Maryland Population Research Center

Expressive Cool and the Paradox of Black and White Males' Neighborhood Socialization toward Education

Author :

Odis Johnson, Jr.
University of
Maryland

www.popcenter.umd.edu

"EXPRESSIVE COOL" AND THE PARADOX OF BLACK AND WHITE MALES' NEIGHBORHOOD SOCIALIZATION TOWARD EDUCATION

Odis Johnson, Jr., PhD
Associate Professor & Chair
African American Studies
University of Maryland

INTRODUCTION

Whether adolescents believe that hard work in school pays off with good grades and success in life (or "achievement ideologies") has been a longstanding interest of researchers for good reason (Gurin and Epps 1975; Willis 1977; MacLeod 1987). If adolescents' rejection of dominant achievement ideologies is inspired by their social background, then social inequalities may work to exacerbate educational stratification. Although the low aspirations and academic disengagement of low income or working class children are frequent worries, these concerns also extend to gender, racial, and residential groups. Not only might race, gender and residency be related to adolescents' educational beliefs, their intersection may embody multiple risks to the academic experiences of African American males in particular, especially since their racial and gender dispositions toward education are cultivated, in part, by their observance of similarly impacted neighbors. Neighboring adults therefore could contribute to the socialization of the next generation, resulting in the social reproduction of the dispositions that enable educational stratification. Pursuant to these possibilities, this study has three related aims: 1) to explore racial differences in how male adolescents' educational attitudes relate to their academic performance (i.e. "attitude-achievement paradox"); 2) to examine how attitude-achievement correspondences vary according to black and white males' "expressive cool" gender dispositions; and, 3) to reveal possible differences in the relation of neighborhood collective socialization to males' educational attitudes and behavior.

ATTITUDES AND ACHIEVEMENT ACCORDING TO RACE, GENDER, AND CONTEXT

Racial stratification in society is an essential part of this discussion because it could unequally inspire among historically marginalized racial groups views critical of achievement ideologies. African Americans, for example, have been shown to endorse achievement ideologies until they are asked whether those beliefs apply to people like them, a distinction Mickelson (1990) notes as having "abstract" versus "concrete" attitudes. Other perspectives argue that African Americans question whether academic success is culturally appropriate for them because they may associate higher academic performance with "acting white" (Ogbu 1987; p. 323; Fryer and Torelli 2010). But skepticism has grown regarding the thought that African Americans are more likely than whites to reject the importance of schooling (Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey 1998; Harris 2006); or face stiffer social penalties for high academic performance (Cook and Ludwig 1997); and, fear stigmas associated with achievement (Tyson, Darity and Castilleno 2005). Yet other studies imply that covariation between African Americans' educational attitudes and behavior should not be assumed (O'Connor 1997; Akom 2003). O'Connor (1997), for example, shows that some African American adolescents develop a disposition toward collective struggle in response to the apparent hypocrisy of dominant achievement ideologies. Her respondents subsequently see success in school as a way to defy society's unfair treatment of, and low expectations for, African Americans (O'Connor 1997). Hence, African Americans can have both critical attitudes and high achievement.

Regarding gender, it has long been thought that males' regard for achievement may be influenced by gendered social hierarchies and identities (Willis 1977; A. Ferguson 2001). Willis' (1977) classic study, for instance, finds male adolescents reinforce masculine norms within the context of their peer group that appear inconsistent with success in school. Males' perceptions of employment opportunity and their understanding of gender role expectations within society were among the primary contributors to their gendered dispositions toward education. However, studies of gender-race intersections leave questions unsettled about the ability of achievement ideology beliefs to shield different behavioral groups, equally,

from the structural influences that undermine achievement. MacLeod's (1987) study, for instance, shows that white boys from a low income housing development question linkages between schooling and employment opportunity and exhibit hyper-masculine behaviors. Their African American peers in contrast endorse achievement ideologies, are not hyper-masculine, but ultimately struggle more than their white counterparts in the labor market, and are more likely to blame themselves for their lack of success. One interpretation of these findings is that race limits the social returns of African American males' positive educational attitudes even when compared to less optimistic, hyper-masculine, white adolescents. Another interpretation is that our gendered society rewards masculine dispositions with social advancement, and that resistance to dominant achievement ideologies carries fewer sanctions when understood as a part of adolescents' masculine identity and behavior.

That MacLeod (1987) finds these race-gender differences among boys that reside in a low income neighborhood is of particular note. In addition, other qualitative studies describe how achievement ideologies manifest among adolescents living in mixed-income and middle-class neighborhoods (Pattillo 1999; Ogbu 2003; Harding 2010). While both experimental (Johnson 2012b) and inferential studies (Johnson 2008) have shown that the relationship between residency among the middle class and the achievement of black males is not always a positive one, Harris (2006) shows, in contrast, that African Americans in a predominantly middle class context often hold optimistic educational attitudes. However, none of the aforementioned studies systematically consider if neighborhood socialization opportunities qualify how black and white adolescents' masculinity relates to their educational attitudes and achievement.

EXPRESSIVE COOL AS GENDER-ROLE PERFORMANCES WITHIN CONTEXTS

I consider "expressive cool" as a type of masculine gender performance because research contends its elements resonate with male youth culture, are informed by neighborhoods and broader

opportunity structures, and may be linked to adolescents' academic orientations (Majors and Billson 1993; Pattillo 1999; R. Ferguson 2001; Dance 2002; Oliver 2006). I next review some primary expressive cool constructs, their connections to neighborhood processes, and how they may relate to educational attitudes and behavior.

I investigate code-switching as an aspect of adolescents' expressive cool because it indicates knowledge of different expressive scripts and an ability to perform them. Neighborhood socialization may be a process in which individuals are taught to relate particular gender-role performances to the appropriate environmental circumstance and perform those behaviors when cued, just as urban residents have been found to switch between "street" and "decent" orientations (Anderson 1999). In addition, the contexts that adolescents experience are not static; there is variation within them, between them, and across time. Neighborhoods may therefore provoke a different gender-role performance than elicited at home or school; in different times of the day; and, even across the different social groups within them (e.g. peers and strangers) that adolescents encounter. Hence, gender performances are relational and fluid (Kimmel 1986) and have an equally dynamic and ever-changing social basis. Although code-switching has a special relevance to African Americans due to their history of negotiating conflicting self and public images (DuBois 1903), and desire to advance socially within dominant and non-dominant cultural contexts (Carter 2003), this study will explore whether white teens within contexts heavily populated by African Americans also code-switch to socially navigate those environments.

I also consider male adolescents' style of expression and appearance because qualitative research shows that "outfits, language, and walk" are important aspects of social organization in middle class neighborhoods (Pattillo 1999). In addition to appearance, "acting black" may be a vital component of adolescents' hype, swagger and ultimately their masculinity, because inasmuch as acting black reflects being hard, tough, and having street credibility (Dance 2002), it is as much a gender "burden" for males as

it may be a racial one. The burden may be heavier for African Americans, and explain why Abreu et al. (2000) find a higher correlation between ethnic belonging and toughness among African Americans than for whites and Latinos. Suggested racial differences find support in claims that "blacks take their style 'more seriously' than whites" and reside in contexts where "the chances that a stylistic faux pas will have negative consequences are higher" (Pattillo 1999, p. 119). A corollary concern is that racial variation in males' expressive culture underlies racial differences in standardized test-scores (R. Ferguson 2001) and academic engagement among the middle class (Thernstrom and Thernstrom 2003; Ogbu 2003). However, white teens in near-urban contexts may be equally susceptible to these behaviors since other studies suggest that the burden of "acting white" is a concern for them too (Tyson, Darity and Castellino 2005), and that individuals become increasingly likely to perform a certain behavior as its prevalence in an area increases (Crane 1991).

