strongly identifies with class theory:

“Social scientists disagree over the proper way to measure inequality in the real world. Some take a gradational approach: on the basis of the key elements of inequality—especially occupational prestige, education, and income—they rank individuals or families in a relatively seamless hierarchy. Yet occupations differ greatly, particularly in the amount of autonomy workers enjoy, the degree to which some people supervise others, the pay, the cleanliness or dirtiness of the work performed, and the amount of prestige that the job commands. *I think of these differences in nongradational terms.*” (p. 26) [emphasis added]

In the quotation above Lareau implies that, if “occupations differ greatly” on a number of key elements, then researchers are compelled to “think of these differences in nongradational terms” (p. 26). In fact, scholars from both class-based and gradational perspectives generally agree that inequalities, even substantial inequalities, exist within most contemporary societies both with respect to income and to a myriad of occupational characteristics (Kingston 2000; Pakulski & Waters 1996). Therefore, it is confusing as to why Lareau neglects to articulate precisely *why* significant variations in advantages necessitates, or provides a convincing rationale in favor of analyses based upon discrete classes. Furthermore, coming out on the side of class-based analysis begs the question of how

to create discrete classes out of what appears, at least to many, as relatively continuous income and occupational inequalities. Income, by its very nature, is, after all, a continuous variable, and, even if we limited the discussion to the realm of work, obvious disparities across diverse dimensions of occupations, including pay, prestige, safety, and security, along with workplace autonomy, opportunities for advancement, and access to benefits, appear to be largely gradational, as opposed to categorical, in nature. Is it accurate to argue that employees can be classified as either having authority or not? Are jobs best classified as not dangerous, somewhat dangerous, and very dangerous? How many discrete categories would be reasonable to establish with respect to occupational prestige, or regarding levels of job security? One can conclude, then, that despite her strong declaration in support of discrete classes over gradations of stratification, Lareau remains somewhat vague with respect to why class analysis is preferable.

Lareau is less mysterious with regard to how class-classificatory maps can, in practice, be created. Across the years a number of different strategies have developed in the attempt to capture the key elements of socioeconomic inequality: So called “class theorists” favor the creation of discrete classes generally based upon aspects of occupational status, such as the relationship to means of production (workers versus owners), authority in the workforce (supervised versus supervisors), and the credentials needed to practice (unskilled versus skilled/blue-collar versus white-collar). Stratification theorists, on the other hand, view society as consisting of more continuous levels of inequality. To complicate matters further, stratification theorists are themselves divided between researchers who argue for including separate measures of income, occupational status, and education (Entwisle and Ashton 1994; Duncan and Magnusson 2003; for reviews, see Ensinger and Fothergill 2003;

Smith and Graham 1995) and those who prefer to aggregate two or more of these typical stratification measures into a single construct (Hollingshead 1975; Bornstein, Hahn, Suwalsky, and Haynes 2003).³¹

In fashioning her own class categories, Lareau considered both theory and pragmatics before settling on a three-class categorization schema to accommodate her sample. The fact that her most intensive ethnographic observations were limited to just twelve families turned out to be a significant factor in her choice, creating a number of practical constraints. For example, the more finely grained class models of Goldthorpe, who generally recommends a seven category classification scheme but has also proposed three, five, eight (Goldthorpe 1987) and eleven category versions (Erikson & Goldthorpe 1993), or Wright (1985), who proposes twelve classes, were not feasible for Lareau. Lareau's limited sample size, along with her goal of making comparisons across both social class and racial lines, ensured that anything over three class categories would prove counterproductive.³²

Although not able to conform faithfully to the classificatory strategies set forth by Goldthorpe or Wright, Lareau did employ similar criteria, including workplace authority, academic credentials, and source of income, in creating her own class map.³³ For example, families classified as "middle class" were those in which the head of household was employed in a job entailing either 1) frequent use of "highly complex, educationally certified

³¹ Occupational prestige (e.g. Duncan, North-Hatt), often created from weighted income and education measures, has often served as a single dimensional continuous measure. While occupational prestige measures were at one time widely utilized, they have recently been waning in popularity. An additional complication comes from research in which continuous measures are arbitrarily divided into pseudo "classes."

³² In statistical terms, Lareau would run into the problem of empty cells (i.e., some race X class categories would likely either go unrepresented or contain a single representative, making comparisons untenable).

³³ Ownership of means of production remains a central preoccupation/foundation of Wrights' neo-Marxist class theory which did not factor into Lareau's study due to the scarcity of subjects who were employers or self-employed (Lareau 2002: 752).

(i.e., college-level) skills” and/or 2) a substantial degree of managerial authority (Lareau 2003: 279). “Working class” families, on the other hand, had “at least one parent ... employed in a position with little or no managerial authority and that [did] not draw on highly complex, educationally certifiable skills. This category include[d] lower-level white collar workers” (Lareau 2003: 279). Finally, Lareau’s “poor” share many characteristics with those whom other researchers and social critics have labeled the “underclass,” including inconsistent labor force participation and prolonged reliance on public assistance.

Contrary to class theorists like Lareau (2003), Goldthorpe (1987), and Wright (1985), are scholars such as Kingston (2000) and Pakulski and Waters (1996) who challenge the notion that “class” remains a viable social scientific concept. These dissenters assert that, while the existence of inequality in contemporary societies is irrefutable, evidence of distinct social classes is sparse. According to this position, economic and occupational inequality is necessary, but certainly not sufficient, to demonstrate the existence of distinct classes. Furthermore, even countless studies reporting correlations between economic and occupational inequalities and any number of outcomes is not proof, in and of itself, that any meaningful conception of a class system is present. Kingston (2000) contends: “Bear in mind my minimalist definition of a class: a substantial group having common economic circumstances and relatively distinct life experiences. Obviously some degree of economic inequality is necessary for a class system to exist. Yet inequality is only a necessary, but by no means a sufficient, condition for class structuration. At least hypothetically, any particular level of inequality can be accompanied by varying levels of class structuration” (p. 53). In order to remain relevant to current debates in the social sciences, Kingston contends that class researchers must embrace the “realist position,” as opposed to a “nominalist” position.

The core of the nominalist stance, as Kingston (2000) defines it, is the tendency of adherents to become overly focused on definitional issues at the expense of attempting to determine if their carefully-defined classes actually share anything significant in common except the label. If nominalist class assignments fail to tell us anything about how people classified into certain categories actually experience the world, how they behave, or what they value and believe, then they risk being charged by critics of class theory as both theoretically empty and practically useless. While complicated, the essence of the “realist” perspective can be summarized, following Kingston (2000), into the following guidelines:

1) Classes are, first and foremost, *economic* categories. As such, class maps must be based primarily on one’s position within the economic structures of a given society. Education and social status/prestige, while potentially related to class, should not serve as a basis for class classification. Similarly, Pakulski and Waters (1996) refer to this as “[t]he position of economism. Class is fundamentally an economic phenomenon. It refers principally to differences in the ownership of property, especially productive property with an accumulation potential, and to differential market capacity, especially labor-market capacity. Moreover, such economic phenomena as property or markets are held to be the fundamental structuring or organizing principles in societal arrangements” (p. 670).

2) Individuals’ class position should be systematically linked with “distinct, life-defining experiences” (Kingston 2000: 1) that are shared with other members of their class. In line with Giddens’ (1973) theory of “structuration,” Kingston also insists that in order for classes to exist in a meaningful, concrete sense, an individual’s economic or workplace experiences, or class, must “structure” other central dimensions of his or her life. Giddens (1973) mentions five domains in which class is predicted to significantly structure experience: 1)

interactional patterns (i.e., friends, marital prospects and partners); 2) political action (voting patterns, political mobilization and social movement recruitment/membership); 3) patterns of intra- and intergenerational mobility; 4) class sentiment (feelings of ‘we-ness’ and shared subjective identity); and 5) cultural orientation. “Cultural orientation” is the most vague of the dimensions and can include such things as lifestyle choices, aesthetic preferences, values, and, most importantly within the context of this dissertation, familial customs and habits, parenting practices, and general patterns of socialization. In other words, it is not satisfactory to simply place people into classes based upon some classificatory criteria if unable to, in addition, demonstrate that occupying such a position has concrete (i.e., empirically verifiable) consequences.

3) There must be evidence of a small number of distinct groups with a significant percentage of a society’s population falling within each group. The importance of this tenet should not be understated. Clearly, as the number of identifiable groups increases, the analysis diverges from class analysis and quickly begins to approximate the ‘multi-runged ladder’ or ‘gradational’ approach which Kingston contends is, under current conditions, superior to class analysis in depicting inequality. On the other hand, if only a tiny percentage of individuals constitute a “class,” it is likely not significant enough to warrant the moniker.

4) Classes must be both “internally consistent to a nontrivial degree” as well as “distinct from other classes to a nontrivial degree” (p.30).³⁴ Logically, one cannot assess inter-class

³⁴ If a trait is found to be more highly represented within one class than in others, but only a small number of individuals within a class can be connected with such a practice or quality, then it is incorrect to assert that classes are “structured by common, distinct orientations” (pp. 31-32). For example, one might find, as did Halle (xxxx), that the upper-middle class expresses a greater fondness for abstract art than lower classes. However, the fact that Halle found that only a small percentage of even his upper-middle class respondents reported such an affinity prevents one, according to Kingston’s criteria, of arguing that appreciation of abstract art is a common experience or a defining element of the upper class. Subsequently, it would be disingenuous to claim that class distinctions exist based on this criterion.

differences without first having established intra-class consistency; however, even if intra-class consistency is evident, the task of determining how substantial a disparity suffices in validating class differences remains. Unfortunately, neither logic nor nature provide an answer and, to this point, even vague guidelines in this area are rare (Kingston 2000),³⁵ making testing and debating class theory a frustrating, and oftentimes unproductive, enterprise.

While Lareau and Kingston diverge in their beliefs about whether class remains an important force in contemporary societies, they do share some points of agreement, concurring that the merits of class theory should rise or fall based upon empirical evidence. Kingston's extensive review of the literature on class effects, however, leads him to emphasize the problem that, by and large, researchers have failed to establish consistent and consequential associations between economic or occupational positions and the overwhelming majority of attitudes and behaviors typically considered in the literature. Lareau, on the other hand, rejoins that the reason why Kingston and others have failed to uncover strong evidence of class differences is that most studies examining class effects have been "fragmented and overly specialized, asking precise but small questions" (2003: 30). Instead, Lareau encourages a move towards more expansive, "holistic" research agenda, searching for the effects of class over "wider swaths of social life" (Lareau 2003: 30) such as that captured, presumably, by concerted cultivation parenting practices. As this dissertation aims to provide a quantitative test of Lareau's ethnographic observations, I will operationalize as closely as possible Lareau's class-based conceptualization of

³⁵ Lareau, for instance, avoids any explicit discussions about how "class effects" could be detected. How much "concerted cultivation" would, in fact, parents need to display in order to fall into such a classificatory category, or, conversely, how few word games, trips to museums, conferences with teachers, or piano lessons would qualify a parent as adhering to natural growth parenting? Furthermore, how much of a difference in such behaviors across classes would Lareau claim is necessary to confirm her theory?

socioeconomic inequality. Clearly, research which conceptualizes and operationalizes inequality consistently with class theorists and also encompasses a wide range of parenting practices is warranted in order to better determine whether the evidence is consistent with Lareau or whether Kingston's general findings concerning the relatively modest effects of socioeconomic status continue to hold true.

What, if anything, can the existing parenting literature tell us about Kingston's contention that class theorists have generally been unable to find that social class strongly structures important aspects of life? The next section examines the two main frameworks concerning the processes by which social class and socioeconomic inequality relate to parenting outcomes, the family stress perspective and investment perspective. Additionally, I review the limited empirical literature that does employ measures of social class, as opposed to socioeconomic status, and which can, therefore, shed some light on the Kingston-Lareau debate.

Theorizing the Relationship between Social Class, Socioeconomic Status and Childrearing

Research linking social class and socioeconomic status to family functioning and childhood outcomes can generally be classified as belonging to either the family stress or the family investment perspectives. The most salient aspect of the family stress model, and that which differentiates it most concretely from the investment model, is its focus on how family finances impact the emotional and psychological climate of the home environment. Rand Conger, one of family stress theory's founders, holds that a proper conceptualization of the full model begins with an account of the amount of economic hardship a family is facing

(Conger and Donnellan 2007). Common indicators of hardship, which has been operationalized in a number of ways, include low income, adverse economic events such as work instability and recent reductions in income and/or increases in expenses, and a high debt to assets ratio (Park et al. 2004; Conger and Donnellan 2007). Hardship, in most cases, reflects socioeconomic status. According to family stress theory proponents, exposure to economic hardship produces financial pressures, which range from insufficient funds to supply basic family needs (e.g., housing, clothing, food, health insurance and medical care) to difficulties in meeting monthly financial obligations. Financial pressures in turn negatively affect parental well-being. Financial pressures burden families most specifically by increasing parental depression, anxiety, and various forms of antisocial behavior, including substance abuse, alcohol abuse, and aggression. Elevated levels of emotional distress and disruptive and harmful behaviors brought about by material hardship and economic pressures in turn lead to family disorganization, compromising the functioning of various aspects of the family system. For example, marital relations often suffer from low levels of warmth, high levels of conflict, and increased instability, and parent-child relations also suffer as parents display more hostility and less nurturance (responsiveness) toward their children (Parke et al. 2004; Conger and Donnellan 2007).

A number of researchers have attempted to test the parenting stress model and, according to the excellent review article by Conger & Donnellan (2007), found overwhelming support for its basic tenets. Specifically, out of the seven published studies which closely operationalized the full model³⁶, the overwhelming majority of mediating pathways were verified to act as hypothesized, generally yielding coefficients of substantial

³⁶ A number of additional studies have tested only specific parts of the model. Overall, they have also met with much success.

size. Furthermore, evidentiary support has been discovered across diverse samples (see Conger & Donnellan 2007: 181) and diverse methods, including longitudinal survey based studies (Conger et al. 1994,1999) and quasi-experimental designs (Costello, Compton, Keeler, & Angold 2003).

Despite its relative proficiency in explaining parenting processes and child outcomes, the economic stress perspective has failed to influence Lareau significantly. Lareau diverges from the family stress model mostly with respect to the manner by which each accounts for interclass differences in parenting practices and also with respect to the range of parenting practices considered. For instance, Lareau does not see interclass differences in parenting practices as strongly influenced by economically-based differences in emotional well-being, family conflict, or stress (as proposed by the family stress model), but rather as due to deeply rooted, class-differentiated conceptions of parental obligations and habitual behaviors. With respect to parenting practices, most family stress researchers have, on the other hand, placed less attention on cognitive stimulation and skill cultivation and more on the typical “responsiveness” practices discussed in the previous section.

Investment model

While both Lareau and figures working within the parental stress model link socio-economic inequality, through parenting practices, to important childhood outcomes, it is clear that the explanatory focus of the two theoretical perspectives differs considerably. Lareau’s approach, I will argue, fits most comfortably within an approach that some scholars have come to call the “investment perspective” (Guo & Harris 2000; Yeung et al., 2002; Conger & Donnellan 2007).

Generally speaking, investment theorists hold that parental differences with respect to socioeconomic characteristics such as income, education, and occupation influence the sorts of investments in time and money that parents make in their children. Families possessing greater financial capital, for instance, are posited to have to spend a lower percentage of their available resources on basic needs and, as a result, allocate more towards tutors, books, musical lessons, and other goods and services which are widely believed to advantage children by providing greater opportunities to develop intellectual and social skills. Additionally, some investment theorists hold that various occupational characteristics (e.g., self-direction, job complexity, intellectualism, cultural sophistication) shape the sorts of skills and personality characteristics that parents possess and also those they value in others, leading them to differentially invest in their children in ways most likely to promote such skills and traits (Kohn 1977; Bourdieu 1984). Occupations also vary with respect to the amount of flexibility in scheduling they provide, differentially affecting the amount of time parents can spend interacting with their children, taxiing them to organized activities, and intervening in institutions on their behalf (see Chin and Phillips 2004). Finally, education is posited by some investment theorists to not only, like occupation, shape what parents value in their children, but also provide parents with different levels of skills with which to provide their children with effective instruction and to intervene on their behalf (Bourdieu 1984; Lareau and Horvat 1999; Hart and Risley 1992, 1995).

Empirical tests of investments models have generally supported the idea that various dimensions of socioeconomic status (income, education, occupation) are tied to parental investments in material resources (Bradley and Corwyn 2003; Duncan and Magnusen 2003) and are positively related to children's participation in extracurricular activities (Dumais

2006), parent-child shared activities (Guo and Harris 2000; Yeung et al. 2002;), quality home linguistic environments and open communication (Hart and Risley 1992, 1995; Huttentlocher et al. 2007; Hoff 2003), along with various hybrid concepts, including “cultural capital” (Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnel 1999), “positive parenting” (Raver et al., 2007, and “intellectual stimulation” (Guo and Harris 1999; Raver et al., 2007). Additionally, both Bodovski and Farkas (2008) and Cheadle (2008) found that concerted cultivation was rather strongly related to SES. For instance, using a standardized measure composed of parental income, education, and occupation Cheadle (2008) reported that “[l]ower SES parents score approximately .9 SD lower than the average SES family, while upper-SES families score nearly .7 SD higher” (p. 11).

Employing the same standardized measure of SES as Cheadle, Bodovski and Farkas (2008) established that SES was fairly highly correlated with most of the subscales that composed concerted cultivation and was positively correlated with their combined concerted cultivation measure with a standardized coefficient of .40. Unfortunately, by diverging from Lareau’s conceptualization of social class, neither Cheadle nor Bodovski and Farkas was able to determine if, as Lareau predicts, the poor and working classes share similar parenting styles with one another and differ only from the middle-class. Similarly, due to the manner in which socioeconomic status and/or “class” was conceptualized and operationalized in the majority of these investment studies, with continuous measures, most of these empirical tests cannot be assessed using Kingston’s criteria for establishing the existence of classes (i.e., 1) class position as based upon economic/occupational criteria; 2) classes as small number of distinct groups; 3) class position as strongly linked to “life-defining experiences”; 4) classes as internally consistent (with respect to “life defining experiences”) and sufficiently different

from other groups). Thus, Lareau's claim that discrete, class-based parenting cultures exist cannot be assessed directly. The current research seeks to address this gap and provide the first quantitative test of Lareau's parenting model utilizing measures of social class which are consistent with Lareau's conceptualization. This brings me to my second hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: *Middle-Class parents will demonstrate higher levels of concerted cultivation than poor and working-class parents, who will exhibit similarly low levels of concerted cultivation.*

CHAPTER IV

RACE VERSUS CLASS

As noted in the introduction, Lareau's ethnographic observations have led her to believe that the power of class trumps the power of race in determining childrearing strategies and thus childhood outcomes. The issue of whether, and to what extent, race plays a distinctive role in shaping family structure and family functioning is an area of research which, according to Furstenberg (2007) is in the midst of a renaissance. Depictions of the Black family in the social science literature enjoy a long and contentious history, covering everything from celebratory accounts of valiant adaptation to less than optimal conditions (Stack 1974) to portrayals as, if not exactly paragons of pathology and dysfunctionality, then at least seriously troubled (Murray 1984; Wilson 1987; Patterson 1998). Theoretical attempts at understanding the underlying factors driving various permutations of the Black family have also spanned a significant range. Sarkisian and Gerstel (2004) contend that most theorists fall into one of two camps, the structural and the cultural. The assorted figures who constitute the structuralist camp, such as Stack (1974), Murray (1984), and Wilson (1987), stress the role that *contemporary* economic, residential, and policy-related factors play in shaping various features of the Black family. Qualities oftentimes associated in the literature with Black families, such as greater ties to extended families, more use of physical discipline and authoritarian parenting (e.g., high control, low warmth), and increased likelihood of

single-parenthood, can be traced, according structural theorists, to, among other things, welfare policies, employment discrimination, gender ratios, and residential segregation.

Conversely, members of the cultural camp contend that, although qualities especially associated with Black families may have emerged as adaptations to earlier structural conditions, certain cultural traits are now so rooted in the Black community that they have come to take on a causal force on their own. Remember, Ogbu (1978) maintains that prolonged exposure to discriminatory policies and attitudes eventually culminated in the sorts of anti-intellectual attitudes and cultures of opposition that he observed throughout his numerous ethnographic inquiries into Black communities across the United States (see also McWorther 2001).³⁷ Importantly, separating Ogbu from the more structurally oriented theorists are his assertions that even when discrimination shows signs of receding, oppositional culture continues to characterize Black communities, contributing to callowness, despair, and stagnation. Other adherents of the cultural approach include such scholars as Moynihan (1965) and Patterson (1998), who have pointed to the legacy of slavery and oppression as contributing to a self-perpetuating culture within the contemporary Black community that deemphasizes marriage and the nuclear family and is forgiving of out-of-wedlock childbearing. Billingsley (1968, 1992), on the other hand, deemphasizes the role that discrimination has played in explaining the distinctiveness of the Black family. Instead, he maintains that the qualities that some contend typify American Blacks, such as the

³⁷ Ogbu's findings with respect to a general culture of opposition among blacks and his 'acting white' hypothesis have been challenged by many. Ogbu's contentions concerning the attitudes and behaviors of the specific middle-class Black inhabitants of Shaker Heights, have faced criticisms not only from the Black parents who commissioned the study, but also from Ferguson's (2001) survey-based, quantitative study of the community.

dominance of the matriarchal family structure and reliance on extended kinship networks, can be traced back before the period of slavery to the cultural traditions of Western Africa.

While it is clear that disagreements abound with respect to the sources of Black familial distinctiveness, what the above scholars from both the structural and cultural traditions share is a sense that Black families possess qualities which, in some respects, sets them apart from the rest of society. Lareau, however, at least with respect to childrearing strategies and features of the physical home environment, found few signs of Black distinctiveness.³⁸ Unfortunately for Lareau, existing research has not, for the most part, supported her claim. Take, for instance, the research regarding extracurricular involvement. Using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, even after instituting controls for socioeconomic status, Dumais (2006) found significant differences across racial categories with Whites reporting higher levels of involvement than Blacks in music lessons (12.1% vs. 10.7%), dance lessons (23.8% vs. 11.9%), art lessons (14.8% vs. 12.3%), athletics (73.2% vs. 41.9%), and clubs (41.5% vs. 26.5%). Interestingly, a higher percentage of Blacks (34.6%) than Whites (26.3%) participated in the performing arts.

