

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351854169>

Beyond the Binary: Intraracial Diversity in Family Organization and Black Adolescents' Educational Performance

Preprint · May 2021

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.36370.58563

CITATIONS

3

READS

2,803

1 author:



Christina Cross

Harvard University

17 PUBLICATIONS 554 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Beyond the Binary: Intraracial Diversity in Family Organization and Black Adolescents' Educational Performance

Christina J. Cross, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology
Center for Population and Development Studies
Harvard University

ABSTRACT

Using a nationally representative sample of African American adolescents from the National Survey of American Life Adolescent supplement (NSAL-A), this study examines intraracial diversity in two key dimensions of family organization—family structure and family integration—and assesses their relationship with youths' educational performance, namely, grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions. Results show that there is substantial within-group heterogeneity in family organization among African Americans, and that patterns of organization vary systematically by level of household resources, specifically household income. Results also indicate that the relationship between family structure and family integration and black adolescents' educational performance differs by resource level. These factors are generally unrelated to the grades, grade repetition and number of suspension of adolescents from low-income households, but they are associated with these outcomes for adolescents from the most economically advantaged households. Irrespective of household income, findings demonstrate that the substantive impact of family organization on black youths' educational outcomes is small, which suggests that family organization has a more limited relationship with black Americans' life chances than previously theorized.

Material is based on work supported by the JPB Foundation, the Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship, and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE 1256260. The author thanks Karyn Lacy, Natasha Pilkauskas, Paula Fomby, Barbara Anderson, Fabian Pfeffer, and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Introduction

For over a century, the organization of black family life has been of central importance to scholarship related to social inequality, race/ethnicity, and individual life chances. In fact, research on black families emerged in the late 19th century out of an urgent concern among social scientists to account for the higher levels of poverty and unemployment, worse educational performance, and lower life chances of blacks compared to whites (e.g., Du Bois, 1899, 1909; Frazier, 1932, 1939; Moynihan, 1965; Myrdal, 1944). This early emphasis on explaining African Americans' uniquely disadvantaged structural position as a function of family organization has indelibly shaped the trajectory of research on black families. It has given rise to a contemporary cross-race comparative approach that is primarily concerned with evaluating the extent to which black families constitute disorganized or adaptive, superorganized forms relative to other racial groups, namely whites (see Sarkisian and Gerstel, 2004 for an in-depth review of the disorganization versus superorganization perspectives).

While this approach provides insight into the “average” experience of a member of a racial/ethnic group to the “average” experience of a member of another racial/ethnic group (Monk, 2015; Schwartz and Meyer, 2010), it does not capture the substantial within-group heterogeneity in family organization that exists among group members. Black families, however, are not monolithic, and despite the numerous challenges that black Americans face, many black people experience favorable outcomes across various domains of social life (Lacy, 2007). If we focus solely on the extent to which black families are similar to or different from other groups, we fail to understand the important distinctions among them that are positively or negatively associated with individual life chances, or are perhaps, altogether inconsequential. For this reason, some scholars have called for research that transcends the binary approach to classifying

black families as disorganized or superorganized relative to other groups (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2004). Among studies focused on the organization of black family life, however, responses to such a call are rare, especially among quantitative studies. Furthermore, and importantly, little research has explicitly tested the extent to which the two key dimensions of family organization—family structure and family integration—are related to the life chances of black Americans. Studies that do examine the influence of family organization overwhelmingly compare samples of low-income black, often single-mother families, to white families, as if these samples were representative of the black population overall (Barnett, 2008; Billingsley, 1992; Garcia Coll et al. 1996; McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Wilson, 2000). It is well-documented, however, that the daily experiences and life chances of black Americans differ markedly by socioeconomic position (e.g., Anderson, 1990; Dow, 2019; Haynes, 2001; Lacy, 2007; Patillo, 1999; Wilson, 1987), and while underexplored, it is likely that patterns of black family organization and their consequences for individual wellbeing will vary by level of household resources.

To fill this gap, this study draws on data from the National Survey of American Life Adolescent Supplement (NSAL-A) to examine intraracial diversity in black family organization and its association with three important and developmentally appropriate indicators of adolescents' educational performance: reported grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions. These three factors are known predictors of future life outcomes for black youths such as educational attainment, employment, and even incarceration (Leventhal, Graber, and Brooks-Gunn, 2001; Owens & McLanahan, 2019; Rocque and Paternoster, 2011; Shollenberger, 2015; Wald & Losen, 2003; Yang, Harmeyer, Chen, and Lofaso, 2018). Given the central role that socioeconomic position plays in shaping the social experiences and outcomes of black

Americans, throughout this study I consider the extent to which family organization and educational outcomes for black youths differ by household income. Household income is an established measure of socioeconomic position, and the single most important mechanism through which family structure, a central component of family organization, influences adolescent wellbeing (Brande et al. 2019; Heflin and Patillo, 2006; Lacy, 2007; McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994). Findings from this research expand our theoretical understanding of family organization and its impact on individual life chances by 1) moving beyond cross-group comparisons to explore heterogeneity in family patterns and processes among black Americans; 2) identifying mechanisms that explain variation in life chances for this group; and 3) comparing the relative impact of the two key dimensions of family organization. Identifying factors that are protective for black youth or elevate their risk of experiencing negative outcomes can inform the development of targeted family interventions that build on strengths and support weaknesses.