Other research claims that racial inopportunity may be a precondition that activates male adolescents' expressiveness, and therefore important to consider. In their form of expressive masculinity called "cool pose" for example, Majors and Billson (1993) argue black male expressiveness extends from the reality that opportunities to achieve a healthy masculine identity are more fully available to white than black males. African American males may therefore enact externalizing behaviors to secure the respect that they believe is generally denied to them (Majors and Billson 1993). To this point, research shows that perspectives about racial discrimination in school and the labor market may lead teens to pursue other ways of gaining social acceptance, resulting in lower achievement (A. Ferguson 2001; Smalls et al. 2007), especially in under-resourced neighborhoods (Caughy et al. 2006).

Perceived masculinity is also an important dimension of adolescents' expressiveness, because how males see themselves and are perceived by others contributes to their gender identity and in turn their behavior. These behaviors tend to be explored within research as problematic responses to women and

femininity (O'Neil et al. 1986; Reidy et al. 2009), diverse sexualities (Kimmel and Mahler 2003; Klein 2006), society's gender norms (Eisler and Skidmore 1987; Lazur and Majors 1995), and as manifestation of risk and vulnerability in contexts (Spencer 2001; Cassidy and Stevenson 2005; Seaton 2007). Within schools, research argues that perceived masculinity informs adolescents' peer group memberships and responses to school staff (MacLeod 1987), non-conformance with school expectations and higher rates of discipline (A. Ferguson 2001), as well as low aspirations within mixed income neighborhoods (Harding 2010).

Yet, masculinities may play a constructive part in adolescents' social and academic development. For example, Kirkland and Jackson (2009) find that black adolescents' use of language and styles that reflect their race and gender simultaneously facilitate a masculine cool self-concept, and an efficacy about the application of those expressive elements to successful literacy practices. Second, role strain, which hypothesizes boys and men experience stress and problematic outcomes related to society's gendered expectations of them (Eisler and Skidmore 1987; Lazur and Majors 1995), may prompt males to become critical of hegemonic masculinity and its linkage to achievement ideologies, redefine manhood in ways that suit them, and assume academically advantageous masculine identities. Therefore, masculinity—whether it engenders a pride and agency in learning processes, or establishes a healthy critique and masculine counter-culture—could lead to higher achievement.

NEIGHBORING ADULTS AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF MALES

I examine adolescents' dispositions toward education within neighborhoods because their understanding of opportunity structures, racial inequalities, and their chances of meeting male role expectations are possibly informed by observing male adults in their vicinity. The influence neighboring adults have on children other than their own is known as neighborhood collective socialization (Jencks and Mayer 1990; Ainsworth 2010), and neighbors' informal social control of adolescent behavior (Sampson

1997). Given that expressive cool is crafted in part by teens' experiences with and emulation of adult males, failing to account for their absence, presence and characteristics within neighborhoods may lead expressive cool dimensions to appear more strongly tied to educational attitudes and achievement than they should. This study therefore considers the following theoretically relevant neighborhood attributes.

Local employment structures bring about the collective socialization of adolescents in various ways. First, the creation of norms that typically arise in response to work may be hindered in neighborhoods with high male unemployment (Wilson 1996), including the modeling of professions, the provider roles men serve in families, and black male success. Second, joblessness within neighborhoods may lead teens to question the availability of opportunity and the economic returns to educational success (MacLeod 1987), especially if increased competition for jobs has limited young people's ability to find work (Newman 1999). Alternatively, being locked out of a tight labor market might give teens more time to study and incentive to pursue more education in order to become more competitive for jobs (Ginther, Haveman and Wolfe 2000). Hence, dismal opportunity prospects could lead to higher grades.

A key indicator of neighborhood collective socialization is the presence of adults with an educational background capable of assisting teens' educational advancement (O'Connor 2000). Research hypothesizes that the neighborhood presence of highly educated populations increases the norms of college-going among peers within schools (Rosenbaum 1995), and the pressure on local schools to provide an educational experience consistent with college-entry requirements (Jencks and Mayer 1990). Having fewer college educated neighbors limits the number of males teens can look up to as examples of educational success or rely on for sponsorship through educational systems.

Urban ethnographies have elucidated the important role "Old Heads" or adult males have as mentors, providers and supervisors for young males in black communities, and how their absence weakens a neighborhoods' ability to collectively regulate adolescents' behavior and development (Duneire 1994,

Anderson 1999). It follows that female-headship at the neighborhood level may present consequences for adolescent males, since an absence of co-resident fathers could reflect a reduction in the number of male adults to engage adolescents in the area (Wilson 1996; Johnson 2001). Evidence suggests that neighborhood female headship rates are negatively related to the educational attainment of black males, but not white males (Duncan 1994; Madyun and Lee 2010). This study will expand this literature by estimating neighboring adult male influences on teens' educational beliefs and grades in suburban settings.

I also consider the location of adolescents' neighborhoods within a broader geography of opportunity, since African American neighborhoods frequently lie between areas of greater risk and privilege (Pattillo 1999; Sampson, Morenoff and Earls 1999). In contrast to the solidly middle class communities Lacy (2007) explores within Prince George's County, its' neighborhoods that border Washington, DC closely resemble the middle class enclaves in Pattillo's study, which are situated near lower income African American areas. Pattillo shows that adolescents' proximity to disadvantaged areas contributed to their "ghetto trance", or a greater affinity with expressive cultures that presumably differ from those associated with their higher income social status. Likewise, Harding (2010) suggests that economically heterogeneous neighborhoods set black youth on divergent pathways toward disparate aspirations. Population heterogeneity provides adolescents models of successful and unsuccessful behavior, competing interpretations of opportunity, and differing standards of success. The present study takes into consideration youths' location relative to Washington, DC, the major city that borders Prince George's County, to account for ensuing differences in the quality of collective socialization opportunities. Following from the substance of the literature review, this study explores the following research questions:

- Does expressive cool account for racial differences in adolescents' achievement ideology rejection (AIR) and grade point average (GPA)?

- Is there evidence of an attitude-achievement paradox where adolescents' expressive cool is more strongly related to their educational attitudes (AIR) than behavior (GPA)?

- Do neighborhoods' collective socialization account for racial differences in youths' AIR and GPA?

    To understand how expressive orientations and neighborhood socialization may differ for black and white adolescents, I also ask:

- Are there racial differences in the relationship of youths' expressive cool to AIR and GPA?

- Does neighborhood collective socialization's mediation of expressive cool's association with educational outcomes differ according to race?

RESEARCH METHODS

Data for this study come from the Maryland Adolescent Development in Context Study (MADICS), a survey of 1,482 youths of Prince George's County (http://www.rcgd.isr.umich.edu/pgc/home.htm). For the several reasons, these data remain the best data for the proposed study despite their collection from 1997 – 2002. First, Prince George's County is ideal for testing Pattillo's hypotheses concerning expressive cool and neighborhood effects in predominantly middle-class, majority black, near urban areas. These sample features would not be achievable in a nationally representative survey, nor do such surveys contain measures of adolescents' context as abundant as found in MADICS. Second, this study adds an emphasis on neighborhood and gender-role socialization processes that have not appeared in previous uses of these data (Cook et al. 2002; Harris 2006; Harris and Marsh 2010). This study utilizes data collected from 11th-grade adolescents, their parents, school personnel and residential measures taken from the census. The risk of bias posed by school dropouts is minimal since 99 percent of those surveyed in grade 8 (wave 3) were also surveyed in grade 11 (wave 4).

My analytic sample began with 524 males (approximately 61.4 percent African American, 29.1 percent white American, 9.5 percent other racial/ethnic groups). Adolescents of racially mixed heritage were re-designated as African American if one of their parents was African American; males of other racial/ethnic groups, 50 in all, were eliminated. After eliminating those adolescents that had changed residences, I arrived at a final sample of 406 males (260 black, 146 white) representing 143 census tracts of 183 census tracts within Prince George's County, MD.