Results of research regarding potential racial differences in levels of parental cognitive stimulation are mixed, but the majority of research suggests that Black parents are less involved than White parents. Hart & Risley (1992), the only scholars to find inter-racial equivalence, report that, when controls for socioeconomic status are in place, Black families are no different than White families with respect to parent-child language interactions in the home (however with a limited sample size, their study lacked statistical power). On the other

³⁸ It should be noted that while Lareau contends that for most aspects of socialization race is inconsequential, she does acknowledge that there are aspects of *racial* socialization (e.g., strategies for dealing with prejudice) which are relatively unique among Blacks.

hand, Broh (2002), who utilized data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88), discovered that Blacks reported significantly less parent-child verbal interaction than did their White counterparts. Similarly, Guo & Harris (2000) employed data collected by the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) and, after controlling for poverty (the proportion of years since child's birth lived below the official poverty line), maternal education, maternal cognitive ability (i.e., Armed Force Qualification Test, or AFQT), and a number of other demographic characteristics, found that Blacks offered significantly less cognitive stimulation to their children than did White parents. Using data collected from seven (1986-1998) waves of the NLSY, Bradley & Corwyn (2003), found that across three separate ages ranges (3 to <6; 6 to <10; 10 to <15) the relationship between SES (Duncan prestige scores) and both parental "stimulation" and "responsivity" was, in almost all cases, significantly greater among Whites than Blacks. Finally, employing the same data set as Dumais (2006), the ECLS-K, Cheadle (2008) found that "concerted cultivation is primarily a white and upper-class pattern of investment, with black, Hispanic, and Asian groups scoring between .5 and .6 standard deviations (SD) below the sample average, which is approximately .9 SD lower than the average white family" (p. 11). According to additional research by Cheadle (2005) and Cheadle and Amato (2007), even after differences in socioeconomic factors and various demographic characteristics are added to models, this gap remains almost as large (.4-.6 SD).³⁹

While the studies cited above have generally reported results inconsistent with Lareau's contention that Blacks and Whites of similar social class display continuities in parenting styles, additional tests are warranted. For one, many existing studies have

³⁹ Bodovksy and Farkas (2008) restricted their sample to White families and, therefore, do not have results relevant to this section.

examined quite restrictive realms of parental involvement and are therefore open to Lareau's criticism that class effects would surface had a fuller range of parenting practices been explored. Another issue, identified as a problem in the previous section, is that most research has approached socioeconomic inequality from a stratification, as opposed to a class-based, perspective and is, therefore, not amenable to the application of Kingston's criteria. Finally, although Cheadle's study, which looks specifically at concerted cultivation, is certainly damaging to Lareau's claims, his operationalization of both social class and concerted cultivation, which lacks measures of linguistic practices, strays somewhat from Lareau's specifications. In the current research I attempt to more closely approximate Lareau's concepts of social class and concerted cultivation in order to determine if, indeed, Black and White middle-class parents display similarly higher levels of concerted cultivation than poor and working class parents, who are predicted to engage in similarly low levels of intensive parenting. Following Lareau, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 3: *Black and white families of similar social class should display similar levels of concerted cultivation. In other words, race will have no relationship with concerted cultivation when social class is controlled.*

CHAPTER V

YOUTH OUTCOMES

This final section is concerned with the potential impact that different home environments have on important aspects of children's psychosocial and intellectual development. Does it, in fact, matter whether one is raised according to a strategy of concerted cultivation or is left to "accomplish natural growth" largely on one's own? Can concerted cultivation parents expect "payoffs" for the investment in time and money that they make in their children, or are children from natural growth homes just as likely to prosper across a variety of developmental realms? Furthermore, to what extent are the developmental advantages that middle-class children accrue over their poor and working-class counterparts explained, or mediated, by different experiences in the home?

Lareau did not spend as much time detailing the potential beneficial outcomes resulting from parental efforts at "concerted cultivation" as she spent specifying the efforts themselves. Her research is, however, predicated on the notion that significant advantages are afforded to children reared according to the standards of concerted cultivation and that such parenting is instrumental in securing the intergenerational reproduction of class status. Fortunately, Lareau does recount some of the more obvious benefits she observed and hints at additional areas where parents could expect payoffs on the investments they have made into their children's development.

For example, one of the most significant advantages that Lareau observed middle-class children to enjoy was an increased sense of confidence in interacting with adults and individuals in authority positions and an elevated sense of entitlement to attention from adults. Such an advantage is really not much of surprise, considering that middle-class youth had ample practice interacting with adults not only within academic settings (which, of course, is something to which children from all social classes are exposed) but also with those adults who served as coaches and instructors in the myriad of activities in which these middle class students participated. Furthermore, the frequent practice that middle-class youths had in performing in front of audiences at little league games, piano recitals, and neighborhood theatrical performances also aided in generating the poise children needed in order to interact confidently with adults.

Social skills were not the only talents that middle-class parents attempted to cultivate in their children, as intellectual abilities were also alluded to. In fact, Lareau consistently observed greater efforts by middle-class parents to attempt to turn life into a one long continuous lesson, finding developmental opportunities hidden even in the most mundane aspects of everyday life. Discussions of current events on the way to soccer practice, history lessons at bedtime, and word games during evening meals are typical of the sorts of efforts middle-class parents made in cultivating skills in their children. And while working class and poor parents generally insisted on being the primary voice in their homes, the opinions of children were not only welcome, but actively encouraged by middle-class parents. It is, unfortunately, hard to pin Lareau down with respect to the precise intellectual and academic benefits that she expects children to accrue as a result of having been reared under a concerted cultivation approach. With concerted cultivation parents constantly providing

educational opportunities, however, it is likely that youth raised in such an environment should develop both a familiarity with, and facility in, a variety of intellectual spheres, along with a general affinity for learning and education. Considering Lareau's reports that the middle class parents she observed tended to turn every available opportunity into a 'teaching experience', one might posit that middle-class children benefit across the full spectrum of cognitive tasks-- from verbal to mathematical skills and analytical problem solving. On the other hand, Lareau was especially keen on emphasizing the strong verbal dimensions of middle-class families and the concerted cultivation approach, leading one to suspect that middle class children might enjoy the greatest advantage over poor and working classes with respect to verbal tasks/skills.

The current study examines empirically whether there is support for Lareau's qualitatively-generated findings with respect to childhood outcomes. I propose that children of middle-class parents will exhibit more social initiative and enjoy a closer bond to their schools than their working class and poor counterparts, as well as higher levels of academic achievement. Justification for these hypotheses is derived not only from Lareau's work, but from a wealth of empirical literature supporting the notion that parenting behaviors influence positive development in children (for excellent reviews see, for example, Steinberg 2001; Conger & Donellan 2007).⁴⁰ The research studies most relevant to the present project, however, are Cheadle's (2008) and Bodovsky and Farkas' (2008) direct tests of Lareau.

⁴⁰ In recent years, parenting research has come under a great deal of scrutiny from scholars who contend that genetics and/or friendship effects are much more important to children's development than parenting (see, for example, Rowe 1994; Harris 1998; for a rebuttal, see Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington, Bornstein 2000). The main issue with respect to the current research is the possibility of endogeneity. Connections among social class, parenting, and child outcomes could be due to omitted genetic factors which are the underlying driving force for all the relationships.

On the whole, Cheadle (2008) found mixed support for Lareau's model. With access to multiple assessments of children's achievement over time, Cheadle was able to provide information regarding the links between race, socioeconomic status, and concerted cultivation on math and reading skills upon entry into kindergarten and also on how these skills changed as the children developed across first, second, and third grades. At kindergarten entry, concerted cultivation was found to be related to both math and verbal skills, with the size of the concerted cultivation effect being approximately 80 percent of the effect that SES measures had on math and verbal skills when both concerted cultivation and SES measured were included in models. Through latent growth curve analysis, on the other hand, Cheadle discovered that measures of concerted cultivation were much more related to children's academic abilities when they entered kindergarten than with their continued development of skills up to the end of third grade. Additionally, concerted cultivation was found to mediate only about 20 percent of the measured growth in skills due to socioeconomic status. This, of course, leaves 80 percent of the difference in growth by socioeconomic status unexplained by the sorts of parental investments that Lareau found to be important, suggesting that there are other advantages, aside from concerted cultivation, which lead to differential academic achievement in youth deriving from different socioeconomic backgrounds.

A final, and important, contribution of Cheadle's was his finding that variations in concerted cultivation across White and Black families helped to explain some of the gap in test scores between Black and White children beyond differences due to socioeconomic status. This counters Lareau's contention that Black and White children of similar social class background receive similar amounts of concerted cultivation and, therefore, that the

addition of concerted cultivation to models attempting to explain the race-based achievement gap would, according to Lareau, unlikely account for any of the gap independently of class. At school entry, Cheadle found that Black children scored .34 SD less than White children on tests of math skills and .20 SD less with respect to reading skills. Approximately 30 percent of this math gap and 47 percent of the reading gap was accounted for by SES. However, and particularly significant when testing Lareau, the race-based math gap was reduced by an additional 30 percent upon the addition of concerted cultivation and the reading gap by an additional 72 percent (the race-based reading gap became nonsignificant). Furthermore, comparing the size of the reduction in the gap when only SES or only concerted cultivation were included as predictors, Cheadle found that concerted cultivation had a larger impact (although he did not test whether the difference was statistically significant). Specifically, the inclusion of SES reduced the math gap by 30 percent and the reading gap by 47 percent, while concerted cultivation led to a nearly 40 percent and a 60 percent reduction, respectively.

Turning to Bodovsky and Farkas' (2008) recent study of White first-graders, they found, consistent with Cheadle, that concerted cultivation proved to be quite strongly linked to socioeconomic status, but failed to make a major impact in explaining away SES differences in children's outcomes. More specifically, Bodovsky and Farkas used data from the ECLS-K to examine the effect of SES and concerted cultivation, along with parental educational expectations, on standardized reading test scores, teacher's ratings of children's literary and verbal skills and "approach to learning"-- a multi-item scale designed to tap into

a student's "effort and organization" with respect to schoolwork.⁴¹ Analyses appraising the effects of SES on these developmental outcomes found moderately strong relationships, with standardized coefficients of .31, .24, and .19 for reading test scores, teacher assessments of verbal skills, and approaches to learning, respectively. The size of effects of concerted cultivation, on the other hand, were not nearly so large, with standardized coefficients of .07 on approaches to learning, .09 on reading test scores, and .06 on teacher's rating of language skills.⁴² More damaging to Lareau's theory, however, was the fact that concerted cultivation could mediate only a rather small portion of the effects of SES on the outcome variables. In fact, the size of the relationship between SES and approaches to learning, which began at .19, was only reduced to .17 with the inclusion of parental educational expectations and only further reduced to .14, with the addition of concerted cultivation to the stepwise regression models. Children's reading test scores and teacher's assessment of student linguistic skills demonstrated a similar pattern, with reading scores reduced from .31 to .27 with the inclusion of educational expectations and to .23 with concerted cultivation added to the model. Additionally, the effect of SES on teacher's rating declined from an initial effect size of .24 to .20 with parental expectations and to .17 when the model was adjusted for differential levels of concerted cultivation.

In summary, both Cheadle and Bodovsky and Farkas discovered support for Lareau in the sense that concerted cultivation was tied to socioeconomic status, but less support in the sense that concerted cultivation mediated only a small portion of the relationship between

⁴¹ The six items comprising the "approach to learning" scale included teacher's assessments of each pupil's eagerness to learn, attentiveness, learning independence, flexibility, organization, and persistence at tasks (p. 910).

⁴² It should be noted, however, that estimates of concerted cultivation effects are taken from models which also included a number of controls for background demographics and, more importantly, measures of parental expectations for their children's educational attainment which, undoubtedly, sapped some strength from concerted cultivation.

SES and positive children's outcomes. Therefore, both works lead to the conclusion that SES is an important predictor of children's outcomes independent of concerted cultivation.

Lareau's hypotheses regarding race also did not fare well in Cheadle's study. While Bodovsky and Farkas (2008) included only White families in their analyses, contrary to Lareau's predictions, Cheadle found that different levels of concerted cultivation proved to reduce racial differences in achievement independently of SES. Despite this evidence which contradicts Lareau's hypothesis, it is important to keep in mind that while Cheadle may have attempted to test Lareau with fidelity, he deviated in one important aspect: her conceptualization of class. Whereas Cheadle conceptualized class using a composite measure of income, occupation, and education, Lareau specifically focuses on occupational status. So, while this may be of little consequence, in order to more definitively say that there is a lack of support for Lareau hypothesis, one needs to test for independent race effects using a measure which more closely approximates Lareau's class conceptualization.

Finally, it should be kept in mind that both Cheadle and Bodovsky and Farkas examined only a very limited number of the sorts of developmental advantages which could lead to the reproduction of social class inequality. Unlike Cheadle, I am able to examine class and parental effects on not only intellectual outcomes, but also a number of aspects of psychosocial development as well, including perseverance, love of learning, school bond, and social initiative. In terms of social initiative, one of the most significant advantages that Lareau found accruing to offspring reared under the concerted cultivation style of parenting was an increased amount of social initiative and sense of confidence in interacting with adults and individuals in authority positions, and an elevated sense of entitlement to attention from adults. Lareau observed that children raised under concerted cultivation had ample

practice interacting with adults not only within an academic setting (which children from all social classes are exposed to) but also those who served coaches and instructors in the myriad of activities in which these middle class students participated. Additionally, Lareau repeatedly encountered middle-class parents encouraging their children to speak up for themselves and that they were worthy of the undivided attention and service of adults, whether they be soccer coaches, pediatricians, dentists, math teachers, language tutors, or dance instructors. The sorts of poise needed to interact confidently with adults also benefitted from middle-class youths' experience performing in front of audiences, whether as part of little league, piano recitals, or theatrical groups.

The increased experience of middle-class, concerted cultivation children with structured, goal-oriented activities is likely to impact their levels of perseverance, as they are more likely to be presented with firm objectives to accomplish (e.g., learn to play this sonata by Bach, practice hard enough to make the county traveling soccer team) and provided with the encouragement, resources, and expectations that encourage the formation of a mindset that seeks to tackle challenges and persist in difficult tasks. On the other hand, by being allowed, or even encouraged, to organize their own free time, and being more likely to spend time just “hanging out” in unstructured activities, poor and working class, “natural growth” children may not develop the requisite habits of mind needed to persist in tasks.

Finally, it is reasonable to assume that Lareau would posit that “love of learning” and “school bonds” would be greater among youth raised in concerted cultivation households due to the greater emphasis placed in middle-class homes on intellectual pursuits and the greater cultural continuity between concerted cultivation homes and the culture of educational institutions than between poor and working class homes and such institutions. With

concerted cultivation parents continually providing educational opportunities to their children and encouraging cognitively stimulating pursuits like reading, playing musical instruments and taking trips to museums and theatrical productions, it is likely that youth raised in such environments should develop increased familiarity with intellectual subjects, derive increased pleasure from them, develop a general affinity for learning and education, and experience comfort within school settings.

Prior research on parenting practices and children's outcomes is extensive, but the majority of studies have been limited to outcomes concerning intellectual achievement and problem behaviors (e.g., psychological distress, juvenile delinquency and/or conduct problems). For example, both parental investments (Guo & Harris 2000, Yeung et al. 2002; Bradley and Corwyn 2003; Raver et al. 2007) and authoritative parenting (Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts 1989; Gray and Steinberg 1999; for a review, see Steinberg 2001) have been linked to higher academic achievement. Fewer studies have focused on the additional positive outcomes (i.e., love of learning, social initiative, school bond, and perseverance) that I am proposing to study, however adolescents raised within authoritative environments report greater levels of self-esteem and are more self-reliant (Steinberg 2001). Drawing upon recent developments in positive psychology (Seligman 2002) and education (Gormley and Phillips 2003) it is important for researchers to consider a full array of child and youth outcomes in order to understand healthy development. My final hypotheses, then, are:

Hypothesis 4: *Middle-class youth will exhibit higher levels of intellectual and psychosocial development than working class and poor youth, who will exhibit similarly low levels of each.*

Hypothesis 5: *The intellectual and psychosocial advantages which middle class youth have over their poor and working-class peers will be significantly mediated by concerted cultivation.*

Contributions

This dissertation aims to make a number of significant contributions to the literature regarding the role of socialization practices in perpetuating socioeconomic inequalities. As mentioned earlier, prior studies of the home environment tend to suffer from a number of limitations. Many of the qualitative studies, for instance, are based upon quite limited samples, which severely limit the generalizability of their findings. Many of the larger scale, quantitative studies, on the other hand, have been limited to either isolated parenting behaviors or combinations of parenting practices which, nonetheless, fail to capture the full range of traits that Lareau envisions in her concerted cultivation construct. Further, class has been treated as a continuous SES variable in most work, rather than as discrete categories of occupational inequality that class theorists prefer. The closest approximation to Lareau's model comes in Cheadle's (2008) recent article. However, while he has provided an important first step in testing Lareau's ideas, by straying from Lareau's conceptualization of social class and restricting the child outcomes examined to solely intellectual achievement, he has assured that much work remains to be done. By employing a nationally representative data set, conceptualizing social class identically to Lareau, capturing a significant range of the elements which constitute concerted cultivation, assessing the relationship of these class variables and parenting practices to a wide range of children's intellectual and psychosocial skills and examining racial differences in concerted cultivation and the role that such differences play in Black and White youths' outcomes, this dissertation promises a more detailed and operationally faithful inquiry into the influence of social class in the lives of families and the development of children.

CHAPTER VI

METHODS

Data

This dissertation uses data from both the 1997 and the 2002/3 waves of the Child Development Supplement (CDS) of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). The first wave of the PSID, in 1968, collected data from almost 5,000 households. This original sample was selected from two separate samples: 1) a nationally representative sample of approximately 3,000 families drawn by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan (generally known as the “SRC sample”); and 2) an additional, national sample of around 2,000 low-income families selected from the larger Survey of Economic Opportunity (known as the “SEO sample”).⁴³ Seventy-six percent of the families contacted agreed to participate in the study and interviews with these families constitute the original, 1968, data. Since then, yearly response rates have been exceptionally high. Due, however, to the lengthy time across which the study has continued, overall attrition rates are also somewhat high. For instance, even though the annual response rates have consistently remained above 96 percent (after a less remarkable response rate of just under 90 percent in the first follow-up year of 1969), according to the website: “As of 1988, the response rate for individuals who lived in

⁴³ “In the mid-1960's, the PSID selected about 2,000 low-income families with heads under the age of sixty from SEO respondents. The sample, known as the SEO sample, was confined to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) in the North and non-SMSA's in the Southern region. The PSID core sample combines the SRC and SEO samples.”(Additional information can be found on the PSID website at: <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Guide/Overview.html>).

1968 households was [only] 56.1 percent. The level of cumulative response is sufficiently low to raise concerns, and this has prompted direct investigation of possible attrition biases.” Fortunately, a number of studies have examined the implications of these attrition rates and the evidence is quite positive: “Taken as a whole, these different studies examine a variety of aspects of data quality, and the general results are supportive of the PSID data being valid and not subject to major nonresponse bias” ([http:// psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Guide/Overview.html](http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Guide/Overview.html)).

The PSID was designed as a lifelong participation study, and original households have been tracked since 1968. Despite starting with only around 5,000 households and suffering from a fair amount of attrition, since 1968 the PSID has grown to include over 7,000 families. The increase is due to an innovative recruitment technique in which offspring of the original, core sample respondents create their own “family unit” once they move out of their parents’ house and set up their own household. The children of these “children” have also been recruited into the study, so that up to four generations of households originating from an original household have been tracked. Additionally, ex-spouses who leave an existing household and set up separate households also continue to be followed.

The CDS, on the other hand, was not instituted until 1997, and includes data from up to two randomly selected 0-12 year-old children of PSID respondents and the PSID respondents themselves. All PSID respondents who were part of a family unit that included children under the age of 13 were asked to participate in the CDS, eventually yielding 2,458 households from the PSID “Core Sample” and 247 households from the “New Immigration

Sample⁴⁴.” From these 2,705 eligible households from the PSID, 88% agreed to participate in the CDS study, providing data on 2,394 families and 3,563 children for the first, 1997, wave of data collection. The initial oversampling of low-income households (i.e., the SEO sample) helped ensure that a sizeable Black population would be included. In fact, 1140 White families with a total of 1,648 children were eventually surveyed in 1997, while data were collected from 997 Black families with 1,467 children. Girls and boys were roughly equally represented.

The second wave of the CDS followed up the 1997 respondents in 2002 and 2003. All families who participated in the CDS-I and who continued, as of 2001, to participate in the PSID survey were re-contacted and invited to participate in the CDS-II. With 2,019 primary caregivers reporting on 2,907 offspring, the second wave managed to retain 91% of the households. Comparisons between those respondents who remained in the sample and those respondents who dropped out between 1997 and 2002/3 revealed no significant differences in race, head of household age, income, or education; those from single-headed households, however, were slightly more likely than those living in intact families to discontinue with the survey after the first wave ($t=12.36$; 1 d.f; $p < .001$). Thus, attrition is not likely to result in appreciable bias.

The analyses performed in this dissertation utilized information gathered from the primary caregiver of children in the sample who were at least ten years old at the time of the second wave of data collection, as well as from the children themselves. This age requirement was necessary due to the fact that some important outcome measures were only gathered from youth aged ten and over. I excluded from the sample youth who either

⁴⁴ The PSID added an “immigrant refresher sample” in order to include new immigrant groups who were not represented in the 1968 sample. As this dissertation is only concerned with Blacks and Whites, these new groups are not relevant.

dropped out of school or who were beyond the twelfth grade due to the inability to collect information about school-related extracurricular involvement from them. Finally, given that Lareau focuses only on Black and White families, only data gathered from White and Black youth and their primary caregivers (generally their mothers) were employed in the analyses. Post-stratification weights based upon the 2001 Current Population Survey were used in the analyses in order to enhance the representativeness of the data (Hofferth et al., 2000).

