Black in School: How Race Impacts the Effect of Concerted Cultivation on Educational Success

By
Jordan M. Mosby

B.A., Morehouse College, 2019

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Sociology at Brown University

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND
MAY 2022

This thesis by Jordan Mosby is accepted in its present form by the Department of Sociology as satisfying the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Date_____ _____

Jayanti Owens, Advisor

Approved by the Graduate School

Date_____ _____

Andrew G. Campbell, Dean of the Graduate School

Acknowledgements

As with all that I write, my goal is for folks to feel seen and acknowledged in my words. In this instance, I hope Black students and parents feel seen; that the reflection of their frustrations and struggles in academic literature brings a sense of solace. Though, Black folks experiences, struggles, and joy, are valid regardless of academia's acknowledgment. Still, I use this science to say: I see you.

I'd like to thank my incredible and masterful advisor, Dr. Jayanti Owens. I am grateful for your tireless effort, mentorship, and unending patience with me through the development and evolution of this thesis. I would also like to thank my reader, Dr. Nicole Van Cleve and Dr. Margot Jackson, who were critical in my understanding of culture and inequality, respectively. Thank you to my colleagues in the sociology department, especially my 2019 cohort who have guided me through multiple iterations of this project.

I'd be remiss to not acknowledge Morehouse College, and my undergraduate mentor, Dr. Adria Welcher. Dr. Welcher's work on Black students in education and the Black middle-class, first exposed me to a topic of research that motivate both my master's thesis and dissertation. Morehouse brought me in close proximity with the heterogeneity of the Black experience; one which I plan to spend the rest of my life discovering, picking apart and understanding. Morehouse continues to serve as the cornerstone of my academic and personal identity.

I'd most especially like to thank my dynamic personal community. Friends that have talked me through the litany of personal difficulties I've overcome in the last two years. My family, most importantly, my mother, Janet and brother, Zane. Your support has meant the world to me and enables me to be the scholar and man I am. Lastly, I'd like to thank my late father, William L. Mosby. The values my father imparted to me motivate all that I do. His spirit is the "amorphous mist" that surrounds my life and informs my work and my understanding of the world. Lastly, and most importantly, I'd like to thank God, without whom, none of this would be possible.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Education scholars have long noted a positive relationship between concerted cultivation and test scores. Yet, few studies have found variation by race, a factor Black middle-class scholars note impacts parental decision making. The current project asks how race moderates the relationship between concerted cultivation and education. We use data from the 2011 ECLS-K cohort to measure the impact of concerted cultivation on fifth-grade students' math and reading test scores. In an analysis of 18,135 students across the U.S., we find statistically nonsignificant support for a negative relationship between concerted cultivation and math and reading scores for Black fifth-grade students. Results confirm the impact of parental involvement and structured activities as beneficial variables that increase all students' test scores. The present study impacts the ways scholars consider the role of race in shaping the cultural resources that students learn through the habitus. This project bridges two distinct literatures and experiences that merge in the experience of Black students' educational journeys.

Keywords: race, (Black) cultural capital, concerted cultivation, education.

INTRODUCTION

Cultural capital is an impactful element in the social lives of group members. In his book entitled *Distinction,* Bourdieu pieces through the ways cultural capital seamlessly compliments social, economic, and educational capital. Cultural capital describes valued tastes, understandings, and knowledge cultivated in the upper-class habitus (Bourdieu [1979] 2010; Carter 2003). Cultural capital may manifest as an embodied, objectified, or institutionalized state. Specifically, the institutionalized state reflects "…professional credentials and educational qualifications" (Wallace 2018:468). Cultural capital has an impact on social, economic, and educational capital. Bourdieu sets the groundwork for educational scholars' understanding of the role of culture in education.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concerted Cultivation

Scholars have noted the impact of cultural capital on children's educational success. Cultural capital is typically operationalized in education literature as concerted cultivation, as coined by Anette Lareau (2003). Lareau finds that class differences structure children's academic and social lives via different parenting styles. Middle-class parents practice *concerted cultivation* while working-class and poor parents practice *natural growth*. Middle-class parents engaged in concerted cultivation, fill their children's time with sports, extracurricular activities like music lessons, and practice verbal and negotiation skills. Working-class children, whose parents choose a natural growth model, have more free time, typically participating in self-guided activities with extended family members (Lareau 2003). These different parenting styles result in middle-class children learning class-based tactics useful in social institutions such as schools. Lareau (2003) also

notes that the largely upper-middle-class parents who partner with schools in children's learning given an educational advantage to their students. Working-class parents are more reluctant to engage with their student's school and demonstrate anxiety when interacting with teachers and school officials. These tactics may influence their student's behaviors in schools, as students observe their parents appearing "baffled, intimidated and subdued" when interacting with teachers (Lareau 2002:170). Lastly, Lareau (2003) notes language differences between working-class and middle-class parents. She finds that working-class parents use more direct language while middle-class parents stop to explain and negotiate with their children (Lareau 2003; Manning 2019).

Contemporary studies demonstrate the returns of concerted cultivation on education (Bodovski and Farkas 2008; Calarco 2011; Cheadle 2009; Redford, Johnson and Honnold 2009). Scholars find that concerted cultivation predicts students' G.P.A. and test scores (Bodovski and Farkas 2008; Redford, Johnson and Honnold 2009). Concerted cultivation also positively impacts the ways teachers perceive students in schools (Bodovski and Farkas 2008). Calarco (2011) extends Lareau's work through a study of a mixed-income public school and finds middle-class students use proactive tactics that garner them help from teachers, as opposed to their working-class counterparts who are more patient but may go unnoticed. Calarco (2011) concludes that middle-class children demonstrate proactive tactics that exercise a form of cultural capital that yields positive social and educational outcomes.