Missing Values Analysis and Multiple Imputation

One complication with these data is that the percentage of missing values for some variables reaches 11.8 percent, making listwise deletion procedures unacceptable. Rather than sacrifice the variation of each independent variable by replacing missing cases with the variable mean, I use multiple imputation methods to assign missing values. The multiple imputation process uses values from other variables to assign a likely value to a missing case and repeats this process five times forming five complete samples. Imputing the two dependent variables in this way would risk the variation that may exist between the measures of attitudes and achievement and therefore were not imputed. I then generated convergence charts to confirm that the statistical properties across all five sample iterations appear nested and to overlap randomly for all variables. This study's statistical analyses generate the pooled estimate of all five samples. As seen in column 4 in table 1, the pooled means of analysis variables appear similar to those of the original data set.

Constructs and Measures

Since it is impossible to use, independently, all relevant variables in the statistical models, I use Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to reduce the number of correlated covariates into a single factor that

expresses the best summary of correlation between three or more variables. The factors generated in PCA were retained as analysis variables if the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was at .600 or higher and the Eigenvalue (total variance explained by the factor) exceeded 1.00. Table 1 reports the factors' principal components, Eigenvalues, standardized means and Cronbach's alpha.

Study variables reflect adolescents' expressive cool, social background, contexts and behavioral outcomes. Beginning with outcomes first, I used six variables to create a factor that reflects youths' *achievement ideology rejection* (AIR). As shown in Table 1, its principal components come from Mickelson's (1990) attitude-achievement paradox scale and reflect teens' concrete attitudes like "schooling is not so important for kids like me," "I don't really care about school," and "studying in school rarely pays off with a good job," and range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). I also consider adolescents' final *GPA* as an indicator of achievement. Including both educational beliefs and behavior permits the examination of attitude-achievement paradoxes.

I also create three factors to represent expressive cool measures (see Table 1). In the first factor, *hype*, parents say it is "not true" (0) to "very true" (2) that their child is now, or has been in the past six months, boastful, a show-off, verbose and using obscene language. *Racial inopportunity* indicates teens "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (4) that because of race, "there is little you can do to avoid discrimination at school," and "at the job you will have in the future," and that "you will have to work harder than others to prove yourself" and "do better than other kids." Lastly, *masculine identity* reflects adolescents' opinion that they feel and look masculine ranging from "not at all" (1) to "very" (7), and feel it is "not at all" (1) to "very" (7) important to appear masculine and avoid appearing feminine. Other expressive cool variables include *acting black* ("friends would think it was very uncool/cool if I acted black"), *best dressed* ("friends would think it was very uncool/ cool if I was voted best dressed"), both scaled 1 to 5, and *being good looking* ("how important is being good looking" scaled 1 for much less, to 7 for much more

important to me than it is for other kids). Finally, while adolescents were not asked whether they code-switch, they were asked to strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5) with the statement, "I can change my personality as I choose," which reflects an ability to code-switch. I refer to this variable as *personality change*.

Of the social background characteristics, my interest in differences among black and white adolescents required a dichotomous *race* variable (0 = white, 1 = black). *Single parenting* (0 = no, 1 = yes) and *dads' interest* indicating "my father almost never (1) to almost always (5) takes an interest in my activities" is considered since an engaged father in the home may reinforce adolescents' traditional masculinity (Mandara, Murray and Joyner 2005) or lessen the impression other males in the neighborhood may have on them. I include two additional family measures; *parent's education* (primary care giver's highest grade completed) to account for parental influences on adolescents' educational aspirations, and *total family income*, which I segment into equal quintiles in case its effects are non-linear. Since peers may confound relationships between neighborhoods or expressive orientations and schooling outcomes I also include *friends' AIR* beliefs ("How many friends that you spend most of your time with think you won't get a good job even if you do well in school"). This variable ranges from "none of them" (1) to "all of them" (5).

Table 1 includes neighborhood characteristics of two types; the first are more objective measures of neighborhood composition taken from the census. I include the *percentage of college degree* holders since the neighborhood presence of those who have completed degrees may communicate the importance of education to area youths and indicate a greater availability of effective role models. I also include the *percentage of female-headed households* to explore variation across neighborhoods in non-resident fathers. Finally, I use youths' distance from DC since Pattillo (1999) posits that males in nearby cities offer suburban teens alternative examples of masculine expressive behavior. I dichotomize this variable to indicate adolescents' *inner suburban ring* residency (0 = no, 1 = yes). The final two measures reflect

parents' perceptions about their neighborhoods. *Neighborhood joblessness* has been dichotomized to indicate parents' view that unemployment in the area is a big problem (1) or not a big problem (0). *Collective socialization* is a factor consisting of parent reports that they strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) that "there are lots of adults in the area our kids can look up to," "I can count on neighbors to tell me about opportunities for children," and "neighbors share similar views about raising kids."

Hierarchical Linear Modeling

The relationships I seek to examine reflect a multilevel conceptual model since the adolescents in this study are nested within neighborhoods (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). Using hierarchical linear models (HLM), I will model between adolescent-measures of AIR according to their social background and expressive cool qualities at level 1, and ecological measures at level 2. In the unconditional model specification below, youths' achievement ideology rejection Y_{cn} is viewed as a function of an intercept for adolescent c in neighborhood n yielding the Level 1 equation:

$$Y_{cn} = \beta_{0n} + e_{cn}$$

Where:

Y_{cn} is the outcome of adolescent c within neighborhood n

β_{0n} is the mean outcome level in neighborhood n

e_{cn} is an error term assumed normally distributed

Level 1 of the conditional model includes the social background and expressive masculinity variables. Since this research investigates adolescents' educational beliefs apart from their expressive cool, there are two level 1 conditional specifications for each education outcome. In the specifications of level 1,

AIR, Y_{cn} is a function of the quintiles of family SES (with the middle quintile excluded); the variables of parents' educational attainment, dads' interest in activities, marriage status; friends' AIR, age, and the seven expressive cool measures: hype, masculine identity, racial inopportunity, acting black, best dressed, personality change, and being good looking. The full level 1 equation is as follows:

$$Y_{cn} = \beta_{0n} + \beta_{1n}(Age)_{cn} + \beta_{2n}(Race)_{cn} + \beta_{3n}(Single\ Parenting)_{cn} + \beta_{4n}(Parents'\ Education)_{cn} + \beta_{5n}(Dad's\ Interest)_{cn} + \beta_{6\text{-}9n}(SES\ Quintiles)_{cn} + \beta_{10n}(Friends'\ AIR)_{cn} + \beta_{11n}(Masculine\ Identity)_{cn} + \beta_{12n}(Hype)_{cn} + \beta_{13n}(Racial\ Inopportunity)_{cn} + \beta_{14n}(Good\ Looking)_{cn} + \beta_{15n}(Acting\ Black)_{cn} + \beta_{16n}(Best\ Dressed)_{cn} + \beta_{17n}(Personality\ Change)_{cn} + e_{cn}$$

The Level 2 equation models neighborhood-to-neighborhood variation for all of the neighborhood variables. Hence, AIR, β_{0n} is a function of the percentage of female headed households, degree holders, parents' perception of high unemployment; collective socialization; and, adolescents' residency in the inner-suburban ring surrounding DC. I express the level 2 equation as:

$$\beta_{0n} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01n}(\%\ Degreed)_n + \gamma_{02n}(\%\ Female\ Heads)_n + \gamma_{03n}(Joblessness)_n + \gamma_{04n}(Collective\ Socialization)_n + \gamma_{05n}(Inner\ Suburban\ Ring)_n + r_{0n}$$

In this equation, the intercept γ_{00n}, represents the AIR for all neighborhoods in the sample. The neighborhood variables indicate the estimated deviation from the mean AIR associated with a unit increase among those factors.

[Table 1 about here]

ANALYSIS

Descriptive Analysis

The descriptive analysis reveals that this sample has low levels of AIR and high GPAs, with modest variation in the latter as evident from its small standard deviation. The racial differences in mean outcomes are also minor, but more pronounced among the social background and neighborhood characteristics. While Prince George's consistently holds the designation as the nation's wealthiest majority black county, Table 1 shows that the average total annual income of white families is higher, falling at the upper end of the $65-69,999 range, while for black families it is in the mid $55-59,999 range. The SES quintile means provide a glimpse at how these incomes are distributed according to race. The lowest income bracket has the largest proportion of black youth (~25 percent) while only 11 percent of white youth are in that category. In fact, only 28 percent of whites are in the two lowest income quintiles compared to 48 percent of black youth. Another notable racial difference appears within the family context, where the single parenting average for African Americans is double that of whites. Despite this disparity, black children report their dads having greater interest in their activities than do whites. Less pronounced differences are apparent in parent education levels, friends' AIR and adolescent age.