Data were collected through both face-to-face interviews and, for more sensitive topics, via the Audio-Computer Assisted Self Interview (ACASI) method whereby interviewees listened to questions by means of a headset and entered responses directly into a computer.

Sample

The sample consists of a total of 1559 children 10 years old and older and their primary caregivers. Youth range from ages 10 to 17 with a mean age of 13.5 (s.d.=2.3). The sample is comprised of 53% Whites and 47% African Americans. 64% of the sample resided in a two-parent household and 36% in a single parent household. The median household income is \$38,913, and the average family size is 4.2 (s.d.=1.3) with an average of 2.22 children (s.d.=1.08). Regarding highest educational attainment in the household, 10% of parents received education beyond a bachelor's degree, 15% completed a four-year college, 27% attended college, 30% completed high school, and 18% never completed high school. Additional characteristics of the adolescent and parent samples can also be found in Tables 1a and 1b.

As mentioned previously, the data used in this dissertation were collected from youth ages 10 to 18, and their primary caregivers. This differs, in part, from the developmental stage examined by Lareau. However, I contend that this is unlikely to present problems in assessing Lareau's theory. Although Lareau's (2002, 2003) observed the parenting strategies of families with children who were in the fourth grade (ages 9-10), there is little reason to suspect that the sorts of *class differences* in general childrearing styles that Lareau found at this stage in the lifecourse would decrease during adolescence. According to Bourdieu, whose theoretical system Lareau draws from, cultural models, or *habitus*, are deeply engrained and long lasting (Bourdieu 1984). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that most, if not all, of the class-based differences in parenting practices that exist during the preteen years would continue during adolescence due to the relative intractability of parenting *habitus*. In fact, these class-based differences may even increase as children mature, making it easier to find support for Lareau's contentions. Poor and working-class parents, who ascribe to a "natural growth" parenting philosophy, may significantly disengage from their already limited involvement as their children progress through adolescence because the sorts of practices that Lareau found that poor and working-class parents believed to be their main duties in their role as parents-- to provide basic necessities to their children-- are exactly the sort of things that adolescents are increasingly able to accomplish themselves. Middle-class, concerted cultivation parents, on the other hand, may be less likely to disengage from active involvement in their offspring's lives during adolescence because the concerted cultivation model that they ascribe to holds that parents are responsible for fostering the development of youth's skills, and especially those skills needed to retain their middle-class status. With competition to attain entry to top colleges constantly increasing,

middle-class parents are likely to continue engaging in intensive parenting techniques throughout the teen years. In fact, the popular media has recently focused attention on the notion of “helicopter parents,” mostly middle-class parents who have earned the moniker as a result of their tendency to “hover” over their offspring well into adolescence and, in some cases, even into young adulthood (Sacks 2007).

A limited amount of empirical research has addressed the issue of the consistency of parenting practices across different life-course stages of children. Overall, there appears to be a growing consensus among researchers that parenting values and behaviors within families are quite stable over time (McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris 1991; Roberts, Block, and Block 1984; Barber, Maughan, and Olsen 2005). Unfortunately, these studies examined practices (e.g., warmth, control) other than those which constitute concerted cultivation. Furthermore, these studies have often been based upon small, samples with limited range of socio-economic and racial variability (McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris 1991; Roberts, Block, and Block 1984). The largest and most relevant of these research efforts is Barber et. al.’s (2005) study of the consistency in childrearing practices of one cohort of fifth-graders and another of eighth graders over a period of four years. Each cohort consisted of approximately 350 students and their families drawn in 1994 from classrooms located in Ogden, Utah. While generalizing from research based upon this sample, which was 71 percent white, 46 percent Mormon, and 84 percent middle income, must done with caution, it is encouraging to note that Barber et al. found that changes in parenting were rare (and limited to decreases in physical affection and limit setting) and that there were no differences across social classes with respect to continuity or change.

Therefore, although the current analyses include information from subjects who were, on average, somewhat older than those on whom Lareau focused her ethnographic research, there are numerous reasons to believe that if social class does, in fact, influence parenting practices and youth outcomes, these relationships should continue into adolescence, justifying the data used in these analyses.

Measures⁴⁵

Social Class and Race: Scholars such as Lareau (2003), Goldthorpe & Marshall (1992), and Wright (1996) hold that distinct social classes exist and, therefore, should be conceptualized and measured as discrete categories. Kingston (2000), on the other hand, argues that socioeconomic differences exist on a continuum, and that social and economic inequality is better measured with disaggregated, continuous variables. An important contribution of this dissertation is the incorporation of a discrete measure of social class based on Lareau's (2002) criteria. Lareau defined the middle class as those households in which at least one parent is employed in a position that either entails managerial authority or that draws upon highly complex, educationally certified skills (i.e., college level). Working class households are defined as those families in which the head of household is employed in a position which provides little or no managerial authority and which does not draw on educationally certified skills. Finally, the poor are those households receiving public assistance and in which no parent participates in the labor force on a regular basis.

Social class in this dissertation was operationalized similarly. Respondents grouped into the middle-class category (coded 0=not, 1=middle class) include those individuals living

⁴⁵ Tests of differences by social class and race of all measures are reported in Table 1a.

in families in which the heads of household⁴⁶ during the 2002/3 wave of data collection responded that they worked as either “professionals” or “managers/administrators.”⁴⁷ The working class, on the other hand, consists of individuals living in families in which heads of households were not working as professionals or managers, were currently employed in other occupational categories, and who were not on public assistance during the year preceding the 2002/3 data collection period. Finally, my poor category was composed of those respondents whose family received public assistance from the government in the year preceding data collection.⁴⁸ Like Lareau, I did not include a separate category for upper-class individuals.

Race of respondents in these analyses was limited to Blacks and Whites, measured via self-reports. Dummy variables were coded with 0=Black and 1=White.

Concerted Cultivation: The first testable hypothesis of this dissertation pertains to a measurement issue; specifically, whether or not concerted cultivation is correctly conceptualized as a latent variable consisting of five indicators: verbal stimulation, educational material resources, parental skill involvement, the variety of extracurricular activities in which a youth is involved, and the frequency of extracurricular involvement. As mentioned earlier, although measures of parental strategic intervention in organizations which could aid their children’s intellectual and psychosocial development (such as schools)

⁴⁶ “As mentioned above, PSID gathers the most information about the Head of the FU [Family Unit]. Within each wave of data, each FU has only one current Head. The person designated as Head may change over time as a result of other changes affecting the family. When a new Head must be chosen, the following rules apply: The Head of the FU must be at least 16 years old and the person with the most financial responsibility for the FU. If this person is female and she has a husband in the FU, then he is designated as Head. If she has a boyfriend with whom she has been living for at least one year, then he is Head. However, if the husband or boyfriend is incapacitated and unable to fulfill the functions of Head, then the FU will have a female Head.” (from PSID website).

⁴⁷ Occupational status in the CDS was confined to the following categories: professionals, managers/administrators, sales, clerical, craftsmen, operatives, transport equipment operatives, laborers, farmers/ farm managers, farm laborers/foremen, service workers, private household workers, unemployed.

⁴⁸ The head of household of “poor” families can be either: 1) unemployed; or 2) working in a non-managerial or non-professional job, provided that the family receives public assistance.

would be ideal, proper indicators of such types of involvement are missing from the CDS for this age group. Data for the indices which compose the indicators of concerted cultivation were all obtained from the second wave interviews of the CDS's primary caregiver and from the child interview questionnaire. I discuss each of these indicators in turn.

Verbal stimulation refers to parent-child verbal communication regarding topics and subject matter that facilitate an exchange of ideas and provide children with experiences likely to build their vocabulary and interactional competence. The verbal stimulation indicator is an index composed of eight survey questions regarding the frequency of child-parent communication on a variety of topics. For example, parents were asked: "In the last 12 months, please tell me how often (1=never, 2=once or twice, 3= a few times, 4= about once a week, 5= more than once a week, 6= every day) you discussed the following with your child: a) school activities or events of particular interest to your child; b) things your child has studied in class; c) your child's experiences in school". Additionally, they were asked: "how often (1=not in the past month, 2=1 or 2 times in the past month, 3= about once a week, 4=several times a week, 5=every day) in the past month have you: a) talked with your child about things he/she is especially interested in; b) talked with your child about his/her relationships, like his/her relationships with friends; c) talked with your child about his/her day; d) talked with your child about current events, like things going on in the news; e) talked to (him/her) about your family?" In order to deal with response categories using different metrics, the different items were standardized and then summed ($\alpha = .78$). Table 1 reveals that parents from all social classes reported relatively high levels of verbal stimulation, with middle-class parents reporting the greatest amount and working class and

poor reporting lower levels similar to one another. Additionally, Black parents reported lower levels of verbal stimulation than White parents.

Educational resources are materials in the youth's home that are commonly believed to promote cognitive development (DeGraaf 1986, Teachman 1987, Roscigno & Ainsworth-Darnell 2001). This indicator is composed of three indices that were standardized and added together. The first index, "household provisions," contains responses from six questions regarding whether a household possesses certain provisions including: "Does your family get a daily newspaper?" (1=yes; 0=no); "Does (CHILD) have a library card or (his/her) name on a library list?" (1=yes; 0=no); "Does (CHILD) have a desk or table where (he/she) can do (his/her) homework?" (1=yes; 0=no); "Is there a musical instrument (for example, piano, drum, guitar, etc.) that (CHILD) can use at home?" (1=yes; 0=no); Does (CHILD) have a dictionary at home that (he/she) can use? (1= yes; 2= no); Does (CHILD) have an encyclopedia or other reference material at home that (he/she) can use? (1= yes; 2= no). The second index, "computers," is simply the sum of the answers to the following two questions: 1) "How many working computers are there in the home that your child(ren) could use?"; and 2) "How many of the computers in your home have an Internet connection?". The final index, "books," consists of an average of the responses to two questions: 1) "About how many books there are in the house?" (1=none, 2=1 or 2, 3= 3 to 9, 4=10-19, 5= 20 or more) and 2); "About how many books does (CHILD) have?" (1=none, 2=1 or 2, 3= 3 to 9, 4=10-19, 5= 20 or more). These three indices were standardized and averaged together to form the educational resources indicator ($\alpha=.67$). The three separate indices are reported in Tables 1a and 1b in their unstandardized forms. The statistics reported in Table 1a suggest a steady increase in "household provisions," "books," and "computers," with middle-class homes

having the most educational resources, followed by working class homes, and with poor households trailing both middle and working class households. Again, we find that Blacks report trail Whites in an indicator of concerted cultivation, with Blacks report fewer household provisions, computers, and books than Whites.

Parental skill involvement can be defined as proactive attempts by parents to provide youth with opportunities to enhance their cognitive and social abilities through both structured and unstructured activities. This scale was constructed from five questions that probe parental participation in a number of their children's activities. For instance, questions include: "About how often (1=not in the past month, 2=1 or 2 times in the past month, 3= about once a week, 4= several times a week, 5= every day) in the past month have you spent time with your child doing one of his or her favorite activities"; "How often (1=never, 2= once or twice, 3=several times, 4=once a month, 5=more than once a month) has a family member taken or arranged to take your child to: a) any type of musical or theatrical performance within the past 12 months; b) the library; c) any type of museum(children's, scientific, art, historical, etc.) within the past 12 months?"; and, lastly, "How often (1= never; 2= once or twice in the past month; 3= several times in the past month; 4= about once a week; and 5= more than once a week) has a family member included your child in family activities within the past month?" Once again, responses have been summed and averaged to create the skill involvement scale (alpha= .63). Looking at Table 1, we find that while average levels of parental skill involvement significantly differed across each of the three social class categories, the biggest divide appeared between middle class parents, who were the most involved in cultivating their children's skills, and the working class and poor

parents who were less involved. Mean levels of White parental skill involvement is significantly higher than that of Blacks.

Finally, the last two indicators of concerted cultivation pertain to youth extracurricular activity involvement. *Youth activities (variety)* attempts to capture the assortment of a youth's involvement in structured, adult-organized activities outside of the home.⁴⁹ Measures of the variety of youth activities included answers of youth to the following questions: "Were you a member of any athletic or sports teams at school in the last 12 months?" (1=yes; 0= no); "Besides athletic teams, did you take part in any other school activities such as clubs or student government in the last 12 months? (1= yes"; 0= no); "Were you a member of any groups in the community such as scouts or hobby clubs in the last 12 months? (1= yes; 0= no); "Were you involved in any volunteer service activities or service clubs in the last 12 months?" (1= yes; 0= no); "During the last summer, were you involved in any organized summer or after-school sports or recreation programs?" (1= yes; 0= no). This indicator was created by simply adding all yes responses together.

Youth activities (frequency), on the other hand, refers to the regularity of youth involvement in structured, extracurricular activities. Measures of the frequency of youth activities are obtained through the following inquiries: "During the last 12 months, how often did you spend time on athletic or sports teams at school" (1= less than once a month, 2= at least once a month, 3=once a week, 4=several times a week, 5= almost every day, 6=every day while program lasted); "During the last 12 months, how often did you spend time on school activities such as clubs or student government"; "During the last 12 months, how

⁴⁹ Considering that this current research examines youth ages 10-18, a range of ages far greater than the 9 and 10 year old children that Lareau's research focused on, one should consider that "youth activities" does not necessarily directly measure *parental* involvement. However, while it is possible that youth could be involved in these activities without parental encouragement, financial support, and transportation, such inputs from parents are assumed to facilitate involvement.

often did you spend time on scouts or hobby clubs”; “During the last 12 months, how often did you spend time on volunteer service activities” (1= less than once a month, 2= at least once a month, 3=once a week, 4=several times a week, 5= almost every day); and, lastly, “During last summer, how often did you spend time on sports or recreation programs” (1= less than once a month, 2= at least once a month, 3=once a week, 4=several times a week, 5= almost every day, 6=every day while program lasted). Responses to these five questions were added together to create this final indicator of concerted cultivation. With respect to both the frequency and variety of youth activities, we can see in Tables 1a and 1b that middle-class youth reported involvement in a greater variety of extracurricular activities and participated in these activities more frequently than did either poor or working-class youth. On the other hand, while working-class youth appeared to have an advantage over poor youth in terms of the variety and frequency of activities, the difference was not as great as that separating the middle class from the poor and working class. Turning to racial differences, we see that Whites, again, reported involvement in a greater variety of activities than Blacks, however we see no statistically significant differences across racial groups with respect to the frequency of participation.

Testing Latent Variable Measurement Models

The components of concerted cultivation described above are hypothesized to form a latent construct; importantly, when constructing measurement models and performing confirmatory factor analysis, it is necessary to determine whether one’s indicators are best theorized as either “causes” or “effects” of the latent variable of interest. “Effect indicators,” by far the most common types of indicators found in the latent variable literature, are

theorized to be empirical manifestations of an underlying latent construct. Latent constructs are hypothesized to operate as unmeasured causal forces which manifest themselves in that which the effect indicators capture. Thus, effect indicators can be thought of as “depending” upon the latent variable, and the latent variable can be conceived of as determining its indicators (Bollen and Lennox 1991).

Although less often encountered in the literature, some measurement models are better conceived of as composed of “causal indicators,” in which indicators are modeled as preceding and thus determining the latent construct. Bollen and Lennox (1991) provide a number of examples of measurement models more accurately specified using causal, as opposed to effect, indicators, such as exposure to discrimination and life stress. Indicators of various forms of capital (e.g., social, cultural, economic, or human) could be correctly conceptualized as causing, or determining, the constructs they are measuring as opposed to the reverse. Socioeconomic status provides perhaps the most recognizable example of a latent construct that obviously warrants treatment using indicators such as education, income, occupational prestige as causal, rather than effect indicators (Bollen and Lennox 1991; Kline 1998). Consider that it makes more intuitive sense to claim that an increase in education would likely “cause” a raise an individual’s socioeconomic status rather to claim that an increase in socioeconomic status would “cause” an increase in education. Further, it is clear that in the case of a construct like SES, it is preferable to model it in a way so that an increase in one of the indicators does not automatically presuppose a concurrent increase in all the other indicators of the construct, as would be the case if modeled under the assumption that indicators were effects of an underlying latent construct.

Confirmatory factor analysis, using M-Plus software, was performed on the previously discussed concerted cultivation latent construct as well as on a number of youth outcome constructs (i.e., school bond, perseverance, social initiative) that will be discussed in the following section, in order to determine if the measurement models yielded acceptable fit indices. Given that each of the goodness of fit indices operates on different assumptions, methodologists generally suggest consulting multiple indices of model fit to look for signs of consistency (Hoyle & Panter, 1995). As such, in Table 2 I present the chi-square test of model fit value and the corresponding *p*-value along with the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI; Bollen, 1989) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudek, 1993). Possible values with respect to the CFI and TLI tests range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating the absence of model fit and 1 indicating perfect model fit. Values of .90 or higher are usually interpreted as evidence of good model fit (Bollen, 1989; Hoyle & Panter, 1995). RMSEA values less than .05 are generally accepted as indicators of good model fit, and those between .05 and .08 are often considered indicative of an adequate model fit (Browne & Cudek, 1993). In addition, because the chi-square statistic is sensitive to both sample size and model complexity, the chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio, which adjusts for model complexity, is also reported. Generally, a chi-square ratio between 1 and 3 is indicative of a good fit (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999). The same criteria used to assess the fit of latent variable measurement models were also applied to evaluating the fit of the model used to test Hypotheses 2 through 5.

Evaluating Concerted Cultivation Measurement Models

Turning to Table 2, the confirmatory factor analysis performed on concerted cultivation provided excellent fit indices, suggesting support for Lareau's contention that concerted cultivation manifests itself in a group of specific parenting behaviors (Hypothesis 1) (CFA Fit Indices: $\chi^2/df=.97/2=.49$; $p=.61$; CFI=1.00; TLI=1.00; RMSEA=.000)⁵⁰. Concerted cultivation appears to work well as a construct consisting of five effect indicators: verbal stimulation, educational material resources, parental skill involvement, the variety of extracurricular activities a youth is involved with, and the frequency of extracurricular involvement. I should, however, point out that while the overall fit indices were quite good, the factor loadings for the individual indicators were not especially high, suggesting that the indicators have relatively low reliability. Had a scale been utilized in the analyses as opposed to a latent factor, which accounts for measurement error by tapping into the shared variance of the indicators, the measure of concerted cultivation would have included a fair amount of error, resulting in biased coefficients.

In addition to testing a five factor lower-order latent variable model of concerted cultivation, I also tested two alternative models. The first alternative was a model in which each of what had been treated as indicators (i.e., verbal stimulation, educational material resources, parental skill involvement, the variety of extracurricular activities a youth is involved with, and the frequency of extracurricular involvement) of concerted cultivation were constructed as latent variables in and of themselves. The five latent constructs were then treated as "effect indicators" of a higher (second) order concerted cultivation construct (similar to that created by Cheadle 2008). It turned out that the lower-order construct composed of five scales had better fit indices and, therefore, I decided to use the lower-order

⁵⁰ Assessment of goodness of fit indicators is discussed in depth in the Analytical Strategy section below.

concerted cultivation construct as opposed to the second-order variant. A second alternative model treated each of the five indicators of the concerted cultivation construct as separate independent variables (in their scale forms) in order to determine if combining them all into a single latent variable, concerted cultivation, yielded a better fitting model. Analyses revealed that the original, five-indicator latent variable concerted-cultivation construct had better fit indices.

Outcome variables

Lareau (2002; 2003) suggested that concerted cultivation parenting techniques provided a number of advantages to youth reared under such methods. As mentioned earlier, Lareau has remained rather vague throughout her writings with respect to specifying the advantages that she believes accrue to middle class youth raised via concerted cultivation methods. With this in mind, I have attempted to follow as closely as possible to the spirit of her position and included a mix of outcomes that are likely to be tied to concerted cultivation and that could reasonably be assumed to aid youth in the process of attaining middle-class status. Fortunately, the second, 2002/3, wave of the CDS captured a wide variety of dimensions of youth's intellectual and psychosocial development via a combination of survey questions and standardized assessment tests. The intellectual and psychosocial outcomes examined in this dissertation include math skills, verbal skills, bonds to school, math academic orientation, reading academic orientation, educational goals, perseverance, and social initiative.

Intellectual skills: Measures of youth's intellectual skills were derived from the "Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Revised (WJ-R)" which, according to the

CDS website, “is a well-established and respected measure that provides researchers with information on several dimensions of intellectual ability, including current developmental status, degree of mastery in reading and mathematics, and group standing (either age or grade group).” The Woodcock-Johnson Revised (WJ-R) Tests of Achievement were administered via trained interviewers, according to a standardized protocol, to all children and youth interviewed as part 2002/3 wave of the CDS.⁵¹ For this dissertation, overall intellectual development was broken down into math skills and verbal skills. *Math skills* refer to the mastery of mathematical techniques and the ability to solve mathematical problems. Scores on the Woodcock Johnson “Applied Problems” tests were used to assess math skills and will, therefore, serve as a single indicator outcome variable. *Verbal skills*, on the other hand, consist of facility with written and spoken language, including vocabulary and reading comprehension abilities. The CDS administered two proficiency tests, “Letter Word” and “Passage Completion,” which were combined to form a single *verbal skills* measure by averaging the two scores. The correlation between Letter Word and Passage Completion tests was .70.

Psychosocial development: School bond refers to youths’ feelings of attachment to, and comfort within, their school. A latent variable, school bond is proposed to consist of four indicators. Youth were asked: “In the last month (1=never, 2=once or twice, 3=about once a week, 4= 2 or 3 times a week, 5=almost every day, 6= every day) how often did you feel: a) like you were part of your school; b) close to people at your school; c) happy to be at your school; d) safe at your school? Considering that we would expect an increase in school bond to manifest itself in feelings of safety within, closeness toward, and attachment and

⁵¹ Due to problems with the second wave’s (2002-3) standardized, or “normed,” Woodcock Johnson Tests scores, staff at the University of Michigan advised using raw scores and controlling for the age of the child.

contentment with, school, the above questions were conceptualized as operating as effect indicators of the school bond. Confirmatory factor analysis revealed a good fit for the construct (CFA Fit Indices: $\chi^2/df=3.90/1=3.91$; $p=.05$; CFI=.992; TLI=.955; RMSEA=.046; see Table 2).