More recent literature disagrees with Lareau's premise that parenting styles and concerted cultivation do not correlate with race (Bodovski 2010; Cheadle 2009). Bodovski (2010) finds that Black parents are less engaged in concerted cultivation than their White counterparts. Cheadle (2009) finds that differing parental investment affects the Black-White achievement gap in early learning, attributing this to the environmental and social constraints facing Black parents. Where these studies recognize the barriers facing Black middle-class

students in participating in concerted cultivation, our work compares Black and non-Black students with equal levels of participation in concerted cultivation.

Racialized Cultural Capital

Race complicates Bourdieu's original conception of cultural capital. Contemporary scholars have critiqued Bourdieu for neglecting race and gender in his analysis of habitus and cultural capital (Moore 2008; Wallace 2018; Yosso 2005). Those cultural capital scholars in education argue that racialized forms of cultural capital exist that empower students in a variety of ways. One strand of racialized cultural capital focuses on the unique aspects of identity that give minority students capital, though it may not be valued in the field. Through a Critical Race Theory (CRT) lens, Yosso (2005) finds that the aspirational, linguistic, familial, social, navigational, and resistant, constitute forms of cultural wealth that students of color bring to the classroom. Still, she argues that these forms of cultural knowledge may not constitute valued capital in schools (Yosso 2005).

Black Cultural Capital

Another strand of alternate cultural capital is "Black cultural capital." Scholars of Black cultural capital use the term in two predominant ways. Carter (2003) coins the term Black cultural capital in her analysis of over forty Black youth in a school in Yonkers, NY. She argues that Black students negotiate both dominant and non-dominant, which she terms Black cultural capital, to achieve different ends. Dominant cultural capital helps these students talk with teachers and achieve mobility, while non-dominant Black cultural capital helps them express ethnic authenticity (Carter 2003). Cultural capital impacts the students' behavior, and they negotiate which capital they use depending on their audience and desired goal.

Contemporary British scholars of the Black middle-class study Black cultural capital as a form of dominant capital where members of the Black middle-class infuse modes of cultural capital with representation of and "expressions and experiences" of Blackness (Wallace 2018). Scholars identify that cultural capital has a racialized lens for Black folks (Meghji 2019; Rollock et al. 2015; Wallace 2018). Cultural capital may be interpreted through a racial lens by Black people as they code certain forms of cultural capital as White, and others are Black (Meghji 2019; Wallace 2018). This is based on an evaluation of Black actors' representation in historically White manifestations of cultural capital and the racial substance of the cultural capital itself. For instance, Black musicians performing jazz music constitute Black representation in performing a form of Black cultural capital, whereas Black musicians playing opera might constitute Black representation in White cultural capital. Indeed, "…racialised dynamics are central to the production, consumption, and activation of cultural capital" (Meghji 2019:9). The implications of this racial coding are far-reaching. Anderson (2015) notes that Black folks recognize "white spaces," and if there are not an adequate amount of people of color in these spaces, they may feel uncomfortable and avoid such spaces. Scholars of race and cultural capital also argue that members of the Black middle-class use cultural capital as an anti-racist practice to counter racial stereotypes and to legitimate Black knowledge (Meghji 2019). Rollock et al. (2015) argue that Black cultural capital is " a set of performative strategies for navigating white institutions (Meghji 2019:5). Thus, Black cultural capital may take on a myriad of forms for Black folks.

Wallace (2019) argues that a dominant form of Black cultural capital undermines notions of cultural capital as a race-neutral concept. These authors also specifically describe the struggle Black middle-class actors face in influencing the field due to racism (Wallace 2018;

Wallace 2019). Members of the Black middle-class have a harder time activating and thus reaping the benefits of their class status (Lacy 2007; Landry 2018). The continued discrimination they face in housing, the workplace, shopping centers, and schools point to racism's role as a pervasive phenomenon in their lived experiences (Clowney 2015). This small body of scholarship has considerable implications for the way scholars think about the racialization of cultural capital and its potential to express multiple identities.

The racialization of cultural capital creates new fundamental questions for the theory of concerted cultivation. Scholars are still working to disentangle the ways cultural capital is racialized. Thus little work has focused on the fundamental arguments for the ways derivative theories, like concerted cultivation, might also benefit from a racial lens. The literature on the Black middle-class offers multiple objections to concerted cultivation. First, Pattillo (2013) finds that many Black middle-class parents work long hours to maintain their middle-class status; thus, they cannot be with their children as often. This may make the parental involvement aspect of concerted cultivation more difficult for Black middle-class parents (Pattillo 2013). These structural barriers may inhibit them from participating in concerted cultivation to the same degree White parents are able to (Cheadle 2009). Second, cultural capital takes on different forms for Black folks; thus, it is reasonable to assume, so might concerted cultivation. In fact, there is a litany of research on the Black middle-class that reveals that race is present in various aspects of the education decision and concerted cultivation specifically.

Implications For Concerted Cultivation

Concerted cultivation theory is, at its core, a theory of parenting styles. While Lareau acknowledges race when discussing Black parents parenting styles, her work has been critiqued for its engagement with race and racism (Lacy 2007; Manning 2019). Black middle-class parents

consider race in a myriad of ways as they parent. Manning (2019) focuses on three poignant ways Black parents consider race when parenting. He says Black parents use racialized parenting techniques aimed at: (1), cultural socialization and racial identity development; (2), awareness of racialized social spaces, and (3), strategies of racial navigation (Manning 2019). These parenting techniques inform children's socialization and interaction with various institutions, including schools.