Among the expressive cool constructs, black and white adolescents differed most in regards to their masculine identity, with the black average being substantially higher (3.592 versus 2.077). Perceptions of racial inopportunity and the social acceptance of acting black were also much higher for black boys. For the former measure however, the black average was still on the low end of the scale indicating more optimism than pessimism about discrimination. Only modest differences appeared in adolescents' hype, personality switching, importance of being good looking, and social acceptance related to dress.

In the neighborhood context, white youth live in neighborhoods that have a higher proportion of college graduates and a lower percentage of female-headed families than do African Americans. A smaller

percentage of white youth reside in the inner suburban ring that borders Washington, DC than do their black peers (15.2 versus 27.9 percent). Minor racial differences were evident among the remaining neighborhood indicators.

[Table 2 near here]

Full Sample Analysis

Columns 1 through 4 in Tables 2 and 3 show the fixed and random effects of the full sample analysis. Model 1 reports the attitude or achievement means of the unconditional analyses; model 2 includes the social background characteristics; models 3 and 4 add the expressive cool and neighborhood dimensions, respectively. Considering teens' achievement ideology rejection first, model 2 shows African Americans have a significantly lower level of AIR ($\widehat{\beta}_0$ = -.24) than their white counterparts of nearly a quarter standard deviation. A smaller but significantly higher likelihood to reject dominant achievement ideologies appears for adolescents who have friends that also reject achievement ideologies ($\widehat{\beta}_{10}$ = .21) and dads that show interest in their activities ($\widehat{\beta}_{05}$ = .10). Once expressive cool dimensions are added in model 3, those significant relationships in model 2 weaken and the racial difference in AIR loses significance. Racial inopportunity ($\widehat{\beta}_{13}$ = .13) appears to heighten AIR, while adolescents' masculine perception ($\widehat{\beta}_{11}$ = -.13) and being considered well-dressed ($\widehat{\beta}_{16}$ = -.25) lowers AIR, the latter effect being the largest in the model amounting to a quarter standard deviation unit reduction in mean AIR. My introduction of the neighborhood variables in model 4 appears to have little influence on the magnitude of Model 3 estimates, and none of them appear significantly related to teens' AIR. The random components

show that any between neighborhood variance, τ (tau), shown to be significant in the unconditional model, becomes likely due to chance as adolescents' social background qualities are considered.

[Table 3 near here]

Table 3 specifies the same models in relation to GPA to understand how these dimensions relate to adolescents' educational behavior. Similar to the AIR analysis, the unconditional model suggests that there is between-neighborhood variation in mean GPAs. However, models 2 and 3 show that social background and expressive cool characteristics cannot explain little, if any, of this variation in GPA. The significant estimates for the neighborhood percentage of degree holders ($\hat{\gamma}_{01}$ = .01), and the tenuous negative effects of neighborhood joblessness ($\hat{\gamma}_{03}$ = -.06) shown in model 4 imply that neighborhood features are better able than individual characteristics to account for variation in adolescents' GPAs. The estimated amount of between-neighborhood variation in teens' GPA explained from model 3 where no neighborhood dimensions are specified, to model 4 where they are (37.3 percent) is calculated by differencing the variance component, τ, of two models and dividing by the value of the former model variance component ($\tau_1 - \tau_2/\tau_1$).

In sum, and in relation to the research questions, Tables 2 and 3 show, 1) evidence of an attitude-achievement paradox where African Americans have attitudes that are more supportive of achievement ideologies, but no higher GPAs than their white counterparts; 2) that expressive cool dimensions seem to have a stronger connection to AIR, and very little, if any, to adolescents' GPA; and, 3) that neighborhood qualities appear unrelated to AIR but do account for some variation in teens' GPA.

Disaggregated Sample Analysis

The full sample analysis provided important insights about racial differences in educational attitudes and the mediating role of neighborhoods and expressive cool. The fact that racial differences in

AIR became insignificant once expressive cool dimensions were added intimates that racial differences in expressive cool might be revealed once these data are disaggregated according to race. To explore this possibility, Tables 4 and 5 summarize the analysis of fixed and random effects disaggregated according to race. The model specifications are identical to those presented in Tables 2 and 3, except that the race variable is withheld.

[Table 4 near here]

Considering the analysis of teens' AIR first, Table 4 shows remarkable racial differences among social background, expressive cool and neighborhood collective socialization dimensions. Considering social background distinctions first, the significantly higher levels of achievement ideology rejection related to dads' interest in their son's activities that emerges in the full analysis seems, in Table 4, most likely to apply to African American teens. Being within a mid-lower SES household ($\widehat{\beta}_{07}$ = .38) is significantly related to higher AIR levels for black adolescents while being in a high income family is related to a half standard deviation reduction for whites ($\widehat{\beta}_{09}$ = -.50). However, higher AIR levels remain for low SES African Americans with the inclusion of expressive cool and neighborhood collective socialization features, while lowered AIR levels disappear for high SES whites. This is also the case for the association between adolescents' AIR and that of their friends'; AIR levels remain elevated for blacks in all models as the AIR of their friends are considered ($\widehat{\beta}_{10}$ = .19), while the larger AIR effect for whites ($\widehat{\beta}_{10}$ = .25) loses significance with the consideration of their expressive cool and neighborhood qualities.

Considering expressive cool next, African American adolescents' masculinity ($\widehat{\beta}_{11}$ = -.12) is related to less skepticism about achievement ideologies in the full model, but not for white males. The two racial groups were also similar in that being regarded as best-dressed is associated with less AIR, especially for white teens ($\widehat{\beta}_{16}$ = -.30), indicating the high SES connection to lowered AIR in model 4 was

accounted for by their dress. However, there were interesting differences too. First, African Americans' inability to change their personality ($\widehat{\beta}_{17}$ = .21) was associated with higher AIR levels, suggesting the absence of this social skill accompanies more critical assessments of dominant achievement ideologies. Second, white AIR levels were more sensitive to beliefs in racial inopportunity ($\widehat{\beta}_{13}$ = .30). This curious finding prompts the question of whether this association is due to their own experiences as an underrepresented group in this context or if it reflects their worldview about race relations.

Last, models 3 and 6 imply that neighborhood features, while unrelated to AIR in the full analysis and for black adolescents, are associated with the AIR of white teens. Parental views about joblessness are related to nearly a third of a standard deviation increase ($\hat{\gamma}_{03}$ = .29) in AIR for whites. In addition, the random components, τ, show that there is significant neighborhood variation in white but not black adolescents' AIR levels. This variation becomes more likely due to chance as expressive cool and neighborhood dimensions are added to the models. The reduction in between-neighborhood variation of white teens' AIR from model 5 where no neighborhood dimensions are specified, to model 6 where they are included amounts to 21.29 percent.

[Table 5 near here]

Table 5 presents the analysis of adolescents' GPA according to race and affirms that the findings of the full analysis apply to both racial groups with just a few exceptions. First, none of the social background or expressive cool characteristics are related to GPA. Second, models 3 and 6 show that it is at the neighborhood level where we find significant associations with GPA of greatest magnitude. Among the associations found for African Americans is a modest positive effect for the neighborhood presence of degree holders ($\hat{\gamma}_{01}$ =. 01) and a larger association for joblessness ($\hat{\gamma}_{03}$ = -.11). Only the neighborhood percentage of degree recipients ($\hat{\gamma}_{01}$ = .02) is positively related to white adolescents' GPA. Significant

between-neighborhood variation in GPA is shown in the random components. Between-neighborhood variation, τ, remains significant but dwindles most considerably for both racial groups as neighborhood characteristics are included, but more among white teens (49%) than among black teens (37%).