Academic orientation refers to the importance individuals place on, the interest they have in, and pleasure they derive from scholastic pursuits. Two academic orientation constructs were derived from a larger, academic self-concept construct (see Eccles, Wigfield, and Blumenfeld 1993), and were predicted to form two latent constructs, *math academic orientation* and *reading academic orientation*, each consisting of three indicators. Regarding *math academic orientation*, indicators include: “For you, being good in math is (1-7 with 1=not important and 7= very important); Do you find working on math assignments (1-7 with 1=very boring and 7=very interesting); How much do you like doing math? (1-7 with 1=not at all and 7=very much).” Regarding *reading academic orientation*, the indicators include: “For you, being good in (reading/English) is (1-7 with 1=not at all important and 7= very important; Do you find working on (reading/English) assignments (1-7 with 1=very boring and 7=very interesting; How much do you like reading (1-7 with 1=not at all and 7=very much).” These questions were predicted to serve as “effect indicators,” meaning that as an individual’s academic orientation increased, this would result in higher scores on the individual indicators. Although fit indices could not be calculated as each construct only contained three indicators, factor loadings were adequate (see Table 2).

Perseverance is defined as the tendency and willingness of individuals to persist in tasks despite difficulties and obstacles. Answers to the following four questions served as indicators of perseverance: “Please indicate how often (1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes,

4=most of the time, and 5=always) you do the following things: a) I stay with a task until I solve it; b) Even when a task is difficult, I want to solve it anyway; c) I try to do my best on all my work; d) I keep my things orderly; e) When I start something, I follow it through to the end.” Once again, these questions were posited to act as effect indicators. Confirmatory factor analysis suggested that the measurement model for perseverance was very strong and produced outstanding fit indices (CFA Fit Indices: $X^2/df=2.28/3=.76$; $p=.52$; CFI=1.00; TLI=1.00; RMSEA=.000; see Table 2).

Social initiative references an individual’s ability and willingness to interact and participate in social situations, including the possession of the poise necessary to actively engage with others and assert oneself in group situations. Lareau, for instance, viewed the ability of children and youth to interact comfortably and effectively with adults as a major benefit of concerted cultivation. Social initiative was found to form a latent variable consisting of the following five indicators: “How often (1=never, 2=once or twice, 3=about once a week, 4=2 or 3 times a week, 5= almost every day, 6=every day) did the following things happen at school in the last month: a) I had conversations with adults (like teachers, staff) at the school; b) I talked to teachers and other adults about things other than class; c) I asked questions in class when I didn’t understand the material; d) I joined in class discussions; e) I was comfortable joking with teachers and other adults.” Responses to the above questions were treated as “effect indicators,” thus the more comfortable youths’ are in social settings, the greater their underlying social initiative, the higher their answers will tend to be. Once again, confirmatory factor analysis suggested an excellent fit for the measurement model (CFA Fit Indices: $X^2/df=3.03/2=1.52$; $p=.22$; CFI=.999; TLI=.995; RMSEA=.021; see Table 2).

Youth educational goals refer to youths' aspirations and expectations with respect to their future educational attainment. This latent construct consists of answers to three questions. The first question asked: "What do you think are the chances that each of the following things will happen to you ... You will graduate from a 4-year college? (1= No Chance; 2=Some Chance; 3= About 50-50; 4= Pretty Likely; 5=It will Happen). Secondly, respondents were asked: "How far would you like to go in school? Would you like to ... (1= Leave high school before graduation; 2= Graduate from high school; 3= Graduate from a two year community college; 4= Graduate from a vocational school, such as beauty school; 5= Attend a 4-year college; 6= Graduate from a 4-year college; 7=Get more than 4 years of college." The third, and final, indicator of this construct was taken from the answer to the following question: "How far do you think you will actually go in school? Do you think you will ... (1= Leave high school before graduation through 7= Get more than 4 years of college." Youth educational goals were also theorized as a latent variable with answers to the above questions serving as effect indicators. (CFA fit indices could not be calculated because there were only three indicators, however with a Cronbach's alpha of .83, the construct appears to be reliable).

Controls

Most of the analyses performed in this dissertation include statistical controls for factors aside from the primary explanatory variables that are reasonably likely to exert an influence over the outcomes. For example, a number of researchers have found that the number of siblings predicts levels of parental support (Downey 1995; Guo & Harris 2000).

Additionally, it is conceivable that the *number of children* in a home could be linked to the

amount of educational resources available to its members. Thus, the number of siblings in the home has been instituted as a control. Prior research has also tied *Family structure* to levels of parental involvement (Lee 1993; Crosnoe 2001). A measure of family structure was included in analyses, with zero representing single-parent households and one corresponding to two parent households (including both biological and step-parents). Youth *gender* has been dummy coded with 0=female and 1=male. I chose to control for gender due to the fact that some researchers have established differential parental involvement based upon the sex of the child. Muller (1998), for example, reported that girls discussed issues concerning school more often with parents than did boys, while Broh (2002) found, in a multivariate model (which instituted a good number of controls—including race/ethnicity, income, and parental education) that females were more likely to talk with both parents (measured as how frequently students talk with parents “about school studies, programs, and classes) and teachers (measured simply as a dichotomous variable of whether or not the student talks to teachers outside of class). *Head of household age* was added to models because older parents may exhibit parenting styles that differ from their younger counterparts. *Youth’s age* was included as an additional control in models due to the fact that, with youth aged from preteen years (10 years old) through their late teens (up to 18 years old) included in our sample, it is likely that age differences among youth could influence the amount of concerted cultivation they receive from their families along with impacting a number of the intellectual and psychosocial outcomes of interest.

Primary caregiver’s cognitive ability was incorporated into models in order to serve as an approximation of a child’s genetic endowment with respect to intellectual, and in particular verbal, ability along with a rough estimate of the quality of the education that the

mother has received and the level of verbal sophistication that a youth may be privy to within the home environment. This variable was attained via the Passage Comprehension Test of the Woodcock Johnson Achievement Test-Revised administered at the time of the CDS interview. Observed scores ranged from a low of 8 to a high of 43.

Household income was included in analyses as a means to control for differences in material resources between families, which could influence their ability to provide such aspects of concerted cultivation as material educational resources, fees to museums, concerts, plays and other skill-cultivating activities/venues, and pay for any of the fees and equipment which could accompany participation in structured, extracurricular activities. Household income was measured by taking the average reported family yearly incomes from the first and second waves of data collection and then taking the log.

Finally, I have included *education*, measured as the highest year of schooling completed by either parent, as a control variable in the analyses. Controlling for education is essential according to scholars such as Kingston (2000), who argue that in order for effect of social class on outcome variables to be convincing, such effects need to hold even after controlling for education. More specifically, Kingston contends that while it may be common in the stratification literature to treat social class and “socioeconomic status” as equivalent, in fact social class, defined as positions within the occupational/economic system and how these positions structure relations among individuals and/or groups, should not be confused with socioeconomic status, which is a more amorphous concept generally treated as an aggregate of occupational, educational, and income measures.

Analytical Strategy

The overarching purpose of this dissertation is to examine links between social class and race on parent's involvement with their children's psychosocial and intellectual development and to see whether this involvement can explain race and class-based differences in youth's developmental outcomes. The analyses necessary to answer these questions were performed in five stages: 1) confirmatory factor analysis of the measurement model for concerted cultivation; 2) an initial structural equations model examining the relationship between social class and concerted cultivation; 3) an additional model including both social class and race in order to determine if race predicts concerted cultivation, independently of class; 4) models assessing the impact social class on the outcome measures; 5) final models testing concerted cultivation as a mediator of relationships between social class and various youth outcomes.

The first stage of the analyses consisted of attempting to create a latent construct which closely approximates Lareau's (2002; 2003) conceptualization of concerted cultivation. As mentioned in the measurement section, concerted cultivation was hypothesized to exist as a single, latent construct consisting of five effect indicators: verbal stimulation, educational material resources, parental skill involvement, the variety of extracurricular activities a youth is involved with, and the frequency of extracurricular involvement. A confirmatory factor analysis measurement model was run in order to determine if the construct was, in fact, composed of the indicators that Lareau suggested and fit indices were checked for adequacy.

The next step entailed testing the second hypothesis that a significant relationship exists between measures of social class and the latent construct of concerted cultivation. It was hypothesized that middle-class parents would exhibit higher levels of concerted

cultivation than working class and poor parents, who were predicted to report similar levels of concerted cultivation to each other. Structural equation models were run to determine whether class is related to concerted cultivation. With three class categories, two separate equations were necessary. First, I ran a model with working class as the omitted category in order to test the hypothesis that the middle class are significantly greater in their use of concerted cultivation parenting. This was followed by a second model which omitted the poor category to test the hypothesis that poor and working classes are not significantly different.

The third step in the analyses examines hypothesis 3 which posits, after Lareau and contrary to Ogbu, that race does not independently affect levels of concerted cultivation. A model was run with pathways from the social class measures (with working class omitted) and now race also, along with controls, to the outcome latent construct, concerted cultivation. In accordance with Lareau, I hypothesized that the race pathway would not be significant.

The fourth stage of the analyses involved determining whether social class was related to the outcome variables of interest. Lareau contends that social class differences in youth's intellectual and psychosocial development are a result of differential employment of concerted cultivation childrearing strategies. In order to test hypothesis 4, that middle class youth enjoy higher intellectual and psychosocial development than their poor and working class counterparts, separate models were run with pathways linking the social class measures with each of the seven outcomes (i.e., math skills, verbal skills, perseverance, math academic orientation, reading academic orientation, social initiative, and school bond). Because Lareau was only interested in the difference between middle-class children and all others

(she does not speculate as to whether poor and working class children are similar or different from one another), the middle class served as the omitted category.

Lareau's theory suggests that any differences in youth outcomes across social classes can be, at least in part, explained by class-based differences in concerted cultivation. In order to confirm hypothesis 5, results should indicate that the main effects of social class on each of the outcomes are significantly reduced once a measure of concerted cultivation is added to the model. In other words, some of the effects of social class on the outcome variables should be found to be indirect effects, operating through the concerted cultivation construct. The "model indirect command" in the *Mplus* statistical package was used to examine the proposed indirect effects and their standard errors (Muthen & Muthen 2005). In this case I wanted to determine the indirect effect of concerted cultivation on the main effect relations between the class categories and the youth intellectual and psychosocial outcomes. The MODEL INDIRECT command is employed in MPLUS providing the calculation of indirect effects and their standard errors, allowing for a statistical test of significant mediation.

Poststratification weights based upon the 1997 Current Population Survey were used to make the data nationally representative (Hofferth et al., 2000). Missing data were handled by employing the missing data option in *Mplus* Version 3.12, which uses information from all observations in the analysis to estimate model parameters employing a maximum likelihood estimator. Missing data are not imputed but the program utilizes all data to estimate the model parameters (Little & Rubin, 1987). Finally, the WEIGHT command was employed within the *Mplus* program which allowed for the utilization of the CDS child weights. By using weights, the analyses are able to account for differential probabilities of selection due to the original PSID sample design and subsequent attrition.

Model Testing

Hypotheses were tested using latent variable structural equation modeling (SEM) in the M-Plus statistical program (Muthen & Muthen, 2005). As mentioned earlier, given that each of the goodness of fit indices operates on different assumptions, researchers typically report multiple indices of overall fit (Hoyle & Panther, 1995). In these analyses, the chi-square test of model fit value and the corresponding p-value are assessed, along with the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudek, 1993). The CFI ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating the absence of model fit and 1 indicating perfect model fit. Values of .90 or higher are typically interpreted as evidence of good model fit (Bollen, 1989; Hoyle & Panter, 1995). Similarly, the TLI compares the estimated model with a perfectly-fitting “baseline model” and values of .90 or greater are generally considered an adequate approximation of the baseline model. RMSEA values that are less than .05, on the other hand, are usually accepted as indicators of good model fit, while those between .05 and .08 indicate an adequate fit (Browne & Cudek, 1993). Finally, due to the fact that the chi-square statistic is sensitive to model complexity and the size of the sample, I also provide the chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio, which adjusts for model complexity. Although there is not complete consensus as to the precise numbers which indicate a good fit, generally a chi-square ratio in the range of 1 and 3 is considered a good fit for a model (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999).

CHAPTER VII

RESULTS^{52 53}

Hypothesis 1: Concerted Cultivation as a Latent Construct

As discussed in the measures section, I found support for Hypothesis 1: Lareau's contention that concerted cultivation is a latent construct manifested across a range of parenting behaviors, including verbal stimulation, skill cultivation, the provision of material educational resources, and the involvement of youth in adult-organized, extra-curricular activities. While the overall fit indices indicate that concerted cultivation works as a latent construct, upon closer inspection of the individual factor loadings, it is notable that those aspects of childrearing on which Lareau focused the most attention in her ethnographic work (i.e., extracurricular activity participation and verbal interactions between parents and offspring) loaded the lowest of all the indicators. Material educational resources, on the other hand, which Lareau covered only briefly, loaded the highest, with parental skill involvement not too far behind (see Table 2).

Hypothesis 2: Social Class and Concerted Cultivation

⁵² Correlation matrices can be found in Appendix 1a and 1b.

⁵³ Tables throughout the results section contain both standardized and unstandardized coefficients. Although the use of standardized coefficients is viewed as controversial by some statisticians, I have chosen to include them for those readers who find them useful.

Tables 3a and 3b contains results of analyses pertaining to Hypothesis 2, that middle-class parents demonstrate higher levels of concerted cultivation than poor and working-class parents, who exhibit similarly low levels of concerted cultivation. Results support both aspects of Hypothesis 2, as middle class respondents reported significantly more concerted cultivation than both their working class and poor counterparts (see Table 3a) and working class and poor households possessed similar levels of concerted cultivation to one another (see Table 3b).

Hypothesis 3: Race and Concerted Cultivation

Hypothesis 3 claimed that Black and White families of similar social class would display similar levels of concerted cultivation. Looking at Table's 3a and 3b, it is clear that this hypothesis was supported by the data; race did not demonstrate a significant independent effect on concerted cultivation after controlling for social class, income, education and other covariates.

Hypothesis 4: Social Class and Youth Outcomes

The results reported in Table 4a pertain to Hypothesis 4, that, after adjusting for potential confounding variables, middle-class youth would exhibit higher levels of intellectual and psychosocial development than working class and poor youth. Indeed, the analyses mostly supported the prediction that middle-class youth would score higher on the various psychosocial and academic outcome measures than either their working class or poor counterparts. Specifically, middle-class youth scored significantly higher than working class and poor youth with respect to social initiative, perseverance, academic reading orientation,

school bond, verbal Woodcock Johnson scores, math Woodcock Johnson scores, and educational goals. No significant differences were detected between middle-class youth and either working class or poor youth regarding academic math orientation.

Although not directly hypothesized about, it is interesting to note that analysis indicated that there were some significant differences in outcomes between working class and poor youth (see Table 4b). Specifically, working-class youth reported significantly higher educational goals than poor youth and obtained significantly higher verbal Woodcock Johnson scores. In contrast, there were no significant differences between working class and poor youth regarding social initiative, perseverance, academic math orientation, academic verbal orientation, school bond, or math Woodcock Johnson scores. Taken as a whole, then, poor and working-class youth proved to be more similar to one another with respect to many more outcomes than either group was similar to middle-class youth, who demonstrated superiority over their poor and working-class counterparts regarding most measures of intellectual and psychosocial development.

Also not explicitly hypothesized about were possible racial differences in youth outcomes. Interestingly, after adjustments were made for social class, education, family structure and several other potentially confounding variables, Black youth reported significantly greater math and reading orientations than White youth. It should be noted, however, that despite their greater interest in math and reading, Whites scored significantly higher on math and verbal skills, as indicated by scores on Woodcock Johnson standardized tests (see Table 4a).

Hypothesis 5: Mediating Effects of Concerted Cultivation on Relations Between Social Class and Youth Outcomes

The final hypothesis, Hypothesis 5, predicted that any intellectual and psychosocial advantages which middle class youth have over their poor and working-class peers would be significantly mediated by concerted cultivation. Overall, the hypothesis was supported, as the results reported in Table 5a reveal that concerted cultivation significantly mediated the positive relations between social class and social initiative, perseverance, academic reading orientation, youth's bonds to their schools, educational goals, and Woodcock Johnson verbal and math scores. Middle-class youth no longer enjoyed an advantage over their poor and working class counterparts on any of these outcomes.

Interestingly, a comparison of the results reported in Table 4a with those found in Table 5a reveals that, with the inclusion of concerted cultivation in models, poor youth now report *higher* levels of social initiative than middle-class youth. Poor and working class youth and working class and middle-class youth, however, do not differ with respect to social initiative. Additionally, when examining the effects of race on youth outcomes, the inclusion of concerted cultivation revealed that Blacks, on average displayed an advantage over Whites on a number of characteristics of positive youth development. Specifically, if we compare the results from Table 4a to those found in Table 5a we find that, with respect to social initiative and perseverance, Black and White youth do not, statistically speaking, differ from one another until adjustments are made for concerted cultivation. Once the levels of concerted cultivation across racial groups are held constant, however, Black youth report greater amounts of social initiative and perseverance than White youth.

Non-Hypothesized Tests for Mediation—Parental Verbal Skills, Parental Education, and Household Income

Theory suggests that what appear to be social class effects on concerted cultivation and youth outcomes could, conceivably, be driven more by education, income, and/or genetic factors which tend to covary with social class status; therefore, parental educational attainment, household income, and parental verbal test scores were included as controls in all models. In initial models, before the inclusion of concerted cultivation, parental verbal scores were significantly related to youth's educational goals, and Woodcock Johnson verbal and math scores. Like parental verbal scores, household income was related related to educational goals and math and verbal skills, but was also positively correlated with social initiative. Parent education, on the other hand, was linked to youth's educational goals, Woodcock Johnson math scores, and youth's bonds to school (see Table 4a).

Since parental verbal scores, household income, and parental education were all found to be correlated with concerted cultivation (see Appendix A for a complete correlation matrix), I conducted additional analyses to determine if the effects of these three independent variables on youth outcomes were mediated by concerted cultivation. Tests of the mediating effects of concerted cultivation on the relation between parental verbal test scores and youth's educational goals and verbal and math skills revealed that each relation was reduced to non-significance when adjustments for concerted cultivation were taken into account. However, the tests of mediation indicated that the mediating effect of concerted cultivation was only statistically significant with respect to educational goals and math skills (see Table 5a).

Concerted cultivation did fully mediate the relations between household income and social initiative, educational goals, and math skills. The effect of income on verbal skills,

however, was not significantly mediated by concerted cultivation, although the effect of household income on verbal skills was no longer significant.

Finally, I found that with the addition of concerted cultivation to models, any advantages that youth of more educated parents had with regard to school bonds, youth educational goals, and math Woodcock Johnson scores was explained away. Strangely, parental education became negatively correlated with social initiative in models including concerted cultivation. Overall, however, the results from mediation analyses suggest that concerted cultivation is a key mechanism through which not only parental social class, but also parental educational, financial, and intellectual, advantages transfer to their children.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary aim of this dissertation has been to examine empirically a number of the ideas put forth by Lareau in her concerted cultivation theory of the connections between familial social class and childrearing practices along with the role that such practices play in producing positive youth outcomes. Out of Lareau's body of work (2002; 2003), I focused on four testable claims: 1) that an underlying cultural disposition toward conceiving the role of parents as nurturers of children's developmental potential manifests itself across a number of interrelated parenting practices which Lareau calls "concerted cultivation"; 2) that skill-nurturing childrearing strategies are tied to social class, with middle-class parents providing more concerted cultivation than working class and poor parents, and with the latter classes providing similarly low levels of such parenting; 3) that, adjusting for social-class status, race is not predictive of parenting practices; and 4) that middle-class advantages in positive youth development are significantly mediated by concerted cultivation.

Analyses revealed that concerted cultivation: 1) could be modeled as a latent construct with acceptable measurement properties; 2a) was found to be greater within the middle-class than among the working-class or the poor, and b) did not differ between poor and working class households; 3) was not related to race independently of social class; and 4) mediated the relationship between familial social class and youth intellectual skills, along with a wide-range of positive psychosocial developmental outcomes.

In this final section of the dissertation, I argue that by putting Lareau's theory to a proper empirical test, my research makes important contributions to sociological knowledge with respect to social class analysis, the family, adolescent development, and race. These contributions are covered under four general headings: 1) the conceptualization and measurement of key concepts; 2) connections between social class and parenting; 3) racial equivalence in parenting practices; and 4) the role parenting plays in explaining social class differences in positive youth development. I discuss each of these contributions in turn, along with making suggestions for future research and addressing some of the limitations inherent in research that utilizes self-reported measures and a non-experimental design.

Contributions to Conceptualization and Measurement of Key Concepts

In any research endeavor it helps to start on a strong foundation built around the careful conceptualization and operationalization of key concepts. Consequently, I begin this discussion by detailing my efforts to improve upon Bodovski and Farkas' (2008) and Cheadle's (2008) prior attempts to measure and model concerted cultivation. As pointed to earlier, for their efforts Bodovski and Farkas (2008) created a concerted cultivation scale, composed of three subscales-- children's leisure activities, parental school involvement, and parental perceptions of responsibilities toward their children - along with a measure of the number of books in the home. Unfortunately, by choosing to construct concerted cultivation as a scale, as opposed to a latent variable, Bodovski and Farkas were unable to account for measurement error. Cheadle, on the other hand, was able to reduce measurement error in his research by drawing on the strengths of structural equations and modeling concerted cultivation as a second-order latent variable with three first-order latent constructs-- "parent

participation in school activities”, “child activities,” and “material resources”—serving as effect indicators.

For my contribution, I confirmed that concerted cultivation could be measured as a higher-order latent construct, however my analyses indicated that concerted cultivation operates better as a lower-order construct consisting of home educational resources, extracurricular activities (variety and frequency), parental involvement in children’s skill-cultivation, and parent-child verbal stimulation. Furthermore, in additional, exploratory analyses, I examined the effect of disaggregating concerted cultivation and treating each of my five initial indicators as separate scales. Results suggest that researchers can expect significant improvements in overall model fit and predictive power from treating concerted cultivation as a single, latent variable than as divided into its subcomponents. Of course this enhanced predictive capacity comes at the expense of being able to determine if, and how, particular parenting practices (e.g., verbal stimulation, enrollment in extracurricular activities, provision of educational resources) act independently or interactively of the others with respect to specific outcomes.