Race matters at many different levels of the educational journey. While there is extensive literature on discrimination in schools against Black students, a lesser-known literature is that concerning the way race plays into parenting decisions as it pertains to education. Race impacts where parents encourage and will even pay for where their children to attend school, from primary schools to college (Landry 2018). Black middle-class parents make considerations for race and schools when considering what neighborhoods they choose to live in (Lacy 2007; Landry 2018). In some instances, Black middle-class parents are put in the position of choosing to live in White neighborhoods that may be less welcoming so that their children can attend better public schools (Lacy 2007; Landry 2018;). School choice for Black middle-class parents is not only about high-performing schools but about Black identity formation (Landry 2018). Black middle-class parents use a multitude of strategies and institutions, including neighborhood choice, social organizations, and schools, to ensure their children have a sense of Black racial identity. Ensuring a sense of racial identity in their children is a concern for many Black middle-class parents (Banks 2012; Landry 2018; Welcher 2013).

Black middle-class parents consider race when making education-related decisions for their children. Education is a critical value for members of the Black middle-class and impacts their decision-making (Landry 2018; Pattillo 2013). From neighborhood and school choice to

curriculum challenges, education is an important value and factor for Black middle-class families (Lacy 2007; Landry 2018; Wallace 2018). Many Black middle-class parents see college as critical for their children to retain middle-class status and thus are willing to making economic sacrifices to finance their collegiate education (Landry 2018). Still, Black parents face unique challenges and circumstances as it concerns interaction with the school system. We will map the experiences of members of the Black middle-class to the two predominant mechanisms of concerted cultivation: parental involvement and structured activities.

Black parental involvement in schools is often racialized. Black middle-class families are what Pattillo (2013) calls "lower-middle-class". Thus, Black middle-class parents work longer hours to help maintain their class status. . Relatedly, she finds that members of the Black middle-class are in closer proximity to impoverished neighborhoods and poor schools, as compared to their White middle-class counterparts. Pattillo (2013:212/213) concludes that Black folks undergo a "unique middle-class experience", one that mixes "…strong cultural traditions with their economic resources to come up with their own "mainstream" practices." While Pattillo's (2013) work might challenge whether or not Black middle-class parents participate in concerted cultivation at all, she finds that they do structure their children's activities in similar ways to White parents (i.e., dance, music lessons).

Black middle-class parents also have differential experiences with direct involvement in their children's schools. Scholars note that school curriculum reflects a white normativity that Black parents and students attempt to combat by deploying Black cultural capital (Wallace 2019). These parents and students make recommendations to faculty about Black authors, artists and histories that can be studied in school. Importantly, Wallace (2019:167) notes that Black parents possess and deploy Black cultural capital to "strengthen their children's class position

and racial consciousness". Some Black middle-class parents find themselves having to supplement standard education to ensure their children's exposure to Black history (Wallace 2018). Parents also find themselves having to pay special attention to their student's schools to ensure they are receiving top education. Lacy (2007) finds Black middle-class parents expressing frustration when their students are steered away from advanced placement (A.P.) courses by guidance counselors. These parents have to advocate for their students, at times demanding they be placed in honors and A.P. courses (Lacy 2007). Thus parental involvement in schools for Black middle-class parents may concern issues of race and racism in school curricula.

Race is also a critical consideration in the ways Black parents structure their student's extracurricular activities. Black parents are purposeful about ensuring their children interact with Black kids. Lacy (2004) finds that Black middle-class parents put their children in Jack and Jill to ensure exposure to Black folks with middle-class values. Jack and Jill is a Black organization of mothers who aim to expose their children to the social and cultural values of middle-class lifestyle (Lacy 2004). Black parents also ensure exposure to objectified forms of Black cultural capital. Banks (2012) finds that Black middle-class parents are intentional about ensuring their children see Black art and Black artist's work in museums. Wallace (2019) finds that Black parents recognize they must supplement their children's education to expose them to Black authors and Black history. Black middle-class parents find themselves involved in aiding their students at various grade levels. Landry (2018) finds that some Black middle-class parents behave as if college is mandatory for their children and are engaged in their learning early on. These parents volunteer at their kid's schools, and at home, do extra problems and assign independent books reports to their children (Landry 2018). These parents also put their children in enrichment camps at nearby universities. Many encourage their children to go to HBCU's to

strengthen their racial identity and mitigate the issues they might face at PWI's. The literature demonstrates that Black parents are intentional with the activities they structure for their children. They consider their children's racialization and class status as they make decisions about their child's socialization (Landry 2018). Black parents must take extra steps beyond the structured activities outlined by Lareau, as it concerns their student's education. For the purpose of this research, we term these extra steps, *Black concerted cultivation*. Thus, Black concerted cultivation describes traditional activities and lifestyles of concerted cultivation, with an added agenda of managing children's racial identity. Though this research does not measure these additional steps, they are crucial in understanding Black parents' relationship with concerted cultivation.

The literature demonstrates that Black folks, specifically the Black middle-class, have a different relationship with cultural capital than do their white counterparts. Thus, this paper tests whether concerted cultivation, a derivative of cultural capital, might also be racialized. Our research questions seek to understand whether Black students receive differential returns on standard measures of concerted cultivation. Concerted cultivation concerns the daily lives of students, parent interactions with institutions, and language use in the household (Lareau 2003; Cheadle 2009). Concerted cultivation is typically operationalized into two typologies: parental involvement and structured activities. We will use these measures to ascertain whether or not Black students receive differential returns.

Thus, our research questions ask:

1. How does race moderate the effects of structured activities on students' educational success?
2. How does race moderate the effects of parental involvement on students' educational success?
3. How does race moderate the effects of the concerted cultivation composite on students' educational success?

HYPOTHESIS

If Black students receive differential treatment on concerted cultivation, there may be multiple potential explanations. Said difference might be a result of participation in Black cultural capital. Students' structured activities could teach them a Black cultural capital that is not valorized in school or reflected in standardized test scores, similar to the ways White cultural capital is (Freedle 2003). Though this study is unable to measure whether or not students participate in Black or White concerted cultivation, the difference for these racialized forms may provide potential explanations.