DISCUSSION

This study sought to understand if there are racial differences in how adolescent males' expressive cool and neighborhood collective socialization relate to their achievement ideology and grades, and whether the pattern of those relationships constitute an "attitude-achievement paradox." In pursuing these possibilities within a suburban context, I considered the claims of existing research that racial differences in expressive gender performances contribute to educational inequality. Given that few studies address these issues within a multilevel analysis, this study's findings are especially timely and offer implications for theory, research and schooling.

The first implication extends from the fact that while African American boys' expressive measures were slightly higher than their white peers (Table 1), these dispositions (i.e. masculinity, code-switching and dress) were related to stronger achievement ideology acceptance, not lower. For white males, not only were expressive cool associations with AIR among the largest in this analysis, being best dressed in particular mediated and rendered insignificant this study's largest association between white adolescents' high income status and lowered AIR. This emphasizes the extent to which social class is expressed through white teens' dress, and to a greater degree than it is for higher income African Americans. While Majors and Billson's (1993) and Pattillo's (1999) claim that middle class blacks take their style more seriously than whites may be supported in the descriptive analysis, the inferential analysis shows the consequences of style's importance are greatest for white teens. Some may reason that this finding among white teens is due to their location in a majority-minority context. The fact that these same associations

were not as prominent for African Americans casts doubt that a cultural spillover effect is the reason. Nonetheless, more research is needed to determine whether the salience of white adolescents' expressivity is exogenous, and would appear similar in contexts with a different demographic composition.

Another implication of this research begs the question of whether past research on the attitude-achievement paradox would have produced similar results had neighborhood features been considered. Although I find greater achievement ideology beliefs among African Americans does not translate into higher GPAs, this paradox disappears as the consideration of expressive cool factors account for the higher AIR levels of white teens.

But there are other notable "paradoxes" that this research presents for discussion. First, significant associations that I report between expressive cool and AIR do not exist in relation to GPA, for the full sample and both racial groups. While this pattern might apply only to the expressive characteristics I examine, it nonetheless implies that the dispositions adolescents' hold do not necessarily impinge on their subsequent behaviors. This outcome contrasts with the claims of Thernstrom and Thernstrom (2003) and Ferguson (2001) that expressive culture is an academic distraction, and linked to lower achievement for African Americans in particular. Assumptions that correspondences exist between dispositions and behavior paint adolescents' culture with broad strokes and overlook the apparent complexity of adolescents' behavioral responses to their gender dispositions. These findings echo the qualitative work of Dance (2002) who laments that these assumptions are overly deterministic and disregard the "contradictions and hybridity" of black males' culture in ways that deny their agency (p. 17).

Second, this work also reveals what might be called a "neighborhood paradox" in which black teens' achievement ideology seems robust to neighborhood socialization risks while their grades seem vulnerable. One interpretation of this phenomena is that achievement ideology beliefs are unable to shield African Americans from the neighborhood influences that undermine their grades to the extent they appear

to do so for whites. Put differently, believing in equal opportunity neither ensures equal educational outcomes, nor retires the material reality black adolescents must contend with in order to secure academic success. Yet another interpretation might view the non-existent connections between neighborhoods and AIR as evidence that their function as sites of African American males' cultural production is secondary to their existence as environments that African Americans must negotiate in order to achieve in school. Hence, neighborhood joblessness for example, which many have argued undermines black males' opportunity beliefs, did not do so in this study, but was nonetheless associated with lowered academic performance.

There are reasons to exercise caution when using research of this kind to make causal claims. One reason is that simultaniety effects are especially difficult to address in observational research. For example, while this research finds that dads' interest in their sons' activities is related to higher AIR levels in the full sample, it is unknown if dads' interest causes higher AIR or if adolescents' AIR causes greater interest from their dads. Additional research is needed to explore and disentangle transactions of this sort before causal conclusions can be reached. A second reason is that adolescents' school contexts are also important to consider, but whether they convey an independent effect or serve to convey neighborhood effects remains a question within research (Johnson 2012a). School effects were not presented here because the models in which I included school gender and racial bias factors provided no significant or mediating effects while other school factors were too highly correlated with neighborhood dimensions to include in this analysis.

A third reason is that adolescents' gender and racial dispositions may be in response to educational experiences. This is an important point that I believe existing studies on youth culture have woefully neglected. For instance, it is not clear whether children's opposition to achievement *leads to* poor performance, or develops *in response to* poor performance. We have forgotten the implications of Liebow's

(1969) classic study, which suggests that men hold mainstream values about work and family life, but develop narratives inconsistent with those values upon losing their jobs and partners. AIR may similarly be a "coping disposition" that emerges post-hoc among youth whose mainstream achievement ideologies were not rewarded with good grades.

A final reason for careful consideration of these study results is that neighborhood selection effects remain a concern in research of this type since many of the reasons that parents decide to live in certain neighborhoods are unknown and possibly related to the welfare of their children. This caution, and the others I mentioned, can be addressed in methodological procedures (e.g. counterfactual modeling) that are not suitable for a sample of this study's size. It is encouraging to note however that other examinations of transaction and selection bias related to education provide little evidence that methodological approaches similar to the ones taken in this study are prone to overstate neighborhood influences (Foster and McLanahan 1996; Duncan, Connell and Klebanov 1997; Harding 2003).

REFERENCES

Abreu, Jose, Rodney Goodyear, Alvaro Campos, and Michael Newcomb. 2000. "Ethnic Belonging and Traditional Masculinity Ideology among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 1: 75-86**.** doi:10.1037//1524-9220.1.2.75

Ainsworth-Darnell, James W. and Douglas B. Downey. 1998. "Assessing the Oppositional Culture Explanation for Racial/ethnic differences in School Performance." *American Sociological Review* 63: 536-553.

Ainsworth, James. 2010. "Does the Race of Neighborhood Role Models Matter? Collective Socialization Effects on Educational Achievement." *Urban Education 45:* 401-423 doi: 10.1177/0042085910372346

Akom, A. A. 2003. "Reexamining Resistance as Oppositional Behavior: The Nation of Islam and the Creation of a Black achievement ideology." *Sociology of Education 76*: 305–325.

Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Carter, Prudence. 2003. "'Black' Cultural Capital, Status Positioning, and Schooling Conflicts for Low-Income African American Youth." *Social Problems 50*: 136–155.

Cassidy, Elaine F., Howard Stevenson. 2005. "They Wear the Mask: Hypervulnerability and Hypermasculine Aggression among African American Males in an Urban Remedial Disciplinary School." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma* 11: 53-74. doi:10.1300/J146v11n04_03

Caughy, Margaret, Sandra Nettles, Patricia O'Campo, and Kimberly Lohrfink. 2006. "Neighborhood Matters: Racial Socialization of African American children." *Child Development* 77: 1220-1236. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00930.x

Cook, Philip J., and Jens Ludwig.1997. "Weighing the "Burden of 'Acting White'": Are there Race Differences in Attitudes toward Education?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 16*: 256-278.

Cook, Thomas, Melissa Herman, Meredith Phillips, and Richard Settersten. 2002. "Some ways in which Neighborhoods, Nuclear Families, Friendship Groups, and Schools Jointly affect Changes in Early Adolescent Development." *Child Development* 73: 1283-1309.

Crane, Jonathan. 1991. "The Epidemic Theory of Ghettos and Neighborhood Effects on Dropping out and Teenage Childbearing." *American Journal of Sociology 96*: 1226-1259.

Dance, L. Janelle. 2002. *Tough Fronts*. New York: Routledge-Falmer,

Duncan, Greg J. 1994. "Families and Neighbors as Sources of Disadvantage in the Schooling Decisions of Black and White Adolescents." *American Journal of Education 103*: 20-53.