The use of confirmatory factor analyses to assess the fit of measurement models is only one method of comparing the relative merit of different operationalizations of a concept. Content validity, a specific type of face validity which refers to the extent to which measures capture the full content, or breadth, of a concept is another consideration. On the surface, it would appear that neither Cheadle’s, Bodovksi and Farkas’, nor my study enjoys a clear edge over the others with respect to construct validity. A comparison across our treatments of concerted cultivation reveals that, due to limitations imposed by our data, none of our measurement models succeeded in encompassing all elements of Lareau’s concept. I, for

one, was left without indicators of parental involvement in schools and other institutions central to children's and youth's development, while Cheadle and Bodovski and Farkas, who worked with the same data as one another, managed to include indicators of school involvement, but lacked measures of parent-child verbal stimulation. With respect to the measurement of home educational resources, on the other hand, I can claim an improvement in content validity since I was able to incorporate multiple indicators of home educational resources (i.e., number of books, computers, musical instruments, and other educational provisions in the household), while Bodovsky and Farkas and Cheadle were only able to include the number of children's books in the home. Furthermore, as evident in Table 2, both verbal stimulation and educational resources loaded quite highly on my concerted cultivation construct, indicating that each played a particularly important role in capturing the concept and adding to the evidence that any advantage in face validity goes to me.

A final consideration in comparing alternative operationalizations of a concept is evaluating the extent to which each operates in ways consistent with a theoretical framework. Of the three tests of Lareau's theory, reading achievement is the only outcome shared by all. As such, it is notable that my study alone managed to mediate completely the relationship between social class reading skills. In addition, I also found that concerted cultivation mediated the relations between social class and additional outcomes, which were examined only in the current study, including perseverance, social initiative, educational expectations and orientations, and school bonds.

Future research should continue inquiry into the optimal way of measuring and modeling concerted cultivation. In terms of remaining true to Lareau and maximizing content validity, the ideal operationalization would combine aspects of Cheadle's, Bodovski and

Farkas', and my construct and include indicators of proactive parental interventions in organizations tied to their child's development, parent-child verbal stimulation, access to developmentally stimulating material resources, adult-supervised extracurricular activities, and parental involvement in skill cultivation through trips and shared activities. Additional research should also attempt to replicate my results that concerted cultivation performs better as a lower-order latent construct than: 1) as a simple scale; 2) disaggregated into its separate indicators; or 3) as a second-order latent construct. Lastly, although the inclusion of adequate indicators of parent-child verbal stimulation and home educational resources appear to be especially important in capturing the essence of concerted cultivation, we still know little about how these indicators act either independently or interactively with one another. If the research regarding concerted cultivation follows a similar trajectory to that of authoritative parenting, we should soon see scholars experimenting with disaggregating concerted cultivation and exploring the roots and consequences of each of its indicators.

Contributions Concerning Connections between Social Class and Parenting

A second contribution of this dissertation has been rendering a more faithful test of the class component of Lareau's theory. By sticking closely to Lareau's conceptualization of social class and by adhering to Kingston's (2000) logic of ascertaining class effects, I have been able to offer insight into some of the contentious issues that continue to divide class theorists and their stratification counterparts.

Throughout this dissertation I have stressed Lareau's stance that the American system of social and economic inequality is more accurately depicted in terms of discrete classes than the more continuous, gradational approach favored by most contemporary, and

especially American, social scientists. Both Cheadle's (2008) and Bodovski and Farkas' (2008) recent tests of Lareau, however, deviated from the class element of her theory by employing an aggregated SES measure (consisting of occupation prestige, household income, and parental education) which, while composed of elements oftentimes quite highly correlated with class, are not, themselves, believed by most class theorists to be constitutive of class categories, nor are they easily converted into such categories (see Kingston 2000). Accordingly, neither Bodovski and Farkas' continuous SES measure, nor Cheadle's strategy of splitting his sample into equal thirds based on this measure, adequately address the class-component of Lareau's theory.

For example, Bodovski and Farkas and Cheadle both found SES to be rather strongly associated with concerted cultivation and concluded that Lareau was largely correct in her claims about the relations between social class and parenting. However, while establishing that SES and concerted cultivation are correlated may, in itself, be interesting to know and even form an important first step in helping scholars make sense of the social roots of parenting styles, it is not the sort of evidence needed to evaluate Lareau's assertion that concerted cultivation is primarily a middle-class occurrence. Due to the difficulties inherent in performing and, especially, interpreting social class analyses, resorting to a stratification-based approach is an understandable, but far from optimal, reaction.

Earlier in the dissertation I pointed to Kingston (2000) as one of the few social scientists who has attempted to establish criteria necessary for claiming that class structuration exists. He proposed that: 1) class categories must be based upon *economic*, generally occupational, criteria; 2) the population of interest must be able to be categorized into a relatively small number of class categories; 3) an individual's social class position

should be found to “structure” other aspects of their lives. In other words, social class must be found to be systematically connected with “*distinct, life-defining experiences*” (Kingston 2000: 1; Italics added), meaning that, with respect to key realms of life (e.g., political participation, marital patterns, friendship choices), classes must be both “internally consistent to a nontrivial degree” as well as “distinct from other classes to a non-trivial degree” (Kingston 2000).

The class-map that Lareau proposed, and I followed, conforms to Kingston’s first two criteria, as economic (i.e., occupational and financial) criteria were used to classify individuals into three distinct, large-scale class categories. Consequently, we are left with the task of determining whether the evidence from analyses regarding social class and concerted cultivation meets the requirements outlined in Kingston’s third criterion: Does concerted cultivation constitute a “distinct, life-defining experience” which today’s middle-class children share with one another, but not with their working class and poor contemporaries?

Close examination of Kingston’s third criterion reveals that the experiences associated with concerted cultivation must be both: 1) life-defining; and 2) distinct. Beginning with the first prong of this two-pronged test, I believe that most readers will agree that, when assessed as a whole, parenting practices, and the childhood and adolescent experiences accompanying such practices, amount to a critical, “life-defining” component of life. The structuring of extracurricular activities, along with the types of daily interactions children have with their parents, and their access to books, computers, and musical instruments in the home all help to mold the personality characteristics, skills, values, and memories that individuals carry with them throughout their lives. In fact, social theorists as

diverse as Freud, Skinner, Durkheim, Bourdieu, and Parsons all viewed childhood experiences as instrumental to both individual development and social reproduction.

Accepting that the sorts of activities, environments, and social interactions encapsulated in Lareau's concerted cultivation concept are experientially-important, and most probably "life-defining," we are left to face the last of Kingston's hurdles: determining whether the parenting and childhood experiences associated with concerted cultivation are class-specific enough to qualify as *distinct*. According to Kingston, evidence of distinctiveness comes from establishing the existence of intra-class similarities *and* inter-class differences. Unfortunately, evaluating such evidence is oftentimes difficult, especially with respect to phenomena which lend themselves more to measurement as continuous traits than to categorical, preferably dichotomous, classification.

Concerted cultivation is one such behavior suited more to continuous than categorical measurement, and the difficulty of evaluating its distinctiveness is further compounded by the likelihood that all classes exhibit at least some parenting behaviors linked to concerted cultivation. After all, how many parents *never* interact with their children, provide *no* material educational resources, *never* enroll their children in structured activities, or do not attempt to nurture *any* skills in their offspring? If, as I am suggesting, we are likely to find elements of concerted cultivation even among the poor, how does one determine where along the continuum of behaviors constitutive of concerted cultivation the practice of "true" concerted cultivation, as a distinct category of parenting, begins? How many books must be owned, institutions intervened in, or soccer teams played on in order to meet the concerted cultivation "threshold"?

Lareau, unfortunately, does not offer much guidance here. Without any explicit instructions to go on, future researchers may want to start by experimenting with cut-off points of different stringency to divide samples into concerted cultivation and natural growth categories. However, given the difficulties of establishing criteria for classifying continuous measures of concerted cultivation into discrete categories, along with the fact that results from analyses which employ dichotomized versions of continuous measures may be misleading (MacCallum et al., 2002), I chose to treat concerted cultivation as a latent construct using continuously-measured indicators. As a result, inter-class distinctions must be assessed by determining whether statistically significant differences in levels of concerted cultivation exist across social classes; the larger the coefficients describing the relations between social class and concerted cultivation, the greater the inter-class differences and the greater the support for the contention of class distinctions in childrearing practices.

My analyses suggest that social class and concerted cultivation are quite strongly linked, with the middle class exhibiting significantly higher levels than either the working class or the poor, even after controlling for parental education, household income, and other potentially confounding variables. Furthermore, poor and working class households were indistinguishable in their parenting practices, suggesting that Lareau was correct in her contention that the primary divide in parenting practices falls between the middle class and the classes beneath them. What, then, does this say with respect to the idea that a social class approach is preferable to stratification analysis?

Skeptics of the notion of social class, such as Kingston, would likely argue that had I employed a more continuous measure of economic/occupational position, results might have revealed that the appearance of class differentiation was, in actuality, an artifact of the

decision to use discrete-class categories. Analyses that utilize class categorizations can be misleading, according to Kingston, because, at least in contemporary American society, economic and/or occupational (i.e., “social-class”) inequalities with respect to such things as workplace autonomy, power, prestige, cleanliness and safety are more accurately encapsulated in continuous measures than in discrete class categories. Therefore, the argument continues, had I captured the true, continuous nature of these inequalities, instead of obscuring them by creating relatively arbitrary “class” divisions where none really exist, my analyses might have detected that a linear relation exists between occupational/economic inequality and concerted cultivation. Unfortunately, very few data sources include information detailing the sorts of specific working conditions mentioned above (e.g., safety, power, cleanliness, etc.), and the CDS data used in the current analyses is no exception. Aside from data availability, we must also consider that just as analyses based on discrete-class measures could potentially obscure underlying continuous, linear relations with outcomes of interest, research employing continuous SES measures could also obscure underlying class effects, especially if researchers fail to include tests for non-linearity. And while curvilinear patterns in relationships between SES and parenting would not, necessarily, indicate that class effects exist they would suggest that even if there are not completely discrete breaks in the relation between economic/occupational inequality and childrearing, that social-class analysis could be closer to capturing reality than continuous measures of inequality with assumptions of linearity.

While I believe that this dissertation has made some significant inroads into understanding the social class-basis of contemporary American parenting, there is much work left to do. In addition to the suggestions already offered, I propose that future research

regarding to the connection between social class and childrearing strategies stands to profit the most by moving in two directions: 1) continuing inquiry into the possibility that the major break in parental investments in their children's skill cultivation, along with other parenting practices, is between the middle class and lower (i.e., poor and working) classes; and 2) attempting to identify the processes through which social class influences concerted cultivation.

Habit has likely played the primary role in hindering progress with respect to my first proposal for future research. The literature on inequality and parenting, as exemplified in the family stress tradition (Conger et al. 1994; Guo and Harris 2000; Yeung et al. 2002; Raver et al., 2007), has generally ignored the full spectrum of social-class and socioeconomic inequality, instead focusing almost exclusively on the impact of poverty and economic hardship on various parent practices. Presumably the concentration on poverty is founded on the assumption that the chief division in childrearing practices occur between the poor and everyone else. Lareau's ethnographic research and the results of this dissertation, however, challenge this assumption by calling attention to the fact that the poor and working class seem to share more similarities with one another than either share with the middle class—at least with respect to the sorts of investments each class makes in their children's intellectual and psychosocial development. Whether a similar divide is also true with respect to realms of parenting other than those covered by concerted cultivation, such as warmth, behavioral control, and psychological control, offers an exciting possibility for future research and determining if social class divides exist in elements of authoritative parenting could shed much-needed light onto the question of the breadth, or narrowness, of class-based parenting practices.

The second direction that future research regarding inequality and parenting should take is figuring out what, specifically, it is about social class that contributes to parenting. Scholars attempting to understand the processes that mediate the relationship between social class and concerted cultivation might begin by borrowing from the work currently being carried out within the family stress perspective mentioned above. As covered earlier, researchers working within this tradition (for a review, see Conger and Donnellan 2007) have gathered a wealth of evidence indicating that poverty and economic hardship increase the likelihood of a number of adverse psychological and behavioral problems among parents, including greater amounts of depressive symptoms and psychological distress, reduced feelings of self-efficacy, along with increasing the odds that children reared in homes experiencing economic hardships will experience low levels of parental receptivity, warmth, and involvement. There are, however, at least two ways in which processes identified within the family stress model of parenting could be useful for understanding social-class differences in concerted cultivation.

The first possibility is that social-class influences on concerted cultivation derive primarily from differences across social classes in exposure to economic hardships; if true, then following the economic stress model, we would expect poor and working class parents to report more psychological and behavioral problems (e.g., increases in psychological distress, marital conflict, and substance abuse, and decreases in their sense of efficacy), which would serve to mediate the relations between social class and positive parenting. However, considering that Lareau and I found that the main divide in concerted cultivation is between the middle class, on the one hand, and the poor and the working class on the other, while the largest difference in economic hardship is likely between the poor and working

classes, economic hardship is unlikely to serve as a primary mechanism explaining differences in concerted cultivation across social classes.

A second possibility for incorporating insights from the family stress literature into explanations of social class difference in concerted cultivation is to consider that differences in psychological distress and lower efficacy could be both linked to social class *and* instrumental in mediating the relationship between social class and concerted cultivation, yet stem from differences that exist across social classes in *areas other than economic hardship*. For example, characteristics of working-class occupations, such as exercising less control over their work-environments than members of the middle-class, could lead to a diminished sense of efficacy and/or more psychological distress among working-class parents. This second possibility is, of course, premised on the prospect that the main divisions in efficacy and psychological distress are between middle-class parents and the poor and working-class parents and *not* between the working class and the poor. Clearly, more empirical work should examine this interesting possibility.

An alternative approach to mediating the relations between social class and parenting would look less to potential social psychological, and more to the possibility of cultural, differences across social classes. Lareau's concerted cultivation theory of the social reproduction of inequality builds upon Kohn's (1959; 1977) pioneering proposal that class (i.e., occupational) cultures influence parenting cultures, with the values workers learn while laboring shaping the values they hold-to in their home-lives. Kohn's insights sensitized subsequent scholars to the possibility that social classes differ profoundly with respect to obligations parents of different classes hold toward cultivating latent talents in their children, and leading Lareau to posit that it is primarily these class-based, culturally-prescribed

perceived role obligations, and not differences in material resources and psychological health, that underlie the differing parenting styles practiced by the middle class and their poor and working class counterparts. In the future researchers should consider including questions on parenting values and attitudes in their data collecting efforts since, currently, such information is almost entirely unavailable.

While some culturally-oriented social scientists consider values, norms, and obligations as constituting the “core” of culture (Parsons 1951; Smith 2003), others conceive of culture as more of a “toolkit” containing knowledge, skills, and schemas useful for solving the day-to-day dilemmas individuals face in life (see Swidler 1986). Chin and Phillips (2004), for instance, claim that class-based cultural differences are less evident in parental role expectations or in the hopes they hold for their children (educational attainment, gainful employment) than in the sorts of tools that parents from different classes tend to have at their disposal to influence their children’s development. According to the skills-based approach to culture, poor and working class parents may desire to help their children develop skills and value academic accomplishments in their children as much as middle class parents, but lack the cultural tools needed to accomplish the task. Accordingly, much work is left to do in order to determine whether culture in the form of norms and obligations, information and skills, neither norms and obligations or information and skills, or both, are part of the reason why we tend to find that middle class parents practice more concerted cultivation than poor and working class parents.

Contributions with Respect to Race and Concerted Cultivation

One of Lareau's more interesting hypotheses was her claim that concerted cultivation is best conceived of as a class-based, as opposed to a race-based, phenomenon. Contrary to Ogbu's (2003) controversial contention, Lareau maintains that Blacks and Whites of similar social class exhibit equal levels of involvement in the intellectual and psychosocial development of their children. Whereas Cheadle's earlier study found that, even after making adjustments for family structure and size, SES, and a number of other potential confounding factors, Blacks reported lower levels of concerted cultivation than their White counterparts, my study suggests otherwise. I found that once potential covariates were included in models, Blacks and Whites exercised equivalent levels of concerted cultivation. There are a number of reasons why our findings could have diverged, including differences in our two studies with respect to: 1) the age of children/youth included in our samples; 2) the operationalization of concerted cultivation; 3) the breadth and comprehensiveness of confounding variables which were included as controls (for example, I was able to control for parental verbal ability, whereas Cheadle did not); 4) my use of social class measures versus Cheadle's SES measures. Considering the lack of consensus between Cheadle and my findings, future research should continue inquiry into the question of whether race affects parental investments in their offspring independently of various combinations of other covariates.

Contributions Regarding the Connection between Parenting and Youth Development

Among the most important contributions of this dissertation has been the discovery of the overwhelming consistency with which concerted cultivation proved to be linked to positive youth outcomes. Results revealed that levels of concerted cultivation were

systematically associated with the full spectrum of intellectual and psychosocial youth outcomes examined; not only did youth raised in homes with higher levels of concerted cultivation perform better at math and reading, but they also set higher educational goals for themselves, approached social situations with more confidence, felt more bonded to educational institutions, and, among other things, reported more persistence in finishing tasks. Equally notable was the discovery that all of the intellectual and psychosocial advantages that the middle-class youth were found to have over their poor and working-class counterparts were reduced to nonsignificance when models were adjusted for social class differences in concerted cultivation. This combination of results provides compelling support that, in concerted cultivation, Lareau's has identified one of the main mechanisms through which social class advantages are transmitted inter-generationally.

With respect to linking concerted cultivation to consequential outcomes, prior research by Cheadle (2008) and Bodovski and Farkas (2008) provided a start by suggesting it serves as a significant predictor of children's success in academic pursuits. Budding scholarship surrounding noncognitive skills (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Farkas 2003), however, suggests that a more complete and accurate account of the family's role in social reproduction and status attainment processes requires expanding the study of the effects of concerted cultivation beyond the current focus on intellectual development. Analyses reported in this dissertation indicate that, along with math and verbal skills, concerted cultivation fosters of a wide assortment of "noncognitive" skills and attitudes, including educational goals, perseverance, school bonds, social initiative, and an appreciation of—an interest in—academic subjects. Additional research is necessary in order to determine just how broad-based the influence of concerted cultivation is on youth outcomes, and especially

whether or not effects extend to characteristics such as self-efficacy, leadership, and positive work attitudes, each of which has literature linking them to occupational success (Bowles and Gintis 1976, 2002; Jencks, Bartlett, and Corcoran et al., 1979; Dunifon, Duncan, and Books-Gunn 2001; Duncan and Dunifon 1997; Dunifon and Duncan 1998; Farkas 2003).

Longitudinal studies tracking adolescents through their transition into young adulthood and beyond would be especially useful, by providing researchers with the data they need in order to determine if the benefits associated with concerted cultivation reported this dissertation are, in fact, lasting and to uncover whether these advantages contribute to intergenerational continuity in social-class status.

Furthermore, since Cheadle and Bodovski and Farkas were much less successful in mediating the effects of their measures of SES on the outcomes they studied, future research should examine how sensitive mediation effects are to differences across studies in terms of such things as the operationalization and measurement of social class and/or concerted cultivation, the age/developmental stage of subjects, the choice of outcome variables and their measurement, and the inclusion or exclusion of different covariates. Finally, future researchers should examine whether two unusual findings from the current dissertation are replicable, or whether they are simply statistical anomalies.⁵⁴ Specifically, adjusting for differential levels of concerted cultivation, poor youth reported greater social initiative than middle-class youth and working-class youth indicated greater math orientation than their middle-class counterparts. From a theoretical standpoint, it is possible that these poor and working class youth may not actually have advantages in these realms, but rather that youth

⁵⁴ Tests for multicollinearity reveal that, amongst the independent variables included in the analyses, none of the bivariate correlations exceeded .50, with the highest being between race and verbal ability at .46. Furthermore, with the lowest tolerance value of .51 and highest VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) value of 1.97, for household income, collinearity does not appear to present a problem in the analyses.

from all social classes report their levels math orientation and social initiative based upon self-assessments derived from specific reference groups. Youth from poor and/or working class homes which have equivalent levels of concerted cultivation as that of middle-class youth may report more social initiative and/or math orientation than middle-class youth not necessarily because their “true score” is actually higher, but rather that their self-assessments of their levels is higher due to their comparisons with different reference group. Why this would only be the case with respect to the poor and social initiative and the working class and math orientation requires additional research to tease out, perhaps using data derived from more concrete measures, third party assessments, observational reports, and/or cognitive interviewing.

Concerns and Limitations

All social research must confront certain limitations and the research reported in this dissertation is no exception. Two of the concerns topping the list with regard to this project are: 1) measurement invalidity; and 2) omitted variable biases. I discuss each of these issues in turn and explain why, despite the need to exercise caution in evaluating findings, the main conclusions of this study are unlikely to be unduly compromised.

The first concern relates to the preponderance of self-reported measures utilized in the current research, as, aside from the youth Woodcock-Johnson achievement test scores and the parental verbal ability scores, all measures derive from surveys administered to either parents or their offspring. This method of collecting information on family processes and youth developmental outcomes is fairly standard among large-scale, nationally-representative data-sets. Unfortunately, the possibility of social-desirability response biases loom large in

almost all self-reported survey-based studies and many of the measures utilized in the current analyses attempt to capture behaviors and/or attitudes which would tempt those individuals who are concerned with presenting a favorable self-image to respond in a way which biased their answers in a predictable direction. Even in anonymous surveys, such as the CDS, we face the prospect that parents could be inclined to over-estimate such things as the amount of time they converse with their children or how often they spend time as a family visiting places like zoos, museums, or libraries. Similarly, youth may inflate their answers to questions which inquire about their ability to persist in tasks or how comfortable they are in social situations. Not surprisingly, mean levels of most measures proved to be skewed toward one end of the response continuum.