Parental Involvement

Black parents' interactions with schools can be contentious. From proposing curriculum changes to demanding their students be placed in advanced courses, Black parents face unique challenges once interacting with schools and school officials. Therefore, we predict that Black students' parental involvement will have a negative relationship with reading and math scores.

Structured Activities

While our measurements for structured activities are the same for all students, regardless of race, the variables available do not capture the racial essence inherent in these variables. Elements of cultural capital like art, dance, and music, have a racial code to them. The identification of White cultural capital and White space may work to deter outgroup members from engaging (Anderson 2015). Our data do not identify the racial code of the structured activities. Thus we can make no conclusions on whether the activities students participate in would constitute Black or White concerted cultivation. Black parents likely consider race as it concerns the makeup of their student's structured activities. Recall, scholars find Black parents are intentional about racial exposure as it concerns aspects of concerted cultivation like art (Banks 2012) and other cultural

and social engagements like Jack and Jill (Lacy 2007). There is little work that speaks to the returns of Black cultural capital in social institutions and schools. In addition, standardized tests, like the S.A.T.'s, have been critiqued for upholding elements of a White cultural capital (Freedle 2003). Considering we do not know the racial dimensions to the cultural capital practiced by Black students, we predict that structured activities will have a negative effect on Black students' test scores.

Concerted Cultivation

Members of the Black middle-class continue to face structural racism and receive less returns on their class status (Clowney 2015; Welcher 2013). These barriers manifest in education as Black parents consider class and racial identity formation for their children. The concerted cultivation composite is a makeup of parental involvement and structured activities. Therefore, in conjunction with our previous hypotheses, we predict that Black students' concerted cultivation will negatively affect reading and math scores.

DATA AND METHODS

We use data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, kindergarten class of 2010-2011 (ECLS-K). The longitudinal study follows over 18,000 students from kindergarten to fifth grade, collecting data from students, parents, teachers, care providers, and schools. Students come from public and private schools and various backgrounds to provide racial and socioeconomic variation in the sample. Data were collected during the fall and spring from 2010-2016. ECLS-K: 2011 contains data focus on students' social, emotional development while taking account of educational performance. ECLS-K is a standard used by education scholars to measure the effects of family, community, and individual impacts, on students' school performance (Bodovski and Farkas 2008; Cheadle 2009; Lareau 2003).

ECLS-K 2011 wave dataset contains observations from 18,174 students. 39 student's genders were reported as missing, and these students were dropped from the sample. Our final sample contains 18,135 observations representing data from fifth-grade math and reading scores. Fifth-grade scores were used to measure longer term benefits of concerted cultivation. Measures for concerted cultivation were taken from the kindergarten wave of data collection.

Dependent Variables

We use reading and math scores from 5th-grade students as dependent variables. These scores were chosen to measure the accumulative effects of concerted cultivation on students. Descriptive statistics for the reading and math variables are displayed in Table 1. Reading and math scores carry a mean of 136.1 6 and 119.7, respectively.

Independent Variables

We have isolated variables that represent the concerted cultivation measured by Lareau. ECLS-K: 2011 asks parents about their involvement in their student's education, as well as the activities their students participate in. Parental involvement variables measure parent participation across six different areas involving their child's school: (1), Parent-Teacher organization (P.T.O.) meetings; (2), parent-teacher conference (P.T.C.) meetings; (3), school fundraisers; (4), sporting events; (5), volunteering and (6), open house or back to school night. Structured activities also consist of six variables that measure students participation in: (1), organized clubs (2), organized sport; (3), art lessons; (4), dance lessons (5), music lessons, and (6), attendance at organized performing arts programs. These variables measure 2/3 of the aspects of concerted cultivation since there is no measure of parental language in the ECLS-K dataset.

Our final sample contains 2,388 Black students and 15,747 White; Hispanic; Asian; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; American- Indian/Alaska Native; and multi-race students. Each regression includes the full list of control variables.

Controls

Our control variables include sex, student's health, health insurance, students with special education, mothers depression, number of individuals in household, income, parents education. Multiple controls are included to account for variables that affect children's education. Parent's education is included a high school diploma, or less education are the reference group. Family structure is included with single parents (mother or father), those with a bio parent, and a stepparent, with biological parents as the reference. Gender is included as well as extraneous variables that affect education like health insurance, mother's depression, and socioeconomic status. Additional controls include low birth weight of students, their having a sibling (adopted or biological). We have included controls for childcare, either at home or in a care center, and whether or not students were included in a head start academic program. Lastly, we include a variable for students who have received special education services in kindergarten.

We impute data to address missingness for both dependent variables and all variables included in the parental involvement and structured activities composite. After imputation, our final sample contained 18,135 observations.

After imputation, we run six multivariate regression analyses to estimate the effects of parental involvement, structured activities, and the concerted cultivation composite on students reading and math scores. The regressions measure the composite of parental involvement, structured activities, and concerted cultivation separately. Each regression includes the full list of

control variables as well as an interaction between the composite and Black, representing the sample of Black students.

RESULTS

We provide descriptive statistics for all dependent, independent, and control variables in Table 1. The means of reading and math scores are relatively close, at 136 and 119.7, respectively.

Parental Involvement

The statistical estimates for our parents involvement models are presented in Tables 1a and 1b. Our results show that parental involvement has a positive effect on student's reading and math scores. We observe a statistically non-significant relationship between the interaction of Black parental involvement and Blacks students' math and reading test scores. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that there are racial differences in the effects of parental involvement. However, we do find a statistically significant negative association between Black students race and math scores. Results show that parental involvement has a positive effect on students' reading (r=5.2) and math scores (r=7.1). Results confirm previous research documenting the Black-White achievement gap, showing Black students score lower than their white counterparts on reading and math tests, though our reading statistic was not significant at the .05 level (.07). Thus, we find that race negatively impacts Black students reading and math scores, while parental involvement has a positive benefit on test scores.