Duncan, Greg, James Connell, and Pamela Klebanov. 1997. "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Estimating Causal Effects of Neighborhood and Family Conditions on Individual Development." Pp. 219-250 in *Neighborhood Poverty: Context and Consequences for Children,* edited by J. Brooks-Gunn, Greg Duncan, and J. Lawrence Aber. NY: Russell Sage Publications.

Duneire, Mitch. 1994. *Slim's Table. Race, Respectability and Masculinity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DuBois, W.E.B. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Random House.

Eisler, Richard and Jay Skidmore. 1987. "Masculine Gender Role Stress. Scale Development and Component Factors in the Appraisal of Stressful Situations." *Behavior Modification 11*: 123-136. doi: 10.1177/01454455870112001

Ferguson, Ann A. 2001. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferguson, Ronald F. 2001. "Test-score Trends along Racial Lines, 1971 to 1996: Popular Culture and Community Academic Standards." Pp. 348-390 in *America becoming: Racial trends and their Consequences*, edited by Neil Smelser, William J. Wilson, and Faith Mitchell. DC: National Academy Press.

Foster, E. Michael and Sarah McLanahan. 1996. "An Illustration of the use of Instrumental Variables: Do Neighborhood Conditions affect a Young Person's Chance of Finishing High School?" *Psychological Methods* 1:249-60. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.3.249

Fryer Roland and Paul Torelli. 2010. "An Empirical Analysis of 'Acting White'." *Journal of Public Economics* 94: 380–96. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2009.10.011

Ginther, Donna, Robert Haveman, and Barbara Wolfe. 2000. "Neighborhood Attributes as Determinants of Children's Outcomes." *Journal of Human Resources*, 35: 603-42.

Gurin, Patricia and Edgar G. Epps. 1975. *Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement*. New York: Wiley

Harding, David. 2003. "Counterfactual Models of Neighborhood Effects: The Effect of Neighborhood Poverty on Dropping out and Teenage Pregnancy." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:676–719. doi:0002-9602/2003/10903-0004

_____. 2010*. Living the Drama: Community, Conflict, and Culture among Inner-City Boys*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harris, Angel. 2006. "I (Don't) Hate School: Revisiting Oppositional Culture Theory of Blacks' Resistance to Schooling." *Social Forces* 85: 797-832.

Harris, Angel and Kris Marsh. 2010. "Is a Raceless Identity an Effective Strategy for Academic Success Among Blacks?" *Social Science Quarterly* 91: 1242-1263. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00730.x

Jencks, Christopher and Susan Mayer. 1990. "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood." Pp. 111-86 in *Inner-city Poverty in the United States*, edited by L. Lynn, Jr., and M. McGeary. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Johnson, Jr., Odis. 2008. "Who Benefits from Concentrated affluence?: A Synthesis of Neighborhood effects Considering Race, Gender and Education Outcomes." *Journal of Public Management and Social Policy* 14: 85-112.

_____. 2012a. "A Systematic Review of Neighborhood and Institutional Relationships Related to Education." *Education and Urban Society 44*: *477-511.* doi:10.1177/0013124510392779

_____. 2012b. Relocation Programs, Opportunities to Learn and the Complications of Conversion. *Review of Educational Research* 82: 131-178. doi:10.3102/0034654312449489

Johnson, Waldo E. 2001. "Paternal Involvement among Unwed Fathers." *Children and Youth Services Review 23:* 513-536. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0190-7409(01)00146-3

Kimmel, Michael. 1986. "Toward Men's Studies." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29: 517-529.

Kimmel, Michael and Matthew Mahler. 2003. "Adolescent Masculinity, Homophobia, and Violence - Random School Shootings, 1982-2001." *American Behavioral Scientist* 46: 1439-1458. doi: 10.1177/0002764203046010010

Kirkland, David and Austin Jackson. 2009. "'We Real Cool': Toward a Theory of Black Masculine Literacies." *Reading Research Quarterly* 44:278-97. dx.doi.org/10.15.98/RRQ.43.3.3

Klein, Jessica. 2006. "Sexuality and School Shootings: What Role does Teasing Play in School Massacres?" *Journal of Homosexuality* 51: 39-62.

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

Lazur, Richard F., and Richard Majors. 1995. "Men of Color: Ethnocultural Variations of Male Gender Role Strain." Pp. 337-358 in *A New Psychology of Men* edited by Ronald F. Levant and William S. Pollack. New York: Basic Books.

Liebow, Elliot. 1967. *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

MacLeod, Jay. 1995. *Ain't no Makin it: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-income Neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Majors, Richard and Janet Billson. 1993. *Cool Pose: The Dilemmas of Black Manhood in America*. Clearwater, FL: Touchstone Books LTD.

Mandara, Jelani, Carolyn Murray and Toya Joyner 2005. "The Impact of Fathers' Absence on African American Adolescents' Gender Role Development." *Sex Roles* 53: 207-220.

Madyun, Na'im and Moo Sung Lee. 2010. "The Influence of Female Headed Households on Black Achievement." *Urban Education* 45: 424-447. doi:10.1177/0042085910372348

Mickelson, Rosyln. 1990. "The Attitude-achievement Paradox among Black Adolescents." *Sociology of Education 63*: 44-61

Newman, Katherine. 1999. *No Shame in my Game*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

O'Connor, Carla. 1997. "Dispositions toward (Collective) Struggle and Educational Resilience in the Inner City: A Case Analysis of Six African-American High School Students." *American Educational Research Journal 34*: 593-629. doi:10.3102/00028312034004593

_____. 2000. "Dreamkeeping in the Inner-City: Diminishing the Divide between Aspirations and Expectations." Pp. 105–140 in *Coping with Poverty: The Social Contexts of Neighborhood, Work, And Family in the African-American Community,* edited by Sheldon Danziger and Ann Lin. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ogbu, John. U. 1987. "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation." *Anthropology of Education Quarterly 18*: 312-36.

_____. 2003. *Black American Students in an Affluent Suburb: A Study of Academic Disengagement.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Press.

Oliver, William. 2006. "'The Streets': An Alternative Black Male Socialization Institution." *Journal of Black Studies*, *36*: 918-937. doi:10.1177/0021934704276445

O'Neil, James M., Barbara Helms, Robert Gable, Lawrence Davis, and Lawrence Wrightsman. 1986. "Gender Role Conflict Scale: College Men's Fear of Femininity." *Sex Roles* 14: 335-350.

Pattillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Raudenbush, Stephen and Anthony Bryk. 2002. *Hierarchical Linear Models*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Reidy, Dennis E, Steven Shirk, Colleen Sloan, and Amos Zeichner. 2009. "Men Who Aggress Against Women: Effects of Feminine Gender Role Violation on Physical Aggression in Hypermasculine Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 10: 1-12. doi:10.1037/a0014794

Rosenbaum, James E. 1995. "Changing the Geography of Opportunity by Expanding Residential Choice: Lessons from the Gautreaux Program." *Housing Policy Debate 6*: 231-269. doi:10.1080/10511482.1995.9521186

Sampson Robert J. 1997. "Collective Regulation of Adolescent Misbehavior: Validation Results from Chicago Neighborhoods." *Journal of Adolescent Research 12*: 227–44. doi: 10.1177/0743554897122005

Sampson, Robert J, Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Felton Earls. 1999. "Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children." *American Sociological Review* 64: 633-660.

Seaton, Gregory. 2007. "Toward a Theoretical Understanding of Hypermasculine Coping among Urban Black Adolescent Males*." Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 15: 367-390. doi:10.1300/J137v15n02_21

Smalls, Ciara, Rhonda White, Tabbye Chavous and Robert Sellers. 2007. "Racial Ideological Beliefs and Racial Discrimination Experiences as Predictors of Academic Engagement among African American Adolescents." *Journal of Black Psychology 33:* 299-330. *doi:10.1177/0095798407302541*

Spencer, Margaret B. 2001. "Resiliency and Fragility Factors Associated with the Contextual Experiences of Low-resource Urban African American Male Youth and Families." Pp. 51-77 in *Does it take a Village?: Community Effects on Children, Adolescents, and Families* edited by Alan Booth and Ann Crouter. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Thernstrom, Abigail and Stephan Thernstrom. 2003. *No Excuses: Closing the Racial Gap in Learning*. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Tyson, Karolyn, William Darity Jr. and Domini R. 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.