The biggest threat to the validity of results comes from the possibility that response bias was systematically linked to key explanatory variables. For instance, if middle class and/or white respondents were more likely than poor and/or Black respondents to bias their answers in specific directions, then the estimated parameters are inaccurate if not adjusted accordingly. While such errors are certainly possible, and we must be careful in interpreting our findings, there are several reasons to be optimistic. For one, prior research offers evidence suggesting that self-reports of both parenting behaviors (Kochanska, Kuczynski, and Radke-Yarrow 1989; Zaslow, Weinfield, Gallager et al., 2006) and child/youth behaviors (Achenbach, McConaughy, and Howell 1987) are generally at least moderately correlated with reports from outsiders. Secondly, several of the general trends that I report, such as the link between social class and parent-child verbal interactions, are comparable to those found in smaller-scale studies, such as those by Hart and Risley (1992; 1995; 1999), Hoff (2003), and Huttenlocher et al., (2007), which employed observational methods. Furthermore, the

fact that, for the most part, parents reported on items utilized to construct concerted cultivation, while youth reports constituted most of the measures of developmental outcomes (aside from the Woodcock Johnson test scores), helped to protect against the sorts of biases which are introduced when the same source of information is used to measure both independent and dependent variables. Finally, my findings with respect to the mediating effects of concerted cultivation were consistent across both self-reported outcomes and standardized test scores. Overall, then, prior research indicating that there is at least moderate cross-rater agreement with respect to parenting and youth behavioral traits, the internal consistency of my results, a general consistency of findings with studies utilizing alternative methods of data collection, the fact that the data performed as theorized in the hypotheses, and, lastly, my ability to employ several sources of information (i.e., parents, children, standardized tests), all provide some assurance that my analyses are unlikely to suffer any appreciable biases from my initial measurement concerns.

The second concern calling for clarification is the possibility of omitted variable bias, in particular the chance that unmeasured genetic factors, correlated with social class, parenting, and youth outcomes, are what is truly driving the relationships my analyses uncovered. That is, the effect of concerted cultivation on youth development may be spurious, or at least inflated, due to my inability to assess genetic influences. Although researchers from across the social science disciplines have tended to ignore the role of genetics on human behavior in the past, it has become increasingly difficult to ignore the compelling case put forth by behavioral geneticists and others who have demonstrated that genetic factors play a prominent role in influencing a wide-array of human attributes (Rose 1995; Collins et al., 2000; Maccoby 2000; Freese, Li, and Wade 2003; Nielsen 2006).

There are a number of potential pathways through which genetics could be operating which, if true, would bias my estimates of the impact of social class and parenting on outcomes. Perhaps the most obvious possibility is that genetically-influenced parental intellectual and personality traits (e.g., IQ, extraversion, self-efficacy, perseverance, conscientious) are, at least in part, responsible for a family's position in the social-class hierarchy and these same, genetically-based, traits are passed on to children both directly, through genetic transmission, and/or indirectly, by influencing parental employment of concerted cultivation which is tied to the positive youth outcomes I explored. Another, slightly different, possibility is that parents' genetics do not influence their parenting practices directly, but rather that the hereditary characteristics that they pass on to their children affect their children's behavior in ways which, in turn, wind up leading to higher levels of concerted cultivation because children either: a) exhibit qualities that induce parents to enroll them in more activities, converse with them more, and so forth; or b) actively create their own concerted cultivation environment by purchasing books and musical instruments themselves, taking the initiative to enroll in structured activities, and initiating conversations with their parents (see Scarr and McCartney 1983; Chin and Phillips 2004). A final possibility is that parental genetics, which are linked to their social class position, in large part determine their use of a concerted cultivation style of parenting, and it is this parenting style, and not the direct transmission of genes, that impacts youth development. Interestingly, if this last scenario is accurate, it would not contradict Lareau's contention that social class-based parenting is the primary mediator linking social class to youth outcomes. It would, however, be rather difficult to reconcile Lareau's social-determinist assumptions with the

idea that the origins of concerted cultivation lie in genetic differences across families and/or social classes.

Examining the evidence, we find there are indications from adoption studies that at least some of the effects of parenting practices on youth that many sociologists and developmental psychologists had believed to be due to environment are actually due to genetic transfers between parents and their biological children (Plomin, Loehlin, and DeFries 1985). Hence, in order to reduce biases with respect to the heritability of intellectual skills, I included parental verbal test scores in my models predicting youth outcomes, although Plomin et al.'s (1985) research suggests that this strategy also has limitations. As a whole, it appears that while the possibility of misestimating the effects of parenting on youth outcomes due to omitted genetic factors must be acknowledged, currently there are few convincing ways of correcting for these potential biases when using data that do not allow for behavioral genetic designs (i.e., twin/kinship and/or adoption data). Therefore, until specific genetic markers for important youth outcomes are identified, or twin data become available that offer sufficient numbers of families in each social class along with measures of concerted cultivation, the only thing we can do is remain cautious in interpreting results from less optimal designs. Insofar as the analyses performed in this dissertation suggests significant effects of concerted cultivation on a number of factors, including social class and various measures of intellectual and psychosocial development, such results pass a first hurdle toward assessing whether parenting plays a causal role, but are by no means conclusive evidence of such a role.

Final Thoughts

In conclusion, it appears that Lareau, in her relatively small, ethnographic study, managed to identify an important mechanism through which families are able to positively impact their children's development and prepare them for future success. Additionally, my analyses reveal that, despite the trenchant critiques offered by scholars such as Kingston (2000) and Pakulski & Waters (1996), social-class analyses do appear to offer important insights into the social distribution of developmentally-consequential childrearing strategies which studies that employ continuous measures of socioeconomic status indicators have largely missed. The focus in the child development and familial socialization literature on the effects of poverty on family functioning, along with a dearth of studies using class-based analyses, appears to have delayed the discovery that, with respect to investments in their children's development, poor parents actually resemble working class parents more than either resemble those parents from the middle-class.

The fact that concerted cultivation parenting practices were consistently tied to a broad array of positive youth developmental outcomes, and that the advantages that middle-class youth tend to hold over their poor and working class counterparts disappeared after adjusting for concerted cultivation, provides compelling evidence that scholars interested in understanding how familial processes contribute to the social reproduction of inequality cannot afford to ignore Lareau's theoretical contributions. Future research should attempt to confirm that the main gap in concerted cultivation does indeed fall between the middle class and the working and poor classes, while beginning to explore whether the same is true for other parenting practices. Another question deserving the attention of scholarship involves figuring out what it is about middle-class membership that fosters a concerted cultivation parenting style. Lastly, considering that Lareau, along with many other scholars who study

social class differences in the home environment, is ultimately interested in understanding the long-term impact of parenting, a primary aim of future research should be to determine whether the advantages that accrue to children and adolescents reared under high levels of concerted cultivation continue into adulthood. According to the research conducted thus far, however, with concerted cultivation Lareau appears to have uncovered a key process by which class advantages are transmitted intergenerationally.

Table 1a: Frequencies and Bivariate Relationships, Social Class and Control, Mediator, and Outcome Variables, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 & 2002/3. (unweighted)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Full Sample</u>	<u>Middle Class</u>	<u>Working Class</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Chi-square Black vs. White</u>			
Social Class (1997)	N=1559									
Middle	27%	N=421			43%	10%	***			
Working	51%		N=795		50%	52%	ns			
Poor	22%			N=343	7%	38%	***			
Race										
White	53%	83%	53%	17%						
Black	47%	17%	47%	83%						
<u>Control Variables (Frequencies)</u>							<u>Chi-square Middle vs. Working</u>	<u>Chi-square Middle vs. Poor</u>	<u>Chi-square Working vs. Poor</u>	<u>Chi-square Black vs. White</u>
Child Gender										
Male	49%	48%	50%	50%	47%	52%	ns	ns	ns	ns
Female	51%	52%	50%	50%	53%	48%				
Family Structure (2002/3)							***	***	***	***
Two-Parent	64%	85%	68%	35%	83%	45%				
Single-Parent	36%	15%	32%	65%	17%	55%				
Family Income (1997)							***	***	***	***
\$0-\$14,999	21%	3%	15%	55%	7%	36%				
\$15,000-\$24,999	12%	5%	13%	19%	8%	16%				
\$25,000-\$39,999	19%	11%	24%	13%	17%	20%				
\$40,000-\$69,999	28%	31%	33%	12%	33%	22%				
\$70,000-\$99,999	12%	24%	11%	1%	19%	4%				
\$100,000 or higher	9%	26%	4%	0%	16%	2%				

Family Income (2002/3)							***	***	***	***
\$0-\$14,999	12%	2%	8%	31%	4%	20%				
\$15,000-\$24,999	12%	4%	11%	22%	5%	20%				
\$25,000-\$39,999	16%	9%	16%	21%	11%	20%				
\$40,000-\$69,999	27%	16%	36%	19%	30%	24%				
\$70,000-\$99,999	17%	29%	18%	5%	24%	10%				
\$100,000 or higher	16%	40%	11%	2%	26%	6%				
<u>Control Variables (Descriptives)</u> <u>(2002/3)</u>							<u>T-Test</u> <u>Middle vs.</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>T-Test</u> <u>Middle</u> <u>vs.</u> <u>Poor</u>	<u>T-Test</u> <u>Working</u> <u>vs.</u> <u>Poor</u>	<u>T-Test</u> <u>Black</u> <u>vs.</u> <u>White</u>
Child age (10-17)	13.47 (2.27)	13.57 (2.28)	13.43 (2.24)	13.27 (2.31)	13.34 (2.22)	13.54 (2.31)	ns	ns	ns	ns
Parent Verbal Scores	30.80 (5.45)	33.92 (4.34)	30.76 (5.02)	27.38 (5.12)	33.35 (4.16)	27.88 (5.32)	***	***	***	***
Parent Education (0-17)	12.86 (3.39)	14.89 (3.00)	12.67 (3.00)	11.23 (3.04)	13.87 (3.01)	11.82 (3.39)	***	***	***	***
Family size	4.22 (1.28)	4.30 (1.20)	4.05 (1.11)	4.49 (1.60)	4.18 (1.05)	4.23 (1.47)	***	ns	***	ns
Children in household	2.22 (1.08)	2.17 (1.00)	2.08 (.89)	2.68 (1.40)	2.10 (.86)	2.33 (1.24)	ns	***	***	***
<u>Concerted Cultivation (2002/3)</u>										
Verbal Stimulation (1-6)	4.25 (.66)	4.38 (.57)	4.23 (.64)	4.22 (.76)	4.31 (.58)	4.20 (.74)	***	**	ns	**
<u>Educational Resources</u>										
Household Provisions(0-6)	4.54 (1.18)	5.13 (.89)	4.54 (1.07)	3.91 (1.34)	4.87 (1.05)	4.19 (1.21)	***	***	***	***
Computers (0-12)	2.13 (1.63)	3.14 (1.8)	2.03 (1.37)	1.13 (1.11)	2.71 (1.69)	1.50 (1.31)	***	***	***	***
Books (1-5)	4.69 (.54)	4.87 (.36)	4.69 (.51)	4.48 (.65)	4.90 (.44)	4.56 (.61)	***	***	***	***
Parental Skill Involvement (1-5)	2.38 (.70)	2.62 (.69)	2.33 (.67)	2.22 (.72)	2.53 (.68)	2.22 (.68)	***	***	*	***
Youth Activities (variety) (0-5)	1.83 (1.46)	2.20 (1.44)	1.75 (1.48)	1.55 (1.37)	1.94 (1.49)	1.73 (1.41)	***	***	*	**
Youth Activities (frequency) (1-5)	1.28	1.55	1.23	1.08	1.33	1.23	***	***	*	ns

<u>Youth Outcomes (2002/3)</u>	(1.10)	(1.09)	(1.10)	(1.05)	(1.10)	(1.09)				
Math Skills	40.04 (6.88)	43.65 (6.47)	39.72 (6.53)	36.29 (5.53)	42.81 (6.30)	37.00 (6.26)	***	***	***	***
Verbal Skills	37.65 (5.62)	40.24 (4.63)	37.77 (5.36)	34.19 (5.65)	39.52 (4.73)	35.59 (5.84)	***	***	***	***
School Bond (1-6)	4.55 (1.13)	4.77 (1.00)	4.52 (1.13)	4.43 (1.19)	4.64 (1.09)	4.47 (1.16)	***	***	ns	**
Math Academic Orientation(1-7)	4.67 (1.37)	4.39 (1.31)	4.69 (1.37)	5.01 (1.40)	4.36 (1.38)	5.00 (1.28)	**	***	**	***
Reading Academic Orientation (1-7)	5.05 (1.30)	5.05 (1.21)	4.99 (1.38)	5.29 (1.24)	4.80 (1.33)	5.34 (1.19)	ns	*	**	***
Perseverance (1-5)	3.81 (.68)	3.88 (.57)	3.77 (.69)	3.82 (.74)	3.78 (.64)	3.84 (.71)	**	ns	ns	ns
Social Initiative (1-6)	3.65 (1.27)	3.90 (1.24)	3.56 (1.27)	3.58 (1.28)	3.71 (1.31)	3.60 (1.21)	***	**	ns	ns
Youth Educational Goals (1-6)	4.78 (1.36)	5.32 (1.04)	4.74 (1.38)	4.17 (1.35)	4.96 (1.30)	4.60 (1.38)	***	***	***	***

Chi-square and T-test differences: * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; ns=no significant difference;

Table 1b: Frequencies and Bivariate Relationships, Social Class and Control, Mediator, and Outcome Variables, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 & 2002/3. (weighted)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Full Sample</u>	<u>Middle Class</u>	<u>Working Class</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>
Social Class (1997)	N=1559					
Middle	37%				43%	12%
Working	48%				50%	45%
Poor	15%				7%	43%
Race						
White	79%	94%	81%	39%		
Black	21%	6%	19%	61%		
<u>Control Variables (Frequencies)</u>						
Child Gender						
Male	49%	48%	50%	50%	47%	52%
Female	51%	52%	50%	50%	52%	48%
Family Structure (2002/3)						
Two-Parent	70%	88%	72%	39%	81%	35%
Single-Parent	30%	12%	28%	61%	19%	65%
Family Income (1997)						
\$0-\$14,999	15%	3%	11%	52%	7%	42%
\$15,000-\$24,999	11%	5%	13%	22%	9%	19%

\$25,000-\$39,999	16%	9%	21%	13%	16%	16%
\$40,000-\$69,999	30%	29%	37%	12%	34%	16%
\$70,000-\$99,999	16%	28%	13%	1%	19%	5%
\$100,000 or higher	12%	26%	5%	0%	15%	2%
Family Income (2002/3)						
\$0-\$14,999	7%	2%	5%	23%	7%	19%
\$15,000-\$24,999	8%	3%	7%	22%	8%	24%
\$25,000-\$39,999	14%	6%	14%	26%	14%	19%
\$40,000-\$69,999	28%	16%	38%	25%	28%	26%
\$70,000-\$99,999	21%	30%	22%	3%	21%	7%
\$100,000 or higher	22%	43%	14%	1%	22%	5%
<u>Control Variables (Descriptives)</u>						
<u>(2002/3)</u>						
Child age (10-17)	13.46 (2.22)	13.62 (2.26)	13.44 (2.19)	13.03 (2.20)	13.45 (2.20)	13.37 (2.28)
Parent Verbal Scores	32.22 (4.94)	34.40 (3.84)	32.24 (4.24)	27.85 (5.11)	33.42 (4.17)	27.67 (5.12)
Parent Education (0-17)	13.42 (3.27)	15.12 (2.74)	12.97 (2.94)	11.48 (2.50)	13.87 (3.09)	11.95 (3.39)
Family size	4.27 (1.30)	4.36 (1.18)	4.10 (1.09)	4.70 (1.83)	4.21 (1.11)	4.28 (1.64)
Children in household	2.24 (1.11)	2.19 (.96)	2.10 (.89)	2.91 (1.67)	2.13 (.88)	2.44 (1.44)
<u>Concerted Cultivation (2002/3)</u>						
Verbal Stimulation (1-6)	4.28 (.62)	4.40 (.55)	4.22 (.61)	4.24 (.76)	4.32 (.57)	4.12 (.77)
<u>Educational Resources</u>						

Household Provisions(0-6)	4.71 (1.13)	5.19 (.86)	4.63 (1.05)	3.97 (1.38)	4.89 (1.04)	4.08 (1.22)
Computers (0-12)	2.44 (1.69)	3.21 (1.91)	2.24 (1.33)	1.23 (1.09)	2.73 (1.70)	1.47 (1.27)
Books (1-5)	4.76(.48)	4.88 (.36)	4.72 (.49)	4.58 (.62)	4.82 (.42)	4.52 (.60)
Parental Skill Involvement (1-5)	2.46 (.68)	2.65 (.67)	2.39 (.65)	2.30 (.75)	2.54 (.68)	2.22 (.64)
Youth Activities (frequency) (1-5)	1.28 (1.11)	1.56 (1.09)	1.18 (1.12)	.94 (.99)	1.32 (1.11)	1.18 (1.07)
Youth Activities (variety) (0-5)	1.85 (1.48)	2.24 (1.45)	1.72 (1.52)	1.38 (1.33)	1.94 (1.51)	1.66 (1.35)
<u>Youth Outcomes (2002/3)</u>						
Math Skills	41.73 (6.85)	44.31 (6.02)	41.27 (6.37)	37.04 (6.14)	43.01 (6.35)	37.17 (6.77)
Verbal Skills	38.71 (5.34)	40.59 (4.59)	38.64 (5.10)	34.42 (5.30)	39.73 (4.62)	34.96 (6.11)
School Bond (1-6)	4.59 (1.10)	4.80 (.99)	4.49 (1.13)	4.42 (1.16)	4.65 (1.06)	4.43 (1.18)
Math Academic Orientation(1-7)	4.50 (1.40)	4.35 (1.35)	4.53(1.40)	4.81(1.46)	4.34 (1.41)	5.08 (1.24)
Reading Academic Orientation (1-7)	4.88 (1.32)	4.99 (1.20)	4.73 (1.42)	5.07 (1.31)	4.77 (1.35)	5.29 (1.11)
Perseverance (1-5)	3.78 (.66)	3.87(.56)	3.75 (.69)	3.69 (.76)	3.78 (.65)	3.80 (.70)
Social Initiative (1-6)	3.68 (1.32)	3.99 (1.32)	3.54 (1.30)	3.49 (1.29)	3.74 (1.33)	3.53 (1.22)
Youth Educational Goals (1-6)	4.86 (1.33)	5.33 (1.05)	4.71 (1.37)	4.15 (1.36)	4.96 (1.31)	4.55 (1.31)

Table 2: Confirmatory Factor Analyses: Factor Loadings and Fit Indices for Latent Constructs, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 2002/3

Construct	Indicators	Factor Loadings	R²	Chi-square/df	P-Value	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Concerted Cultivation				.97/2=.49	.61	1.00	1.00	.000
	Verbal Stimulation	.32	.12					
	Parental Skill Involvement	.51	.26					
	Educational Resources	.64	.41					
	Activity Participation (frequency)	.38	.15					
	Activity (Variety)	.38	.15					
School Bond				3.90/1	.05	.992	.955	.046
	Feel part of school	.67	.34					
	Feel close to people at school	.70	.37					
	Happy to be at school	.61	.49					
	Safe at school	.44	.26					
Math Academic Orientation				--	--	--	--	--
	How important	.46	.25					
	How interesting	.86	.70					
	How much like it	.85	.75					
Reading Academic Orientation				--	--	--	--	--
	How important	.52	.35					
	How interesting	.77	.50					
	How much like it	.65	.42					
Perseverance				2.28/3=.76	.52	1.00	1.00	.000
	Stay with task until solve it	.63	.40					
	Even when task difficult, want to solve it	.58	.33					
	Keep things orderly	.55	.30					
	Try to do best on all work	.55	.30					
	When start something, follow through	.83	.69					
Social Initiative				3.03/2=1.52	.22	.999	.995	.021
	Conversations with adults at school	.60	.36					

	Talked to teachers and other adults about things other than class	.54	.29					
	Asked questions in class	.78	.60					
	Joined in class discussions	.76	.58					
	Comfortable joking with teachers and other adults	.84	.70					
Youth Educational Goals				--	--	--	--	--
	Chance graduate from 4-yr college	.72	.54					
	How far would like to go in school	.85	.72					
	How far expect to go in school	.91	.82					

--only three indicators and fit indices could not be calculated

Table 3a: Structural Equation Model of the Relationship between Social Class and Concerted Cultivation (Middle Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>B (S.E.) Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient</u>	<u>R²</u>
Concerted Cultivation				.73
	Poor (0=middle)	-.20 (.05)***	-.27	
	Working class (0=middle)	-.16 (.04)***	-.32	
	White (0=Black)	.05(.04)	.08	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.07 (.03)*	-.13	
	Parental verbal scores	.02 (.01)**	.20	
	Children (#)	-.01 (.01)	-.06	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	.03 (.03)	.06	
	Child age	-.03 (.01)**	-.28	
	Parent Education	.02 (.01)*	.21	
	Household Income	.09 (.03)**	.27	
<u>Fit Indices</u>				
Chi-Square/df ratio	119.74/42=2.85			
P-Value	.00			
CFI	.95			
TLI	.93			
RMSEA	.04			

Table 3b: Structural Equation Model of the Relationship between Social Class and Concerted Cultivation (Working Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>B (S.E.) Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient</u>	<u>R²</u>
Concerted Cultivation				.73
	Poor (0=working)	-.02 (.03)	-.09	
	Middle class (0=working)	.16 (.04)***	.31	
	White (0=Black)	.05 (.04)	.07	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.07 (.02)**	-.13	
	Parental verbal scores	.02 (.01)**	.19	
	Children (#)	-.01 (.01)	-.06	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	.03 (.03)	.05	
	Child age	-.03 (.01)**	-.28	
	Parent Education	.02 (.01)*	.17	
	Household Income	.09 (.03)**	.29	
<u>Fit Indices</u>				
Chi-Square/df ratio	119.74/42=2.85			
P-Value	.00			
CFI	.95			
TLI	.93			
RMSEA	.04			

Table 4a: Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Middle Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3