Structured Activities

The statistical estimates are presented in Tables 2a and 2b. Results show that structured activities, much like parental involvement, have a positive effect on students' reading and math

scores, with coefficients of 5.7 and 8.2, respectively. Consistent with the results from our parental involvement analysis, we find a statistically significant relationship between Black students and lower test scores. Consistent with our hypothesis, we see a statistically non-significant relationship between the interaction of Black students and structured activities, with math and reading scores. We fail to reject the null hypothesis that there are not racial differences in the returns of structured activities on students' test scores.

Concerted Cultivation

The results for the concerted cultivation composite (displayed in Table 3a and 3b) resemble those of parental involvement and structured activities, displaying statistically significant positive benefits to students reading (r=9.1) and math (r=12.6) scores. These coefficients, combining parental involvement and structured activities, displays the largest benefit to students test scores. Our results are consistent with multiple studies that show a positive relationship between concerted cultivation and students test scores (Bodovski and Farkas 2008). However, consistent with the parental involvement and structured activities regressions, we find a statistically significant negative correlation between Black students race and test scores. In addition, we find statistically non-significant support for our hypothesis that the interaction of Black and concerted cultivation has a slightly negative effect on student test scores. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that there are no racial differences in the returns of concerted cultivation on students' test scores.

Controls

Statistically, significant gender differences persist across all three measures (parental involvement, structured activities, and concerted cultivation). Results are consistent with gender

research, showing girls with higher reading scores and boys with higher math scores (Goldin, Katz, and Kuziemko 2006; Hedges and Nowell 1995; Hyde, Fennema, and Lamon 2008). Having an adopted sibling has a statistically significant negative effect on students math and reading scores throughout all of our models. Siblings have a negative impact across models, though results are non-significant for math scores, yet significant for reading scores across all models. Our most surprising finding is the negative effect of receiving special services in kindergarten for students. We find a statistically significant negative relationship between receiving special services in kindergarten and reading and math scores across all regressions. Low birthweight has a small but statistically significant negative effect on test scores. Across regressions, we find a positive relationship between our family socioeconomic status composite and reading and math scores. The remaining variables concerning insurance, mother's age, one adoptive parent (mother or father), child care, head start, care centers, and home care all have small, statistically non-significant effects on test scores in either direction.

DISCUSSION

Our results lend partial support to the hypothesis that Black students receive less of a return to parental involvement. Our results were non-significant at the .05 level. Previous literature documents the barriers to parental involvement for Black parents and the obstacles that arise when interacting with schools. Further research is needed to investigate the exact mechanisms by which Black parental involvement has a negative effect on Black student's test scores.

Results indicate partial support of our hypothesis that Black students receive less of a return to structured activities. Our non-significant results suggest that structured activities are

negatively associated with Black students' reading and math scores. As expected, the coefficient for the concerted cultivation composite were higher than parental involvement and structured activities separately. Across models we identify that Black fifth grade students have lower test scores in reading and math than their white counterparts.

Race is a social construct that structures society and the experiences of racialized people (Itzigsohn and Brown 2020). Education scholars have noted the race impacts Blacks students' experiences in schools, from discipline (Owens and McLanahan 2020) to hair and clothing (Lewis and Diamond 2015). Therefore, we would expect that race impacts the effect of concerted cultivation for Black students in schools. We might imagine that practicing aspects of Black concerted cultivation may conflict with the White cultivation/cultural capital that influences schools. Our results clearly show that parental involvement and structured activities benefit non-Black students.

We argue that Black students participation in Black or White forms of concerted cultivation may have a differing impact on students test scores. Under the assumption that White forms of concerted cultivation, those that are rewarded in schools, may reap additional benefits to students, than Black forms of concerted cultivation. Therefore, the racial dynamics of cultural capital may have implications for returns to concerted cultivation. We understand this project as measuring Black students participation in a racially uncoded form of cultural capital. The data lacks specificity on what racial code of cultural capital students participate in. This research would have benefited from disaggregated data that identifies Black students who participate in traditionally White cultural capital and those that participate in Black cultural capital. This style of analysis may have presented different results, for instance, showing that Black students who participate in Black concerted cultivation have significant disadvantages on test scores. Future

surveys may benefit from operationalizing concerted cultivation with racial codes, allowing researchers to identify the differences between student participation in Black and White concerted cultivation. Measuring the difference of these returns will help address the intricate nature of class and race dynamics in American schools.

LIMITATIONS/IMPLICATIONS

This study has multiple limitations. First, the ECLS-K data pull academic achievements from public and private school students. Private schooling is a parental investment in student education; thus, we might expect that said private school parents invest in their students through concerted cultivation. It is also feasible that parents invest most of their funds reserved for their child's investment into the private school, thus not having thus leaving little remaining funds for structured activities. Regardless, this study does not isolate private schooling as a control variable. In addition, students in the kindergarten wave include those attending school full-time and part-time. Full-day kindergarten has been noted to have positive impacts on students' test scores, though short-lived, especially for minority students (DeCicca 2007). Isolating full or part-time kindergarten could have also provided different results.