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University.

Wilson, William J. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Vintage.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Full (N=406), Black (N=261) and White (N=145) Samples

Variables	Definitions	Eigen-value	Alpha	Orig. Mean	Pooled Mean	Black Mean	White Mean	Min	Max	Orig. Stdv
AIR (Achievement ideology rejection) factor (disagree - agree)*		3.000	.78	1.66	1.66	1.76	1.89	0.00	5.00	1.00
Components	Schooling not so important for kids like me			2.19	2.19	2.17	2.25	1.00	5.00	.98
	I don't really care about school			2.21	2.21	2.26	2.48	1.00	5.00	1.08
	Studying in school rarely pays off with job			2.54	2.54	2.63	2.60	1.00	5.00	1.10
	Homework is a waste of time			2.39	2.39	2.40	2.68	1.00	5.00	1.06
	School is a waste of time			2.06	2.06	2.06	2.34	1.00	5.00	1.05
	We treated unfairly at work no matter how educated			2.76	2.76	3.04	2.40	1.00	5.00	1.03
GPA	Final grade point average*			3.59	3.59	3.53	3.67	2.70	4.69	.31
Income	Total family income (1 – 21)			13.49	13.96	12.71	14.83	2.00	21.00	5.39
Low SES	Family income quintile 1, 0 – 34,999K			.19	.21	.25	.11	.00	1.00	.39
Middle low SES	Family income quintile 2, 35 – 54,999K			.19	.22	.23	.17	.00	1.00	.39
Middle SES	Family income quintile 3, 55 – 69,999K			.19	.21	.20	.30	.00	1.00	.39
Middle high SES	Family income quintile 4, 70 – 89,999K			.16	.19	.18	.18	.00	1.00	.37
High SES	Family income quintile 5, 90K and over			.23	.19	.15	.24	.00	1.00	.42
Friends' AIR	Friends say you won't get good job (1=none, 5=all)			1.65	1.72	1.67	1.62	1.00	5.00	.97
Parent education	Highest grade of primary care giver in grade years			14.16	14.18	13.90	14.69	9.00	21.00	2.45
Dad's interest	Dad takes interest in my activities (1=never, 5=always)			2.72	2.74	2.84	2.57	1.00	5.00	1.34
Race	What do most people call your race (0=white, 1=black)			.64	.64	1.00	.00	.00	1.00	.48
Age	Age at 11th grade start in years			17.46	17.46	17.48	17.43	16.26	19.68	.49
Single parent	Single parent head of household (0 =no – 1=yes)			.34	.35	.41	.20	.00	1.00	.47
Hype factor (not true – very true)		2.082	.70	.82	.92	.96	.98	.00	5.28	1.00
Components	Parent says youth talks too much			.22	.28	.31	.24	.00	2.00	.49
	Parent says youth brags or boasts			.39	.46	.42	.53	.00	2.00	.58
	Parent says youth swears/uses obscene language			.21	.28	.24	.35	.00	2.00	.48
	Parent says youth shows off/clown			.42	.50	.52	.45	.00	2.00	.60
Masculine identity factor (not at all - very)		2.300	.72	3.60	3.08	3.59	2.08	.00	4.83	1.00
Components	I feel as though I am masculine			5.85	5.75	5.84	5.57	1.00	7.00	1.40

	I look as though I am masculine			5.84	5.74	5.77	5.68	1.00	7.00	1.40
	How important is it that you appear masculine			4.69	4.66	4.92	4.20	1.00	7.00	1.95
	How important is it that you avoid appearing feminine			4.64	4.64	5.01	3.97	1.00	7.00	2.29
Racial inopportunity factor (strongly disagree – strongly agree)		2.430	.81	1.68	1.80	2.08	1.27	.00	4.37	1.00
Components	Little you can do to avoid job discrimination			2.22	2.27	2.38	1.97	1.00	4.00	.84
	Because of race you must do better than other kids			1.98	2.03	2.25	1.46	1.00	4.00	1.08
	Because of race you will have to work harder			2.15	2.19	2.50	1.69	1.00	4.00	.97
	Little you can do to avoid discrimination at school			2.25	2.30	2.35	2.21	1.00	4.00	.86
Acting Black	Friends think it's cool if I act black (1=uncool, 5=cool)			3.19	3.17	3.49	2.60	1.00	5.00	1.10
Best dressed	Friends think it's cool if I'm voted best dressed			3.84	3.80	3.92	3.62	1.00	5.00	1.00
Personality change	Can change personality (1=strongly agree, 5=disagree)			2.35	2.38	2.26	2.56	1.00	5.00	.84
Looking good	How important is being good looking (1=less, 7=more)			4.15	4.18	4.36	3.80	1.00	7.00	1.65
Collective socialization factor (disagree - agree)		1.886	.70	3.39	3.31	3.23	3.44	.00	5.46	1.00
Components	Lots of adults our kids can look up to			3.60	3.57	3.45	3.78	1.00	5.00	.92
	Can count on adults to tell me of child opportunities			3.21	3.21	3.13	3.34	1.00	5.00	.99
	Neighbors share similar views about raising kids			3.56	3.55	3.57	3.51	1.00	5.00	.86
Joblessness	Unemployment in area (1=no problem, 3=big problem)			1.81	1.81	1.90	1.64	1.00	3.00	.80
% Degreed	Percentage of college graduates			25.23	25.41	22.04	31.16	.00	65.62	12.18
% Female heads	Percentage of female headed families			21.76	22.44	26.59	15.14	5.53	57.50	13.01
Inner ring	Residency in inner suburban ring (0=no, 1=yes)			.20	.23	.28	.15	.00	1.00	.40

*NOTE: Dependent variables do not have imputed values so the original and pooled means are identical

TABLE 2. Achievement Ideology Rejection, Full Sample (N = 406)

Fixed Effects	MODEL 1 Estimate	SE	MODEL 2 Estimate	SE	MODEL 3 Estimate	SE	MODEL 4 Estimate	SE
Intercept	1.810***	0.058	1.805***	0.053	1.806***	0.049	1.798***	0.049
Age in Years			0.121	0.107	0.017	0.105	0.031	0.107
Race			-0.240*	0.119	-0.001	0.139	0.066	0.157
Single Parent			0.033	0.124	0.002	0.111	-0.001	0.112
Parent Education			-0.063**	0.023	-0.060**	0.021	-0.065**	0.021
Dad's Interest			0.102*	0.044	0.079*	0.037	0.079*	0.038
Low SES			0.044	0.159	0.074	0.136	0.093	0.138
Mid-low SES			0.191	0.131	0.186	0.127	0.186	0.126
Mid-high SES			0.139	0.164	0.127	0.159	0.121	0.165
High SES			-0.098	0.169	-0.058	0.166	-0.085	0.168
Friends' AIR			0.208***	0.064	0.165**	0.059	0.165**	0.060
Masculine Appearance					-0.127*	0.052	-0.131*	0.051
Hype					0.069	0.049	0.064	0.050
Racial Inopportunity					0.130*	0.056	0.129*	0.054
Being Good Looking					-0.003	0.033	0.001	0.033
Cool if Acted Black					-0.037	0.049	-0.044	0.048
Cool if Best Dressed					-0.251***	0.053	-0.248***	0.054
Personality Change					0.143+	0.073	0.136+	0.072
% Degreed							0.007	0.005
% Female Heads							-0.002	0.005
Joblessness							0.031	0.071
Inner Suburban Ring							0.006	0.123
Collective Socialization							-0.031	0.050
Variance/SD	0.095**	0.307	0.062+	0.249	0.050+	0.224	0.057+	0.240
Level 1, r/SD	0.903	0.950	0.829	0.910	0.718	0.847	0.715	0.846

*** = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$, + = $p < .10$

TABLE 3. Grade Point Average, Full Sample (N = 406)