<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>B (S.E.) Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient</u>	<u>R²</u>
Social Initiative				.06
	Poor (0=middle)	-.20 (.10)*	-.10	
	Working class (0=middle)	-.30(.11)**	-.15	
	White (0=Black)	-.18 (.13)	-.07	
	Child Gender (1=male)	.02 (.09)	.01	
	Parental verbal scores	.01 (.01)	.03	
	Children (#)	-.01 (.04)	-.01	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.05 (.11)	-.02	
	Child age	.04 (.03)	.09	
	Parent education	.02 (.02)	.03	
	Household Income	.16 (.07)*	.12	
Perseverance				.05
	Poor (0=middle)	-.22 (.10)*	-.14	
	Working class (0=middle)	-.12 (.05)*	-.11	
	White (0=Black)	-.12 (.07)	-.08	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.13 (.04)**	-.11	
	Parental verbal scores	-.01 (.01)	-.05	
	Children (#)	.03 (.02)	.07	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	.06 (.06)	.05	
	Child age	-.01 (.01)	-.01	
	Parent education	.01 (.01)	.08	
	Household Income	-.02 (.03)	-.02	
Academic Math Orientation				.14
	Poor (0=middle)	-.11 (.09)	-.05	
	Working class (0=middle)	.01 (.06)	.01	
	White (0=Black)	-.31 (.08)***	-.18	
	Child Gender (1=male)	.10 (.05)*	.07	
	Parental verbal scores	-.01 (.01)	-.01	
	Children (#)	.05 (.02)*	.08	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.03 (.07)	-.02	
	Child age	-.08 (.02)***	-.27	
	Parent education	.01 (.01)	.05	
	Household Income	-.04 (.04)	-.05	
Academic Reading Orientation				.21
	Poor (0=middle)	-.24 (.12)*	-.10	

	Working class (0=middle)	-.24 (.08)**	-.15	
	White (0=Black)	-.46 (.10)***	-.24	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.52 (.08)***	-.33	
	Parental verbal scores	.01 (.01)	.04	
	Children (#)	.02 (.03)	.03	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.15 (.08)	-.09	
	Child age	-.07 (.02)***	-.19	
	Parent education	.01 (.01)	.05	
	Household Income	-.01 (.05)	-.02	
School Bond				.08
	Poor (0=middle)	-.30 (.15)*	-.10	
	Working class (0=middle)	-.23 (.10)*	-.12	
	White (0=Black)	-.01 (.14)	-.01	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.05 (.07)	-.03	
	Parental verbal scores	.01 (.01)	.02	
	Children (#)	.08 (.04)*	.09	
	Two-parent household	-.06 (.11)	-.03	
	Child age	-.06 (.02)**	-.15	
	Parent education	.03(.01)*	.12	
	Household Income	.05 (.07)	.04	
Youth Educational Goals				.15
	Poor (0=middle)	-.43 (.15)**	-.18	
	Working class (0=middle)	-.24 (.08)**	-.14	
	White (0=Black)	-.07 (.11)	-.03	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.14 (.06)*	-.08	
	Parental verbal scores	.02 (.01)*	.10	
	Children (#)	-.01 (.03)	-.01	
	Two-parent household	-.11 (.09)	-.06	
	Child age	.01 (.01)	-.01	
	Parent Education	.03 (.01)*	.11	
	Household Income	.16 (.04)**	.15	
Verbal Skills				.39
	Poor (0=middle)	-3.08 (1.05)**	-.13	
	Working class (0=middle)	-1.14 (.57)*	-.06	
	White (0=Black)	3.40 (.89)***	.17	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-1.20 (.46)*	-.07	
	Parental verbal scores	.33 (.06)***	.20	
	Children (#)	-.47 (.25)*	-.06	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.45 (.68)	-.03	
	Child age	1.44 (.10)***	.39	
	Parent Education	.08 (.07)	.03	
	Household Income	.84 (.31)**	.08	
Math Skills				.37
	Poor (0=middle)	-1.76 (.81)*	-.09	
	Working class (0=middle)	-1.25 (.47)**	-.09	
	White (0=Black)	2.89 (.62)***	.17	
	Child Gender (1=male)	1.19 (.39)**	.09	
	Parental verbal scores	.20 (.06)**	.14	

	Children (#)	-.06(.22)	-.01	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.71 (.56)	-.05	
	Child age	1.13 (.09)***	.37	
	Parent Education	.17 (.07)*	.08	
	Household Income	1.20 (.32)***	.14	
Fit Indices				
	Chi-Square/df ratio	999.22/412=2.43		
	P-Value	.00		
	CFI	.89		
	TLI	.85		
	RMSEA	.04		
*p≤.05; **p≤.01; ***p≤.001				

Table 4b: Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Working Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3

<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>B (S.E.) Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient</u>	<u>R²</u>
Social Initiative				.06
	Poor (0=working)	.22 (.16)	.07	
	Middle class (0=working)	.30(.11)**	.15	
	White (0=Black)	-.18 (.13)	-.07	
	Child Gender (1=male)	.02 (.09)	.01	
	Parental verbal scores	.01 (.01)	.03	
	Children (#)	-.01 (.04)	-.01	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.05 (.11)	-.02	
	Child age	.04 (.03)	.09	
	Parent education	.02 (.02)	.03	
	Household Income	.16 (.07)*	.12	
Perseverance				.05
	Poor (0=working)	-.10 (.09)	-.06	
	Middle class (0=working)	.12 (.05)*	.10	
	White (0=Black)	-.12 (.07)	-.08	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.13 (.04)**	-.11	
	Parental verbal scores	-.01 (.01)	-.06	
	Children (#)	-.03 (.02)	.07	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	.06 (.06)	.05	
	Child age	-.01 (.01)	-.01	
	Parent education	.01 (.01)	.08	
	Household Income	-.02 (.03)	-.02	
Academic Math Orientation				.14
	Poor (0=working)	-.11 (.08)	-.06	
	Middle class (0=working)	-.01 (.06)	.01	
	White (0=Black)	-.31 (.08)***	-.18	
	Child Gender (1=male)	.10 (.05)*	.07	
	Parental verbal scores	-.01 (.01)	-.01	
	Children (#)	.05 (.02)*	.08	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.03 (.07)	-.02	
	Child age	-.08 (.02)***	-.27	
	Parent education	.01 (.01)	.05	
	Household Income	-.04 (.04)	-.05	
Academic Reading Orientation				.21
	Poor (0=working)	.03 (.11)	.01	

	Middle class (0=working)	.24 (.08)**	-.15	
	White (0=Black)	-.46 (.10)***	-.24	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.52 (.08)***	-.33	
	Parental verbal scores	.01 (.01)	.04	
	Children (#)	.02 (.03)	.03	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.15 (.08)	-.09	
	Child age	-.07 (.02)***	-.19	
	Parent education	.01 (.01)	.05	
	Household Income	-.01 (.05)	-.02	
School Bond				.08
	Poor (0=working)	-.01 (.14)	-.01	
	Middle class (0=working)	.23 (.10)*	-.12	
	White (0=Black)	-.01 (.14)	-.01	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.05 (.07)	-.03	
	Parental verbal scores	.01 (.01)	.02	
	Children (#)	.08 (.04)*	.09	
	Two-parent household	-.06 (.11)	-.03	
	Child age	-.06 (.02)**	-.15	
	Parent education	.03(.01)*	.12	
	Household Income	.05 (.07)	.04	
Youth Educational Goals				.14
	Poor (0=working)	-.19 (.13)	-.08	
	Middle class (0=working)	.24 (.08)**	-.14	
	White (0=Black)	-.07 (.11)	-.03	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.14 (.06)*	-.08	
	Parental verbal scores	.02 (.01)*	.10	
	Children (#)	-.01 (.03)	-.01	
	Two-parent household	-.11 (.09)	-.06	
	Child age	.01 (.01)	-.01	
	Parent Education	.03 (.01)*	.11	
	Household Income	.16 (.04)**	.15	
Verbal Skills				.39
	Poor (0=working)	-2.03 (.86)*	-.09	
	Middle class (0=working)	1.14 (.57)*	-.06	
	White (0=Black)	3.40 (.89)***	.17	
	Child Gender (1=male)	-1.20 (.46)*	-.07	
	Parental verbal scores	.33 (.06)***	.20	
	Children (#)	-.47 (.25)*	-.06	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.45 (.68)	-.03	
	Child age	1.44 (.10)***	.39	
	Parent Education	.08 (.07)	.03	
	Household Income	.84 (.31)**	.08	

Math Skills				.37
	Poor (0=working)	-.45 (.71)	-.06	
	Middle class (0=working)	1.25 (.47)**	-.09	
	White (0=Black)	2.89 (.62)***	.17	
	Child Gender (1=male)	1.19 (.39)**	.09	
	Parental verbal scores	.20 (.06)**	.14	
	Children (#)	-.06(.22)	-.01	
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.71 (.56)	-.05	
	Child age	1.13 (.09)***	.37	
	Parent Education	.17 (.07)*	.08	
	Household Income	1.20 (.32)***	.14	
Fit Indices				
Chi-Square/df ratio	999.22/412=2.43			
P-Value	.00			
CFI	.89			
TLI	.85			
RMSEA	.04			
*p≤.05; **p≤.01; ***p≤.001				

Table 5a: Mediating Influence of Concerted Cultivation on the Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Middle Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3

<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>B (S.E.) Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>Test for Mediation</u>
Social Initiative				.66	
	Poor (0=middle)	1.10 (.50)*	.38		-1.18(.49)*
	Working class (0=middle)	.71 (.39)	.34		-1.01 (.39)*
	White (0=Black)	-.48 (.22)*	-.19		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.43 (.19)*	.20		
	Parental verbal scores	-.05 (.03)	-.26		
	Children (#)	.08 (.08)	.09		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.25 (.24)	-.11		
	Child age	.24 (.08)**	.51		
	Parent education	-.07 (.04)*	-.23		
	Household Income	-.38 (.26)	-.30		.54 (.26)*
	Concerted Cultivation	6.14 (2.45)*	1.51		
Perseverance				.34	
	Poor (0=middle)	.23 (.21)	.15		-.45 (.21)*
	Working class (0=middle)	.26 (.17)	.23		-.39 (.16)*
	White (0=Black)	-.23 (.10)*	-.16		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.03 (.09)	.02		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.01)**	-.25		
	Children (#)	.07 (.0)*	.13		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.01 (.10)	-.01		
	Child age	.08 (.03)*	.29		
	Parent education	-.02 (.02)	-.10		
	Household Income	-.22 (.11)*	-.32		
	Concerted Cultivation	2.35 (1.06)*	1.06		
Academic Math Orientation				.41	
	Poor (0=middle)	.41 (.24)	.21		
	Working class (0=middle)	.44 (.19)*	.32		
	White (0=Black)	-.43 (.12)***	-.26		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.28 (.10)**	.20		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.02)	-.21		
	Children (#)	.09 (.04)*	.14		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.11 (.10)	-.07		
	Child age	.01 (.03)	.01		
	Parent education	-.03 (.02)	-.12		
	Household Income	-.28 (.12)*	-.33		
	Concerted Cultivation	2.67 (1.13)*	1.01		

Academic Reading Orientation				.37	
	Poor (0=middle)	.25 (.25)	.11		-.46 (.23)*
	Working class (0=middle)	.15 (.10)	.10		-.39 (.19)*
	White (0=Black)	-.58 (.13)***	-.30		
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.36 (.11)**	-.23		
	Parental verbal scores	-.02 (.02)	-.11		
	Children (#)	.05 (.04)	.07		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.23 (.13)	-.13		
	Child age	.01 (.04)	.03		
	Parent education	-.02 (.02)	-.08		
	Household Income	-.22 (.13)	-.23		
	Concerted Cultivation	2.39 (1.20)*	.78		
School Bond				.36	
	Poor (0=middle)	.46(.33)	.17		-.69 (.32)*
	Working class (0=middle)	.35 (.25)	.18		-.59 (.26)*
	White (0=Black)	-.19 (.17)	-.08		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.18 (.14)	.09		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.02)	-.16		
	Children (#)	.12 (.06)*	.14		
	Two-parent household	-.17 (.16)	-.08		
	Child age	.05 (.05)	.12		
	Parent education	-.01 (.03)	-.05		.05 (.02)*
	Household Income	-.27 (.18)	-.23		
	Concerted Cultivation	4.62 (2.01)*	1.38		
Youth Educational Goals				.65	
	Poor (0=middle)	.46 (.39)	.19		-.89 (.39)*
	Working class (0=middle)	.52 (.32)	.30		-.76 (.31)*
	White (0=Black)	-.29 (.16)	-.14		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.17 (.15)	.09		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.02)	-.17		.05 (.02)*
	Children (#)	.05 (.06)	.06		
	Two-parent household	-.27 (.18)	-.14		
	Child age	.14 (.06)*	.37		
	Parent Education	-.03 (.03)	-.12		.06 (.03)*
	Household Income	-.25 (.20)	-.24		.40 (.20)*
	Concerted Cultivation	4.62 (2.01)*	1.38		
Verbal Skills				.46	
	Poor (0=middle)	-.04 (1.93)	-.01		-3.34 (1.60)*
	Working class (0=middle)	1.55 (1.39)	.09		-2.59(1.28)*
	White (0=Black)	2.63 (.82)**	.13		
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.16 (.68)	-.01		
	Parental verbal scores	.17 (.10)	.09		
	Children (#)	-.26 (.31)	-.04		
	Two-parent household	-.94 (.92)	-.05		

	(0=single)				
	Child age	1.94 (.26)***	.52		
	Parent Education	-.13 (.13)	-.05		
	Household Income	-.54 (.93)	-.05		
	Concerted Cultivation	16.75 (8.89)*	.49		
Math Skills				.51	
	Poor (0=middle)	2.02 (1.74)	.11		-3.77 (1.69)*
	Working class (0=middle)	1.97 (1.33)	.15		-3.22 (1.32)*
	White (0=Black)	1.94 (.85)*	.11		
	Child Gender (1=male)	2.47 (.69)**	.18		
	Parental verbal scores	-.01 (.11)	-.01		.20 (.10)*
	Children (#)	.21 (.30)	.03		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-1.31 (.90)	-.09		
	Child age	1.76 (.26)***	.58		
	Parent Education	-10 (.13)	-.05		.26 (.13)*
	Household Income	-.51 (.90)	-.06		1.80 (.91)*
	Concerted Cultivation	19.57 (9.01)*	.73		
Fit Indices					
Chi-Square/df ratio	1272.08/571=2.23				
P-Value	.00				
CFI	.90				
TLI	.87				
RMSEA	.04				
*p≤.05; **p≤.01; ***p≤.001					

Table 5b: Mediating Influence of Concerted Cultivation on the Relationship between Social Class and Youth Outcomes (Working Class Omitted), Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 1997 and 2002/3

	<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>B (S.E.) Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>Test for Mediation</u>
Social Initiative				.66	
	Poor (0=working)	.36 (.23)	.12		
	Middle class (0=working)	-.71 (.39)	.34		1.01 (.39)*
	White (0=Black)	-.48 (.22)*	-.19		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.43 (.19)*	.20		
	Parental verbal scores	-.05 (.03)	-.26		
	Children (#)	.08 (.08)	.09		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.25 (.24)	-.11		
	Child age	.24 (.08)**	.51		
	Parent education	-.07 (.04)*	-.23		
	Household Income	-.38 (.26)	-.30		.54 (.26)*
	Concerted Cultivation	6.14 (2.45)*	1.51		
Perseverance				.34	
	Poor (0=working)	-.04 (.11)	-.02		
	Middle class (0=working)	-.26 (.17)	.23		.39 (.16)*
	White (0=Black)	-.23 (.10)*	-.16		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.03 (.09)	.02		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.01)**	-.25		
	Children (#)	.07 (.0)*	.13		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.01 (.10)	-.01		
	Child age	.08 (.03)*	.29		
	Parent education	-.02 (.02)	-.10		
	Household Income	-.22 (.11)*	-.32		
	Concerted Cultivation	2.35 (1.06)*	1.06		
Academic Math Orientation				.41	
	Poor (0=working)	-.04 (.11)	.02		
	Middle class (0=working)	-.44 (.19)*	.32		
	White (0=Black)	-.43 (.12)***	-.26		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.28 (.10)**	.20		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.02)	-.21		
	Children (#)	.09 (.04)*	.14		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.11 (.10)	-.07		
	Child age	.01 (.03)	.01		

	Parent education	-.03 (.02)	-.12		
	Household Income	-.28 (.12)*	-.33		
	Concerted Cultivation	2.67 (1.13)*	1.01		
Academic Reading Orientation				.37	
	Poor (0=working)	.09 (.13)	.04		
	Middle class (0=working)	-.15 (.10)	.10		.39 (.19)*
	White (0=Black)	-.58 (.13)***	-.30		
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.36 (.11)**	-.23		
	Parental verbal scores	-.02 (.02)	-.11		
	Children (#)	.05 (.04)	.07		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.23 (.13)	-.13		
	Child age	.01 (.04)	.03		
	Parent education	-.02 (.02)	-.08		
	Household Income	-.22 (.13)	-.23		
	Concerted Cultivation	2.39 (1.20)*	.78		
School Bond				.32	
	Poor (0=working)	.08 (.18)	.03		
	Middle class (0=working)	-.35 (.25)	.18		.59 (.26)*
	White (0=Black)	-.19 (.17)	-.08		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.18 (.14)	.09		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.02)	-.16		
	Children (#)	.12 (.06)*	.14		
	Two-parent household	-.17 (.16)	-.08		
	Child age	.05 (.05)	.12		
	Parent education	-.01 (.03)	-.05		.05 (.02)*
	Household Income				
	Concerted Cultivation	3.18 (1.32)*	.86		
Educational Goals				.65	
	Poor (0=working)	-.08 (.18)	-.03		
	Middle class (0=working)	-.52 (.32)	.30		.76 (.31)*
	White (0=Black)	-.29 (.16)	-.14		
	Child Gender (1=male)	.17 (.15)	.09		
	Parental verbal scores	-.03 (.02)	-.17		.05 (.02)*
	Children (#)	.05 (.06)	.06		
	Two-parent household	-.27 (.18)	-.14		
	Child age	.14 (.06)*	.37		
	Parent Education	-.03 (.03)	-.12		.06 (.03)*
	Household Income	-.25 (.20)	-.24		.40 (.20)*
	Concerted Cultivation	4.62 (2.01)*	1.38		
Verbal Skills				.51	
	Poor (0=working)	-1.65 (1.00)	-.07		
	Middle class	-1.55 (1.39)	.09		2.59(1.28)*

	(0=working)				
	White (0=Black)	2.63 (.82)**	.13		
	Child Gender (1=male)	-.16 (.68)	-.01		
	Parental verbal scores	.17 (.10)	.09		
	Children (#)	-.26 (.31)	-.04		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-.94 (.92)	-.05		
	Child age	1.94 (.26)***	.52		
	Parent Education	-.13 (.13)	-.05		
	Household Income	-.54 (.93)	-.05		
	Concerted Cultivation	16.75 (8.89)*	.49		
Math Skills				.46	
	Poor (0=working)	.02 (.92)	.01		
	Middle class (0=working)	-1.97 (1.33)	.15		3.22 (1.32)*
	White (0=Black)	1.94 (.85)*	.11		
	Child Gender (1=male)	2.47 (.69)**	.18		
	Parental verbal scores	-.01 (.11)	-.01		.20 (.10)*
	Children (#)	.21 (.30)	.03		
	Two-parent household (0=single)	-1.31 (.90)	-.09		
	Child age	1.76 (.26)***	.58		
	Parent Education	-10 (.13)	-.05		.26 (.13)*
	Household Income	-.51 (.90)	-.06		1.80 (.91)*
	Concerted Cultivation	19.57 (9.01)*	.73		
Fit Indices					
Chi-Square/df ratio	1272.08/571=2.23				
P-Value	.00				
CFI	.90				
TLI	.87				
RMSEA	.04				
*p≤.05; **p≤.01; ***p≤.001					

APPENDIX 1a

Correlation Matrix of Dimensions of Concerted Cultivation and Youth Outcomes, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 2002/3(unweighted)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
<u>Concerted Cultivation</u>													
1. Verbal Stimulation	--												
2. Educational Resources	.16***	--											
3. Skill Involvement	.39***	.32***	--										
4. Activities (frequency)	.13***	.22***	.16***	--									
5. Activities (variety)	.12***	.23***	.18***	.91***	--								
<u>Youth Outcomes</u>													
6. Perseverance	.08**	.09**	.03	.20***	.18***	--							
7. Social Initiative	.11***	.14***	.07*	.27***	.25***	.27***	--						
8. Youth Educational Goals	.13***	.37***	.14***	.32***	.35***	.26***	.28***	--					
9. Math Skills	.06*	.37***	.05	.19***	.20***	.06*	.21***	.39***	--				
10. Verbal Skills	.08**	.40***	.02	.14***	.15***	.09**	.20***	.37***	.76***	--			
11. School Bond	.06*	.13***	.07*	.23***	.21***	.26***	.31***	.30***	.11***	.10***	--		
12. Math Academic Orientation	.13***	.09**	.08**	.11***	.09**	.27***	.09**	.10***	-.12***	-.26***	.21***	--	
13. Verbal Academic Orientation	.11***	.02	.04	.12***	.12***	.33***	.18***	.22***	-.15***	-.03	.23***	.20***	--

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

APPENDIX 1b

Correlation Matrix of Dimensions of Concerted Cultivation and Youth Outcomes, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Child Development Supplement: 2002/3(weighted)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
<u>Concerted Cultivation</u>													
1. Verbal Stimulation	--												
2. Educational Resources	.21***	--											
3. Skill Involvement	.40***	.32***	--										
4. Activities (frequency)	.13***	.24***	.16***	--									
5. Activities (variety)	.11***	.25***	.19***	.91***	--								
<u>Youth Outcomes</u>													
6. Perseverance	.11**	.13**	.08***	.23***	.22***	--							
7. Social Initiative	.15***	.18***	.12***	.35***	.33***	.30***	--						
8. Youth Educational Goals	.19***	.40***	.15***	.36***	.37***	.29***	.33***	--					
9. Math Skills	.02	.35***	.02	.27***	.28***	.09*	.27***	.46***	--				
10. Verbal Skills	.01	.39***	.01	.19***	.21***	.11**	.26***	.43***	.76***	--			
11. School Bond	.10***	.15***	.08**	.26***	.24***	.28***	.34***	.31***	.11***	.11***	--		
12. Math Academic Orientation	.14***	.03*	.14**	.13***	.12**	.27***	.10***	.13***	-.06**	-.22***	.23***	--	
13. Verbal Academic Orientation	.13***	.07**	.11**	.15***	.14***	.33***	.22***	.25***	-.14***	-.03	.24***	.19***	--