This research is also limited to students' academic scores in fifth grade. Future studies should extend through middle, high school, and tertiary education to measure the full extent of the impact of concerted cultivation. This project is also limited in the use of test scores as an outcome variable. Other studies of concerted cultivation speak to the interactions between teachers and students as it concerns the conflict of Black and White cultural capital (Wallace 2018). Fortunately, this work speaks to the impact of concerted cultivation on Black students. This work is also unable to directly compare the impact of concerted cultivation between Black and White students. The reference category for our Black race variable includes White, Latinx,

other, and multi-racial students. Therefore, the results of this study speak to the impact of concerted cultivation on Black students alone, without making direct comparisons.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
reading9irt	11408	136.101	15.703	72.268	159.006
math9irt	11408	119.698	17.741	26.764	148.038
concertedcultivati~2	11408	.439	.176	-.173	1.014
parentalinvolvement2	11408	.69	.237	-.066	1.456
structuredactiviti~2	11408	.189	.198	-.499	1
parentBA	11408	.333	.487	-1.342	1.953
siblings1	11408	1.505	1.122	-3.18	12
childcare1	11408	.223	.424	-1.205	1.673
insurance2	11408	.947	.223	0	1.797
mage	11408	34.417	6.712	8.326	74
lbw	11408	.036	.184	-.6	1
singlemom	11408	.196	.392	-1.183	1.884
socialdad	11408	.055	.233	-.79	1
adoptedother	11408	.018	.135	-.546	1
continuousses1	11408	-.045	.829	-2.911	2.596
headstart	11408	.114	.35	-1.111	1.408
carecenter	11408	.191	.4	-1.349	1.553
homecare	11408	.252	.435	-1.224	1.746
anyspecialservices k	11408	.043	.202	0	1
girls	11408	.489	.5	0	1
cesdclinical	11408	.147	.354	0	1

Table 2a

Linear regression

reading9irt	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
parentalinvolvement2	5.206	.649	8.03	0	3.935	6.477	***
1.black	-3.624	1.353	-2.68	.007	-6.276	-.973	***
1.black#c.parental~2	-1.331	1.88	-0.71	.479	-5.016	2.354	
1.parentBA	.905	.359	2.52	.012	.201	1.609	**
siblings1	-.678	.137	-4.95	0	-.947	-.41	***
1.childcare1	.461	.456	1.01	.312	-.432	1.355	
1.insurance2	-.098	.68	-0.14	.886	-1.431	1.236	
mage	.094	.023	4.06	0	.049	.139	***
lbw	-2.292	.764	-3.00	.003	-3.79	-.794	***
1.singlemom	-1.165	.431	-2.70	.007	-2.01	-.319	***
1.socialdad	1.289	.693	1.86	.063	-.07	2.647	*
adoptedother	-8.004	1.33	-6.02	0	-10.611	-5.397	***
continuousses1	6.526	.235	27.78	0	6.066	6.987	***
headstart	-.174	.385	-0.45	.651	-.929	.58	
carecenter	-.485	.478	-1.01	.31	-1.421	.452	
homecare	.812	.312	2.60	.009	.201	1.422	***
1.anyspecialservic~k	-10.873	.865	-12.58	0	-12.568	-9.178	***
girls	1.433	.26	5.52	0	.924	1.942	***
1.cesdclinical	.178	.387	0.46	.645	-.58	.937	
Constant	130.524	1.14	114.49	0	128.29	132.759	***

Mean dependent var	136.101	SD dependent var	15.703
R-squared	0.225	Number of obs	11408.000
F-test	173.219	Prob > F	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	92334.987	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	92481.828

*** *p<.01*, ** *p<.05*, * *p<.1*

Table 2b

Linear regression

math9irt	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
parentalinvolvement2	7.064	.72	9.81	0	5.652	8.476	***
1.black	-6.89	1.514	-4.55	0	-9.858	-3.922	***
1.black#c.parental~2	-3.164	2.107	-1.50	.133	-7.295	.966	
1.parentBA	1.444	.4	3.61	0	.661	2.227	***
siblings1	-.161	.148	-1.09	.277	-.451	.129	
1.childcare1	1.778	.493	3.61	0	.812	2.744	***
1.insurance2	-.55	.721	-0.76	.446	-1.964	.864	
mage	.022	.026	0.86	.388	-.028	.073	
lbw	-4.054	.887	-4.57	0	-5.793	-2.314	***
1.singlemom	-2.098	.482	-4.35	0	-3.043	-1.153	***
1.socialdad	.712	.778	0.92	.36	-.812	2.237	
adoptedother	-7.851	1.47	-5.34	0	-10.732	-4.969	***
continuousses1	7.118	.257	27.71	0	6.615	7.622	***
headstart	-1.231	.43	-2.87	.004	-2.074	-.389	***
carecenter	-.566	.525	-1.08	.281	-1.595	.463	
homecare	.692	.347	1.99	.046	.011	1.372	**
1.anyspecialservic~k	-12.328	1.064	-11.59	0	-14.413	-10.243	***
girls	-2.015	.289	-6.98	0	-2.581	-1.449	***
1.cesdclinical	-.55	.435	-1.27	.206	-1.402	.302	
Constant	117.242	1.234	95.03	0	114.824	119.66	***

Mean dependent var	119.698	SD dependent var	17.741
R-squared	0.255	Number of obs	11408.000
F-test	201.020	Prob > F	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	94670.260	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	94817.101

**** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1*

Table 3a

Linear regression

reading9irt	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
structuredactiviti~2	5.694	.726	7.84	0	4.27	7.118	***
1.black	-4.39	.681	-6.44	0	-5.726	-3.055	***
1.black#c.structur~2	-1.372	2.517	-0.55	.586	-6.306	3.562	
1.parentBA	.801	.36	2.22	.026	.095	1.507	**
siblings1	-.69	.138	-5.00	0	-.96	-.42	***
1.childcare1	.372	.455	0.82	.414	-.52	1.264	
1.insurance2	-.081	.677	-0.12	.905	-1.408	1.247	
mage	.102	.023	4.42	0	.057	.148	***
lbw	-2.241	.763	-2.94	.003	-3.737	-.744	***
1.singlemom	-1.248	.433	-2.88	.004	-2.098	-.399	***
1.socialdad	1.088	.688	1.58	.114	-.26	2.436	
adoptedother	-8.137	1.355	-6.01	0	-10.792	-5.482	***
continuousses1	6.514	.239	27.29	0	6.046	6.982	***
headstart	-.28	.385	-0.73	.466	-1.034	.474	
carecenter	-.585	.477	-1.23	.22	-1.521	.351	
homecare	.72	.312	2.31	.021	.109	1.331	**
1.anyspecialservic~k	-10.761	.865	-12.44	0	-12.457	-9.065	***
girls	1.031	.267	3.87	0	.508	1.554	***
1.cesdclinical	.095	.389	0.24	.808	-.667	.856	
Constant	133.104	1.067	124.74	0	131.012	135.196	***