Fixed Effects	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Intercept	3.561***	0.029	3.562***	0.029	3.563***	0.028	3.562***	0.023
Age in Years			-0.008	0.020	-0.002	0.020	0.001	0.020
Race			-0.022	0.030	-0.032	0.043	0.004	0.036
Single Parent			0.005	0.020	0.003	0.020	0.001	0.020
Parent Education			0.003	0.006	0.002	0.006	0.001	0.006
Dad's Interest			-0.001	0.006	-0.001	0.006	-0.004	0.009
Low SES			-0.020	0.031	-0.014	0.029	-0.002	0.006
Mid-low SES			-0.028	0.031	-0.021	0.030	-0.019	0.030
Mid-high SES			-0.004	0.045	-0.001	0.041	-0.002	0.041
High SES			-0.001	0.036	0.004	0.038	-0.005	0.038
Friends' AIR			0.003	0.014	0.004	0.014	0.009	0.013
Masculine Appearance					0.008	0.013	0.006	0.013
Hype					-0.013	0.014	-0.012	0.013
Racial Inopportunity					0.003	0.011	0.003	0.010
Being Good Looking					-0.006	0.008	-0.005	0.008
Cool if Acted Black					-0.006	0.014	-0.006	0.014
Cool if Best Dressed					0.001	0.008	0.001	0.008
Personality Change					0.004	0.013	0.000	0.012
% Degreed							0.012***	0.003
% Female Heads							-0.005	0.003
Joblessness							-0.060+	0.033
Inner Suburban Ring							0.078	0.065
Collective Socialization							0.012	0.028
Variance/SD	0.097***	0.311	0.093***	0.305	0.091***	0.302	0.058***	0.240
Level 1 r/SD	0.018	0.136	0.018	0.135	0.018	0.135	0.018	0.135

*** = p < .001, ** = p < .01, * = p < .05, + = p < .10

TABLE 4. Achievement Ideology Rejection Disaggregated According to Race

	Black Sample (N = 261)						White Sample (N = 145)					
	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5		MODEL 6	
Fixed Effects	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Intercept	1.756***	0.059	1.758***	0.053	1.747***	0.054	1.873***	0.100	1.882***	0.090	1.898***	0.085
Age in Years	0.067	0.115	-0.019	0.123	-0.003	0.123	0.199	0.212	0.103	0.194	0.136	0.185
Single Parent	-0.033	0.166	-0.045	0.146	-0.042	0.148	0.208	0.194	0.148	0.154	0.157	0.164
Parent Education	-0.106***	0.027	-0.091***	0.025	-0.096***	0.026	-0.001	0.038	0.011	0.038	0.014	0.036
Dad's Interest	0.089+	0.049	0.078+	0.042	0.079+	0.042	0.133	0.094	0.056	0.082	0.047	0.082
Low SES	0.141	0.204	0.124	0.170	0.139	0.173	-0.145	0.290	-0.017	0.272	0.057	0.252
Mid-low SES	0.375*	0.165	0.317*	0.154	0.318*	0.152	-0.176	0.209	-0.035	0.220	-0.107	0.224
Mid-high SES	0.177	0.199	0.189	0.196	0.174	0.211	0.021	0.237	-0.109	0.258	-0.156	0.265
High SES	0.196	0.218	0.137	0.213	0.108	0.228	-0.500*	0.216	-0.309+	0.205	-0.297	0.199
Friends' AIR	0.201**	0.073	0.165**	0.065	0.163**	0.067	0.254*	0.123	0.181	0.105	0.135	0.101
Masculine Appearance			-0.122*	0.057	-0.125*	0.055			-0.076	0.097	-0.083	0.096
Hype			0.069	0.061	0.064	0.060			0.070	0.083	0.051	0.082
Racial Inopportunity			0.035	0.062	0.031	0.057			0.301**	0.093	0.307***	0.087
Being Good Looking			-0.003	0.038	0.002	0.037			0.018	0.070	0.025	0.067
Cool if Acted Black			-0.004	0.063	-0.007	0.063			-0.080	0.079	0.093	0.080
Cool if Best Dressed			-0.243***	0.063	-0.241***	0.064			-0.306***	0.180	-0.286***	0.079
Personality Change			0.209**	0.079	0.204*	0.080			-0.030	0.099	-0.065	0.095
% Degreed					0.006	0.006					0.008	0.010
% Female Heads					-0.001	0.005					-0.008	0.015
Joblessness					0.000	0.078					0.293*	0.123
Inner Suburban Ring					-0.064	0.127					0.174	0.218
Collective Socialization					-0.026	0.061					-0.110	0.092
Variance/SD	0.022	0.148	0.006	0.080	0.011	0.107	0.213**	0.461	0.155*	0.394	0.122+	0.349
Level 1, r/SD	0.806	0.898	0.702	0.838	0.705	0.840	0.757	0.870	0.675	0.821	0.671	0.819

*** = p < .001, ** = p < .01, * = p < .05, + = p < .10

TABLE 5. Grade Point Average Disaggregated According to Race

	Black Sample (N = 261)						White Sample (N = 145)					
	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5		MODEL 6	
Fixed Effects	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Intercept	3.522***	0.036	3.523***	0.036	3.523***	0.030	3.721***	0.041	3.654***	0.043	3.643***	0.033
Age in Years	-0.009	0.021	-0.004	0.025	-0.003	0.024	-0.012	0.046	0.003	0.051	0.014	0.053
Single Parent	-0.006	0.018	-0.007	0.017	-0.009	0.018	0.011	0.050	0.003	0.046	0.001	0.045
Parent Education	0.003	0.007	0.002	0.007	0.005	0.006	0.010	0.011	0.009	0.012	0.001	0.011
Dad's Interest	-0.001	0.009	-0.000	0.009	0.001	0.007	-0.010	0.021	-0.010	0.023	-0.022	0.017
Low SES	-0.011	0.023	-0.010	0.023	-0.006	0.021	-0.053	0.116	-0.012	0.080	0.040	0.085
Mid-low SES	-0.018	0.026	-0.017	0.027	-0.021	0.028	-0.042	0.080	-0.038	0.089	-0.028	0.088
Mid-high SES	0.001	0.041	0.002	0.040	-0.001	0.040	-0.035	0.099	-0.054	0.058	-0.032	0.080
High SES	0.003	0.051	0.006	0.048	-0.006	0.050	-0.009	0.063	0.081	0.081	-0.015	0.061
Friends' AIR	0.001	0.017	0.002	0.018	0.004	0.018	0.018	0.036	0.021	0.039	0.026	0.037
Masculine Appearance			0.006	0.012	0.001	0.009			0.021	0.042	0.012	0.036
Hype			-0.005	0.009	-0.008	0.008			-0.027	0.029	-0.009	0.023
Racial Inopportunity			0.007	0.012	0.007	0.012			0.001	0.017	0.004	0.016
Being Good Looking			-0.004	0.012	-0.004	0.011			-0.014	0.023	-0.017	0.022
Cool if Acted Black			-0.006	0.011	-0.005	0.011			0.003	0.036	0.002	0.031
Cool if Best Dressed			-0.000	0.009	0.001	0.009			0.012	0.019	0.010	0.017
Personality Change			0.000	0.012	-0.002	0.011			0.019	0.038	0.020	0.031
% Degreed					0.010**	0.003					0.016***	0.004
% Female Heads					-0.005+	0.003					-0.005	0.006
Joblessness					-0.113**	0.037					0.002	0.049
Inner Suburban Ring					0.112	0.069					0.063	0.112
Collective Socialization					0.004	0.030					0.023	0.039
Variance/SD	0.085***	0.292	0.084***	0.290	0.053***	0.230	0.074***	0.271	0.075***	0.273	0.038***	0.194
Level 1, r/SD	0.013	0.115	0.014	0.116	0.013	0.116	0.034	0.185	0.033	0.182	0.034	0.185

*** = p < .001, ** = p < .01, * = p < .05, + = p < .10