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, Alfred L. 1948. "Socialization and the Parent-Child Relationship." *Child Development*. 19:127-36.
- Barber, Brian K., Suzanne L. Maughan, and Joseph A. Olsen. 2005. "Patterns of Parenting across Adolescence." *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 108: 5-16.
- Baumrind, Diana. 1966. "Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior." *Child Development* 37(4): 887-907.
- Baumrind, Diana. 1971. "Current Patterns of Parental Authority." *Developmental Psychology Monographs* 4(1).
- Baumrind, Diana. 1972. "An Exploratory Study of Socialization Effects on Black Children: Some Black-White Comparisons *Child Development* 43(1): 261-267.
- Baumrind, Diana. 1991a. "Effective Parenting During the Early Adolescent Transition." Pp. 111-163 in *Family Transitions*, edited by P.A. Cowan & M. Hetherington. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Baumrind, Diana. 1991b. "The Influence of Parenting Style of Adolescent Competence and Substance Use." *Journal of Early Adolescence* 11: 56-95.
- Diana Baumrind. 1993. "The Average Expectable Environment Is Not Good Enough: A Response to Scarr." *Child Development* 64(5): 1299-1317.
- Baumrind, Diana & Allen E. Black. 1967. "Socialization Practices Associated with Dimensions of Competence in Preschool Boys and Girls." *Child Development* 38(2): 291- 327.
- Bellinger David C and Herbert L. Needleman. 2003. "Intellectual Impairment and Blood Lead Levels." *New England Journal of Medicine* 349: 500-502.
- Bergin, David and Helen Cooks. 2002. "High School Students of Color Talk About Accusations of 'Acting White'." *The Urban Review* 34:113-34.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1971. *Class, Codes, and Control: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Billingsley, A. 1992. *Climbing Jacob's Ladder: The Enduring Legacy of African American Families*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Blau, Zena Smith. 1964. "Exposure to Child-Rearing Experts: A Structural Interpretation of

- Class-Color Differences.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 69(6): 596-608.
- Bodovski, Katerina & George Farkas. 2008. "'Concerted Cultivation' and Unequal Achievement in Elementary School." *Social Science Research*. 37(3): 903-919.
- Bollen, Kenneth.A. 1989. *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: Wiley.
- Bollen Kenneth A. and Scott Long. 1993. "Introduction." In Kenneth A. Bollen & Scott Long (Eds.) *Testing Structural Equation Models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bornstein Marc H. and Robert H. Bradley, eds. 2003. *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Bornstein, Marc H., Chun-Shin Hahn, Joan T. D. Suwalsky, and O. Maurice Haynes. 2003. "Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development: The Hollingshead Four Factor Index of Social Status and the Socioeconomic Index of Occupations." In *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*, edited by Marc H. Bornstein and Robert H. Bradley. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of the Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241-58 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J.C. Richardson. New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J.D. Wacquant 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bradley, Robert H. and Robert F. Corwyn. 2003. "Age and Ethnic Variations in Family Process Mediators of SES." Pp. 161-188 in *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*, edited by Marc H. Bornstein and Robert H. Bradley. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bradley, Robert H. and Bettye M. Caldwell. 1984. "The Relation of Infants' Home Environments to Achievement Test Performance in First Grade: A Follow-Up Study." *Child Development* 55: 803-9.
- Bradley, Robert H., Robert F. Corwyn, Bettye M. Caldwell, Leanne Whiteside-Mansell, Gail A. Wasserman, & Iris T. Mink. 2000. "Measuring the Home Environments of Children in Early Adolescence." *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 10: 3 247-288.

- Broh, Beckett A. 2002. "Linking Extracurricular Programming to Academic Achievement: Who Benefits and Why?" *Sociology of Education* 75(1): 69-91.
- Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne and Pamela K. Klebanov. 1996. "Ethnic Differences in Children's Intelligence Test Scores: Role of Economic Deprivation, Home Environment, and Maternal Characteristics." *Child Development* 67(2): 396-408.
- Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Pamela K. Klebanov, and Greg J. Duncan. 1996. "Ethnic Differences in Children's Intelligence Test Scores: Role of Economic Deprivation, Home Environment, and Maternal Characteristics." *Child Development* 67:396-408.
- Cheadle, Jacob E. 2008. "Educational Investment, Family Context, and Children's Math and Reading Growth from Kindergarten Through the Third Grade." *Sociology of Education* 81(1): 1-31.
- Chin, Tiffani. 2000. "'Sixth Grade Madness': Parental Emotion work in the Private High School Application Process." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 29: 124-63.
- Chin, Tiffani & Meredith Phillips. 2004. "Social Reproduction and Child-Rearing Practices: Social Class, Children's Agency, and the Summer Activity Gap." *Sociology of Education* 77: 185-210.
- Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hodson, James McParland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederick D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York. 1966. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Collins, Andrew W. Eleanor E. Maccoby, Laurance Steinberg, L., Mavis E. Hetherington, Marc H. Bornstein. 2000. Contemporary Research on Parenting: The Case for Nature and Nurture. *American Psychologist*. 55(2): 218-232.
- Conger Rand D. and Glen H. Elder Jr.. 1994. *Families in Troubled Times: Adapting to Change in Rural America*. Hawthorne, NY: de Gruyter Aldine.
- Conger Rand D, Xiaojia Glen H. Elder Jr., Frederick O. Lorenz, Ronald L. Simons. 1994. "Economic Stress, Coercive Family Process, and Developmental Problems of Adolescents." *Child Development* 65:541-61.
- Conger, Rand D. and M. Brent Donnellan. 2007. "An Interactionist Perspective on the Socioeconomic Context of Human Development." *Annual Review of Psychology* 58: 175-199.
- Cook, Philip J. & Jens Ludwig. 1998. "The Burden of Acting White: Do Black Adolescents Disparage Academic Achievement." Pp. 375-400 in *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, edited by Christopher Jencks & Meredith Phillips. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

- Crain, William. 2004. *Reclaiming Childhood: Letting Children Be Children in Our Achievement-Oriented Society*. New York: Owl Books.
- Davis, Allison & Robert J. Havighurst. 1946. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing." *American Sociological Review* 2: 698-710.
- Dornbusch, Sanford M., Phillip L. Ritter, P. Herbert Leiderman, Donald F. Roberts, Michael J. Fraleigh, 1987. "The Relation of Parenting Style to Adolescent School Performance." *Child Development* 58: 1244-1257.
- Downey, Douglas. 1995. "When Bigger is Not Better: Family Size, Parental Resources, and Children's Educational Performance." *American Sociological Review* 60: 746-61.
- Downey, Douglas B. and James W. Ainsworth-Darnell. 2002. "The Search for Oppositional Culture among Black Students." *American Sociological Review* 67:156-64.
- DuBois, WEB. 1908. *The Negro American Family*. Atlanta, GA: Atlanta University Press.
- Dumais, Susan A.. 2006. "Elementary School Students' Extracurricular Activities: The Effects of Participation on Achievement and Teachers' Evaluations." *Sociological Spectrum* 26 (2): 117-147.
- Duncan, Greg J. and Rachel Dunifon 1998. "Soft Skills and Long-Run Labor Market Success." Pp. 123-150 in *Research in Labor Economics*, edited by Solomon W. Polacheck and John Robst. London: JAI Press.
- Duncan, Greg and Katherine A. Magnuson. 2003a. "Off with Hollingshead: Socioeconomic Resources, Parenting, and Child Development." Pp. 83-106 In *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*, edited by Marc H. Bornstein and Robert H. Bradley. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Duncan, Greg, Katherine A. Magnuson, and Jens Ludwig. 2004. "The Endogeneity Problem in Developmental Studies." *Research in Human Development* 1: 1&2: 59-80.
- Duncan, Greg and Katherine A. Magnuson. 2005. "Can Family Socioeconomic Resources Account for Racial and Ethnic Test Score Gaps?" *The Future of Children* 15(1): 35-54.
- Dunifon, Rachel and Greg J. Duncan (1998). "Long-Run Effects of Motivation on Labor Market Success." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(1):33-48.
- Duvall, Evelyn M. 1946. "Conceptions of Parenthood." *American Journal of Sociology* 52: 193-203.
- Elder, Glen. 1974. *Children of the Great Depression: Social Change in Life Experience*.

- Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
- Entwisle, Doris R. and Nan Marie Astone. 1994. "Some Practical Guidelines for Measuring Youth's Race/Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status." *Child Development*. 65 (6): 1521-1540
- Evans, Gary W. 2006. "Child Development and the Physical Environment." *Annual Review of Psychology* 57(1): 423-51.
- Farkas, George. 2003. "Cognitive Skills and Noncognitive Traits and Behaviors in Stratification Processes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1): 541-562.
- Farkas, George, Christy Lleras, and Steve Maczuga. 2002. "Does Oppositional Culture Exist in Minority and Poverty Groups?" *American Sociological Review* 67(1): 148-55.
- Ferguson, Ronald. 2001. "A Diagnostic Analysis of Black-White GPA Disparities in Shaker Heights, Ohio." Pp. 347-414. In *Brookings Papers on Education Policy 2001*, edited by Diane Ravich. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Fordham, Signathia & John Ogbu. 1986. "Black Student's School Success: Coping with the Burden of 'Acting White.'" *The Urban Review* 18(3): 176-205.
- Frazier, Edward F. 1939. *The Negro Family in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fryer, Roland G., Jr., and Steven D. Levitt. 2004. "Understanding the Black-White Test Score Gap in the First Two Years of School." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86:447-64.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1973. *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goldthorpe, John H. 1987. 2nd ed. *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Goldthorpe, John and Gordon Marshall. 1992. "The Promising Future of Class Analysis: A Response to Recent Critiques." *Sociology* 26: 381-400.
- Grimes, Michael D. 1991. *Class in Twentieth-Century American Sociology: An Analysis of Theories and Measurement Strategies*. New York: Praeger.
- Guo, Guang and Kathleen Mullan Harris. 2000. "The Mechanisms Mediating the Effects of Poverty on Children's Intellectual Development." *Demography* 37(4): 431-47.
- Guo, Guang and Elizabeth Stearns. 2002. "The Social Influences on the Realization of Genetic Potential for Intellectual Development." *Social Forces* 80(3): 881-910.

- Hart, Betty and Todd R. Risley. 1992. "American Parenting of Language-Learning Children: Persisting Differences in Family-Child Interactions Observed in Natural Home Environments." *Developmental Psychology* 28: 1096-1105.
- Hart, Betty and Todd R. Risley. 1995. *Meaningful Differences in the Everyday Experiences of Young American Children*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Hart, Betty and Todd R. Risley. 1999. *The Social World of Children Learning to Talk*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Harvey, David L. and Michael H. Reed. 1996. "The Culture of Poverty: An Ideological Analysis." *Sociological Perspectives* 39(4): 465-495.
- Havighurst, Robert J. & Allison Davis. 1955. "A Comparison of the Chicago and Harvard Studies of Social Class Differences in Child Rearing." *American Sociological Review*. 20(4): 438-42.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herrnstein, Richard J. and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hirsh-Pasek, Kathy & Roberta Michnick Golinkoff, and Diane Eyer. 2003. *Einstein Never Used Flashcards: How Our Children Really Learn--and Why They Need to Play More and Memorize Less*. Rodale Books: Emmaus, Pa.
- Hoff, Erica 2003. "The Specificity of Environmental Influence: Socioeconomic Status Affects Early Vocabulary Development Via Maternal Speech." *Child Development* 74:1368-78.
- Hofferth, Sandra L., Pamela Davis-Kean, Jean Davis, and Jonathan Finkelstein. 1998. "User Guide for the Child Development Supplement of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics."
- Holden, George H.. 1997. *Parents and the Dynamics of Child Rearing*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hollingshead, A. A. 1975. "Four-Factor Index of Social Status." Unpublished Manuscript, Yale University, New Haven CT.
- Horvat, Erin McNamara & Kristine S. Lewis. 2003. "Reassessing the 'Burden of 'Acting White''': The Importance of Peer Groups in Managing Academic Success." *Sociology of Education*. 76: 265-280.

- Huttenlocher, Janellen, Marina Vasilyeva, Heidi R. Waterfall, Jack L. Vevea, and Larry V. Hedges. 2007. "The Varieties of Speech to Young Children." *Developmental Psychology*. 43 (5): 1062-1083.
- Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephan Michelson. 1972. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic.
- Jenkins, Richard. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: Routledge.
- Jones, Rachel K. & Ye Luo. 1999. "The Culture of Poverty and African-American Culture: An Empirical Assessment." *Sociological Perspectives*. 42(3): 439-58.
- Kerckhoff, Allen C. 1972. *Socialization and Social Class*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kingston, Paul W. 2000. *The Classless Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kline, Rex B. 1998. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kohn, Melvin L. 1959. "Social Class and Parental Values." *American Journal of Sociology* 64: 337-51.
- Kohn, Melvin L. . 1959. "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority." *American Sociological Review*. 24(3): 352-366
- Kohn, Melvin L. 1963. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 68(4): 471-480.
- Kohn, Melvin L. 1977. *Class and Conformity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamborn, Susie, Nina Mounts, Laurence Steinberg, & Sanford Dornbusch. 1991. "Patterns of Competence and Adjustment among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful Homes." *Child Development* 62: 1049-65.
- Lareau, Annette. 2000. *Home Advantage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Lareau, Annette. 2002. "Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families." *American Sociological Review* 67: 747-776.
- Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lareau, Annette and Erin McNamara Horvat. 1999. "Moments of Social Inclusion and Exclusion Race, Class, and Cultural Capital in Family-School Relationships."

- Sociology of Education*. 72(1): 37-53.
- Lee, Seh-Ahn. 1993. "Family Structure Effects on Student Outcomes." In *Parents, Their Children, and Schools*, edited by In Barbara Schneider and James S. Coleman (Eds.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1968. "The Culture of Poverty." In Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.) *On Understanding Poverty: Perspective from the Social Sciences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1971. "The Culture of Poverty." Pp. 187-220 in *On Understanding Poverty*, edited by Louis A. Ferman, Joyce A. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Linver, Miriam R., Jean Brooks-Gunn, and Dafna E. Kohen. 2002. "Family Processes as Pathways From Income to Young Children's Development." *Developmental Psychology*. 38(5): 719-34.
- Littman, Richard A. Robert C. A. Moore, & John Pierce-Jones. 1957. "Social Class Differences in Child Rearing: A Third Community for Comparison with Chicago and Newton." *American Sociological Review*. 22(6): 694-704.
- Locke, John. 1978/1693. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lynd, Robert S. & Helen Merrell Lynd. 1929. *Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Maccoby, Eleanor & Patricia Gibbs. 1954. "Methods of Child Rearing in Two Social Classes." In *Readings in Child Development*, edited by William E. Martin & Celia Burns Stendler. Harcourt Brace & Company: New York.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. 1992. "The Role of Parents in the Socialization of Children: An Historical Overview." *Developmental Psychology*. 28: 1006-17.
- Maccoby, Eleanor. E. & J. A. Martin. 1983. "Socialization in the Context of the Family: Parent-Child Interaction." Pp. 1-101 *Handbook of Child Psychology*, edited by E. M. Hetherington. New York: Wiley.
- McLoyd, V. C. (1990). "The Impact of Economic Hardship on Black Families and Children: Psychological Distress, Parenting, and Socioemotional Development." *Child Development*, 61: 311-346.
- McLoyd Vonnie C. 1998. "Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Child Development." *American Psychologist*. 53:185-204.

- Mickelson, Roslyn and Anne Velasco. 2006. "Bring it On! Diverse Responses to 'Acting White' Among Academically Able Black Adolescents." In *Beyond Acting White: Reassessments and New Directions in Research on Black Students and School Success*, edited by Erin McNamara Horvat and Carla O'Connor. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Mayer, Susan. 1997. *What Money Can't Buy: Family Income and Children's Life Chances*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, Walter. 1958. "Lower-class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." *Journal of Social Issues* 14: 5-20.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. 1965. *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Muthen, L.K., & Muthen, B.O. 2004. *Mplus Statistical Analysis with Latent Variables User's Guide version 3*. Los Angeles, Ca: Muthen & Muthen.
- Muller, Chandra. 1998. "Gender Differences in Parental Involvement and Adolescents' Mathematics Achievement." *Sociology of Education* 71: 336-56.
- Murray, Charles. 1984. *Losing Ground: American Social Policy 1950-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ogbu, John. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ogbu, John. 2003. *Black Students in an Affluent Suburb: A Study of Academic Disengagement*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Parke, Ross D., Scott Coltrane, Sharon Duffy, Raymond Buriel, Jessica Dennis, Justina Powers, Sabine French, Keith F. Widaman. 2004. "Economic Stress, Parenting, and Child Adjustment in Mexican American and European American Families." *Child Development* 75:1632-56.
- Parker, Seymour and Robert J. Kleiner. 1970. "The Culture of Poverty: An Adjustive Dimension." *American Anthropologist* 72(3): 516-527
- Phillips, Meredith, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Greg J. Duncan, Pamela Klebanov, and Jonathan Crane. 1998. "Family Background, Parenting Practices, and the Black-White Test Score Gap." Pp. 103-48 in *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Preacher, Kristopher J., Derek D. Rucker, Derek D., Robert C. MacCallum. 2005. "Use of the Extreme Groups Approach: A Critical Reexamination and New Recommendations." *Psychological Methods* 10(2): 178-192.

- Rainwater, Lee & William L. Yancey. 1967. *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Riordan, Cornelius. 2004. *Equality and Achievement: An Introduction to the Sociology of Education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Roscigno, Vincent J. & James W. Ainsworth-Darnell. 1999. "Race, Cultural Capital, and Educational Resources: Persistent Inequalities and Achievement Returns." *Sociology of Education*. 72(3): 158-178
- Rosenfeld, Alvin & Nicole Wise. 2001. *The Over-Scheduled Child: Avoiding the Hyper Parenting Trap*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile*. 1956/1762. (W. Boyd Trans.) New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sarkisian, Natalia & Naomi Gerstel (2004). "Kin Support Among Black and Whites: Race and Family Organization." *American Sociological Review* 69(6): 812-837.
- SAS OnlineDoc Version 8 (accessed 2/24/05) v8doc.sas.com/sas/html.
- Schaefer, Earl S 1965. "A Children's Report of Parental Behavior: An Inventory." *Child Development* 36: 413-424.
- Sears, Charles. H. 1899. "Home and School Punishments." *Pedagogic Seminary*. 6: 159-87.
- Sears Robert R, Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin. 1957. *Patterns of Child Rearing*. Evanston, Ill: Row, Peterson.
- Sewell, William H., Robert M. Hauser, & David L. Featherman (Eds). 1976. *Schooling and Achievement in American Society*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sewell, William H. and Vimal P. Shah. 1968. "Social Class, Parental Encouragement, and Educational Aspirations" *American Journal of Sociology* 73: 559-72.
- Sewell, William H. and Robert Hauser. 1980. "The Wisconsin Longitudinal Study of Social and Psychological Factors in Aspirations and Achievements." Pp. 59-64 in *Research in the Sociology of Education and Socialization*, edited by A. Kerckhoff. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Stack, Carol B. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies For Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stattin, Håkan & Margaret Kerr. 2000. "Parental Monitoring: A Reinterpretation." *Child Development*. 71(4): 1072-1085.

- Steinberg L., J. D., Elmer, & N.S. Mounts. 1989. Authoritative Parenting, Psychosocial Maturity, and Academic Success among Adolescents. *Child Development* 60: 1424-36.
- Steinberg Laurence. 2005. "Psychological control: Style or substance?" *New Directions for Child & Adolescent Development* 2005(108): 71-78.
- Steinberg Laurence. 2001. "We Know Some Things: Parent-Adolescent Relationships in Retrospect and Prospect." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 11:1-19.
- Teachman, Jay D. 1987. "Family Background, Educational Resources, and Educational Achievement." *American Sociological Review* 52: 548-557.
- Teachman, Jay D. and Paasch, Kathleen. 1998 "The family and Educational Aspirations." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60(3) 704-714.
- Tyson, Karolyn. 2002. Weighing in: Elementary-Age Students and the Debate on Attitudes Toward School among Black Students." *Social Forces* 80: 1157-89.
- Tyson, Karolyn, William Darity Jr & Domini Castellino. 2005. "It's Not 'a Black Thing': Understanding the Burden of Acting White and Other Dilemmas of High Achievement." *American Sociological Review* 70: 582-605.
- Valentine, Charles. 1968. *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- White, Martha Sturm. 1957. "Social Class, Child Rearing Practices, and Child Behavior." *American Sociological Review*. 22(6): 704-12.
- Whiteside-Mansell, Leanne, Robert H. Bradley, Todd D. Little, Robert Flynn Corwyn, Donna Spiker, 2001. An Examination of Cross-Racial Comparability of Mother-Child Interaction Among African American and Anglo American Families. *Journal of Marriage & Family*. 63(3): 767-79.
- Woodcock, R.W. and M.B. Johnson. 1989. *Tests of achievement, standard battery [form B]*. Chicago, IL: Riverside Publishing (Houghton Mifflin).
- Woodcock, R.W., & Mather, N. (1989, 1990). *WJ-R Tests of Achievement: Examiner's Manual*. In R. W. Woodcock & M.B. Johnson, *Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery – Revised*. Allen, TX: DLM Teaching Resources.
- Wright, Eric Olin. 1985. *Classes*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Eric Olin. 1996. "The Continuing Relevance of Class Analysis—Comments." *Theory and Society* 25: 693-715.

Yeung, W. Jean, Mirian R. Linver, & Jean Brooks-Gunn. 2002. "How Money Matters for Young Children's Development: Parental Investment and Family Processes." *Child Development* 73(6):1861-1879.