Mean dependent var	136.101	SD dependent var	15.703
R-squared	0.224	Number of obs	11408.000
F-test	176.037	Prob > F	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	92350.010	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	92496.851

*** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1*

Table 3b

Linear regression

math9irt	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
structuredactiviti~2	8.179	.813	10.06	0	6.585	9.773	***
1.black	-8.696	.768	-11.32	0	-10.202	-7.191	***
1.black#c.structur~2	-2.505	2.832	-0.88	.376	-8.056	3.046	
1.parentBA	1.29	.401	3.22	.001	.504	2.076	***
siblings1	-.171	.149	-1.15	.252	-.462	.121	
1.childcare1	1.663	.494	3.37	.001	.696	2.631	***
1.insurance2	-.543	.719	-0.75	.45	-1.953	.867	
mage	.032	.026	1.26	.209	-.018	.083	
lbw	-3.984	.878	-4.54	0	-5.706	-2.262	***
1.singlemom	-2.21	.483	-4.58	0	-3.157	-1.264	***
1.socialdad	.436	.78	0.56	.576	-1.092	1.964	
adoptedother	-7.984	1.482	-5.39	0	-10.888	-5.08	***
continuousses1	7.059	.26	27.13	0	6.549	7.569	***
headstart	-1.36	.43	-3.16	.002	-2.203	-.516	***
carecenter	-.709	.526	-1.35	.178	-1.741	.322	
homecare	.57	.347	1.64	.101	-.111	1.251	
1.anyspecialservic~k	-12.165	1.061	-11.46	0	-14.245	-10.085	***
girls	-2.594	.296	-8.75	0	-3.175	-2.013	***
1.cesdclinical	-.665	.436	-1.53	.127	-1.52	.189	
Constant	120.726	1.148	105.12	0	118.475	122.977	***

Mean dependent var	119.698	SD dependent var	17.741
R-squared	0.254	Number of obs	11408.000
F-test	203.022	Prob > F	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	94679.966	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	94826.807

**** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1*

Table 4a

Linear regression

reading9irt	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
concertedcultivati ~2	9.092	.883	10.29	0	7.361	10.824	***
1.black	-3.773	1.259	-3.00	.003	-6.241	-1.306	***
1.black#c.concert e~2	-1.943	2.705	-0.72	.473	-7.245	3.359	
1.parentBA	.765	.359	2.13	.033	.062	1.469	**
siblings1	-.659	.137	-4.80	0	-.929	-.39	***
1.childcare1	.487	.454	1.07	.284	-.403	1.377	
1.insurance2	-.202	.679	-0.30	.766	-1.533	1.128	
mage	.091	.023	3.93	0	.046	.136	***
lbw	-2.259	.765	-2.95	.003	-3.758	-.76	***
1.singlemom	-1.191	.432	-2.76	.006	-2.036	-.345	***
1.socialdad	1.282	.69	1.86	.063	-.071	2.635	*
adoptedother	-7.893	1.341	-5.89	0	-10.52	-5.265	***
continuousses1	6.226	.24	25.89	0	5.754	6.697	***
headstart	-.135	.385	-0.35	.725	-.889	.619	
carecenter	-.562	.476	-1.18	.238	-1.495	.371	
homecare	.804	.311	2.58	.01	.194	1.413	***
1.anyspecialservic ~k	-10.786	.862	-12.51	0	-12.477	-9.096	***
girls	1.107	.261	4.23	0	.594	1.619	***
1.cesdclinical	.167	.387	0.43	.666	-.591	.925	
Constant	130.511	1.109	117.70	0	128.337	132.684	***

Mean dependent var	136.101	SD dependent var	15.703
R-squared	0.228	Number of obs	11408.000
F-test	177.657	Prob > F	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	92297.733	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	92444.575

**** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1*

Table 4b

Linear regression

math9irt	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
concertedcultivati ~2	12.626	.983	12.84	0	10.698	14.553	***
1.black	-7.226	1.421	-5.08	0	-10.012	-4.439	***
1.black#c.concert e~2	-4.448	3.059	-1.45	.146	-10.444	1.547	
1.parentBA	1.249	.399	3.13	.002	.466	2.031	***
siblings1	-.132	.148	-0.90	.371	-.422	.157	
1.childcare1	1.818	.491	3.70	0	.855	2.78	***
1.insurance2	-.7	.72	-0.97	.331	-2.111	.711	
mage	.017	.026	0.67	.502	-.033	.068	
lbw	-4.008	.883	-4.54	0	-5.74	-2.277	***
1.singlemom	-2.136	.481	-4.44	0	-3.078	-1.193	***
1.socialdad	.708	.776	0.91	.361	-.812	2.228	
adoptedother	-7.676	1.47	-5.22	0	-10.558	-4.794	***
continuousses1	6.688	.262	25.52	0	6.174	7.201	***
headstart	-1.17	.429	-2.72	.006	-2.011	-.328	***
carecenter	-.67	.523	-1.28	.2	-1.695	.355	
homecare	.686	.346	1.98	.048	.007	1.365	**
1.anyspecialservic ~k	-12.211	1.058	-11.55	0	-14.283	-10.138	***
girls	-2.466	.291	-8.49	0	-3.035	-1.896	***
1.cesdclinical	-.564	.434	-1.30	.194	-1.415	.287	
Constant	117.131	1.197	97.83	0	114.785	119.478	***

Mean dependent var	119.698	SD dependent var	17.741
R-squared	0.259	Number of obs	11408.000
F-test	206.659	Prob > F	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	94606.728	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	94753.570

*** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1*

References

Anderson, Elijah. 2015. "'The White Space.'" *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1):10–21. doi: 10.1177/2332649214561306.

Banks, Patricia A. 2012. "Cultural Socialization in Black Middle-Class Families." *Cultural Sociology* 6(1):61–73. doi: 10.1177/1749975511427646.

Bodovski, Katerina, and George Farkas. 2008. "'Concerted Cultivation' and Unequal Achievement in Elementary School." *Social Science Research* 37(3):903–19. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2008.02.007.

Bodovski, Katerina. 2010. "Parental Practices and Educational Achievement: Social Class, Race, and *Habitus*." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 31(2):139–56. doi: 10.1080/01425690903539024.

Bourdieu, Pierre. [1979] 2010. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Calarco, Jessica McCrory. 2011. "'I Need Help!' Social Class and Children's Help-Seeking in Elementary School." *American Sociological Review* 76(6):862–82. doi: 10.1177/0003122411427177.

Carter, Prudence L. 2003. "Black Cultural Capital, Status Positioning, and Schooling Conflicts for Low-Income African American Youth." *Social Problems* 50(1):136–55.

Cheadle, Jacob E. 2009. "Parent Educational Investment and Children's General Knowledge Development." *Social Science Research* 38(2):477–91. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2008.12.002.

Clowney, Stephen. 2015. "Boundary Work in Black Middle-Class Communities." Savannah Law Review 2(1):225–46.

DeCicca, Philip. 2007. “Does Full-Day Kindergarten Matter? Evidence from the First Two Years of Schooling.” *Economics of Education Review* 26(1):67–82. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2005.04.003.

Freedle, Roy. 2003. "Correcting the S.A.T.'s Ethnic and Social-Class Bias: A Method for Reestimating S.A.T. Scores." *Harvard Educational Review* 73(1):1–43. doi: 10.17763/haer.73.1.8465k88616hn4757.

Goldin, Claudia, Lawrence F. Katz, and Ilyana Kuziemko. 2006. “The Homecoming of American College Women: The Reversal of the College Gender Gap.” Journal of Economic Perspectives, 20(4): 133–56.

Hedges, Larry V., and Amy Nowell. 1995. “Sex Differences in Mental Test Scores, Variability, and Numbers of High-Scoring Individuals.” *Science* 269(5220): 41–45. doi: 10.1126/science.7604277.

Hyde, Janet S., Elizabeth Fennema, and Susan J. Lamon. 1990. “Gender Differences in Mathematics Performance: A Meta-Analysis.” *Psychological Bulletin* 107(2):139–55. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.139.

Itzigsohn, José, and Karida Brown. 2020. *The Sociology of W.E.B. Du Bois: Racialized Modernity and the Global Color Line*. New York: New York University Press.

Lacy, Karyn R. 2004. “Black Spaces, Black Places: Strategic Assimilation and Identity Construction in Middle-Class Suburbia.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(6):908–30. doi: 10.1080/0141987042000268521.

Lacy, Karyn R. 2007. *Blue-Chip Black: Race, Class, and Status In the New Black Middle Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Landry, Bart. 2018. *The New Black Middle-class in the Twenty-First Century*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Lareau, Annette. 2002. “Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families.” *American Sociological Review* 67(5):747. doi: 10.2307/3088916.

Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lewis, Amanda E., and John B. Diamond. 2015. *Despite the Best Intentions: How Racial Inequality Thrives in Good Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Manning, Alex. 2019. “THE AGE OF CONCERTED CULTIVATION: A Racial Analysis of Parental Repertoires and Childhood Activities.” *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 16(1):5–35. doi: 10.1017/S1742058X19000080.

Meghji, Ali. 2019. “Encoding and Decoding Black and White Cultural Capitals: Black Middle-Class Experiences.” *Cultural Sociology* 13(1):3–19. doi: 10.1177/1749975517741999.

Moore, Kesha S. 2008. "Class Formations: Competing Forms of Black Middle-Class Identity." *Ethnicities* 8(4):492–517

Owens, Jayanti, and Sara S. McLanahan. 2020. “Unpacking the Drivers of Racial Disparities in School Suspension and Expulsion.” *Social Forces* 98(4):1548–77. doi: 10.1093/sf/soz095.

Pattillo, Mary E. 2013. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril among the Black Middle Class*. Second edition. Chicago ; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Redford, Jeremy, Jennifer A. Johnson, and Julie Honnold. 2009. “Parenting Practices, Cultural Capital and Education Outcomes: The Effects of Concerted Cultivation on Academic Achievement” *Race, Gender and Class* 16(1-2):25-44.

Rollock, Nicola, David Gillborn, Carol Vincent, and Stephen J. Ball. 2015. *The Colour of Class: The Educational Strategies of the Black Middle-classes*. New York and London: Routledge.

Wallace, Derron. 2018. “Cultural Capital as Whiteness? Examining Logics of Ethno-Racial Representation and Resistance.” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 39(4):466–82. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2017.1355228.

Wallace, Derron. 2019. “The Racial Politics of Cultural Capital: Perspectives from Black Middle-Class Pupils and Parents in a London Comprehensive.” *Cultural Sociology* 13(2):159–77. doi: 10.1177/1749975519839521.

Welcher, Adria. 2013. "Chasing the Dream: How Black Middle-Class Parents Make Educational Decisions for Their Children." PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, Emory University.

Yosso, Tara. 2005. “Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth.” *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8 (1): 69–91.