Background and Theoretical Perspectives

The Organization of Black Family Life: A Brief Overview

While some ambiguity exists in the use of the term “family organization”, scholarship in this area generally refers to two elements of family life: (1) family form, specifically, family structure, and (2) family function, namely family integration (Allen, 1979; Rose, Joe, Shields, and Caldwell, 2014; Sarkisian and Gerstel, 2004; Yabiku, Thornton, and Axinn, 1991). Family structure is typically conceptualized based on the presence or absence of a child’s biological parents in a household and parents’ union status (Brown, 2010; Manning, Brown, & Stykes, 2014). Commonly used indicators of family structure are rates of marriage, divorce, cohabitation, and single parenthood. Family integration is a multidimensional concept that represents three functions of the family: cohesion, expressive functions (e.g., love), and instrumental functions

(e.g., financial support) (Dager & Mccullough, 1982). Indicators of family integration usually involve some measure of kin support (e.g., childrearing assistance); a few studies also include factors such as family closeness and contact. Researchers generally regard “intact” nuclear families (i.e., households including both biological parents and only their shared children) and high family integration as signifiers of “better” family organization (Sarkisian and Gerstel, 2004).

As early as the late 19th century, social theorists pointed to racial differences in family organization to explain persistent racial inequality in America. Pioneering researchers of the study of black families such as W.E.B. Du Bois (1899; 1909), E. Franklin Frazier (1932; 1939), and Gunnar Myrdal (1944) argued that a long history of slavery and racial discrimination led to the separation of African American families and high rates of single parenthood and widowhood. In fact, in reflecting on the consequences of slavery for the black community, Du Bois wrote: “The essential features of Negro slavery, was [sic] 1) No legal marriage; 2) No legal family life; 3) No legal control over children... This is what slavery meant, and no amount of kindness in individual owners could save the system from its deadly work of disintegrating the ancient Negro home” (Du Bois, 1909:21,37). In his historical analysis of black family life, Frazier (1939) also pointed to the role of slavery in shaping black family organization. While rejecting the notion that higher rates of “out-of-wedlock” births and divorce were a result of biological determinism, Frazier attributed the rise of “unstable matriarchal families” to a loss of African cultural identity and a cultural pathology produced by slavery (Roschelle, 1997; Allen 1978). Although Frazier and other early scholars’ perspectives on African cultural erasure, family dysfunction, and black matriarchy have been called into question (see Hunter, 2006 for a detailed discussion), it bears

noting that their studies emphasized the importance of investigating how variation in social conditions among African Americans led to diversity in black family organization.

This scholarly tradition became somewhat overlooked following the publication of one of the most well-known and controversial studies of black family life, the Moynihan Report (1965). This report cited the lower levels of educational attainment and higher rates of unemployment and “welfare dependency” among African Americans as evidence of the deterioration of the black community, and it concluded that the disorganization of black family life lay at the center of this degenerative process (Allen, 1978). Successive scholars seemed obligated to respond to this report, and it gave rise to a cross-race comparative approach that is primarily concerned with evaluating the extent to which black family organization, especially amongst the poor and working classes, parallels that of white middle-class families (Billingsley, 1992). Some researchers challenged the report’s focus on negative aspects of black family life, and they emphasized the structural and/or cultural resiliency of black families, particularly strong extended kin ties among black Americans (Allen 1979; Billingsley, 1968; Gutman, 1976; Hays and Mindel, 1973; McAdoo 1980; Stack, 1974; Sudarkasa, 1996). These scholars maintain that due to the structural racism that black families face, and/or enduring African cultural traditions that promote family connectedness, black families rely more on one another for support and have higher levels of integration than white families. Therefore, in contrast to the Moynihan Report’s premise of black family disorganization, they maintain that black families can be thought of as superorganized.

Recently, scholars have acknowledged that either characterization of black family life assumes a uniformity in family organization among black Americans (e.g., Sarkisian and Gerstel, 2004). Given recent findings documenting considerable within group variation in exchanges of

family support, a key aspect of family organization, (Cross, Taylor and Chatters, 2018; Lincoln, Taylor, and Chatters; 2013; Taylor, Chatters, Woodward, and Brown, 2013), there is reason to believe that this assumption is inaccurate. However, even if this assumption were true, a focus on the relative organization of black families as compared to white families does not aid us in identifying what aspects of family organization have significant implications for individual wellbeing. Thus, rather than asking whether black families have a distinct pattern of organization that contributes to their relative deprivation, a more productive question would be “What aspects of family organization enhance the wellbeing of black Americans, and what aspects are inconsequential or even detrimental to their life chances?”. This question is the focus of the current study, which I describe in further detail below.

Family Organization and Educational Performance

Family structure. A holistic theory of black family organization and its relationship with individual outcomes has yet to be developed. Nevertheless, numerous studies have documented an association between family structure and youths’ educational performance. In general, children who are raised by both biological parents fare better academically than those raised in any other family structure (i.e., single parent, stepparent, cohabiting, and divorced families) (Amato, 2001; Brown, 2010; Ginther and Pollak, 2004; McLanahan and Percheski, 2008; McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994). Researchers posit that family structure impacts children’s education through three distinct (but not mutually exclusive) mechanisms: economic resources, parenting practices, and family stability (Brown, 2010; Fomby and Cherlin, 2007; McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994; Wu, 1996). Youth raised by two biological married parents typically benefit from access to greater economic resources, a clearer and stronger parental authority structure, and a more stable home environment than those raised outside this arrangement. Combined,

these factors provide children with the material resources, monitoring and supervision, and emotional security necessary to flourish academically.

Family integration. While the relationship between family structure and youths' educational performance is well-documented, few studies investigate the association between family integration and educational outcomes, and to the best of my knowledge, this study is the first to examine these two components of family organization side-by-side. However, when evaluating the impact of family organization on individual life chances, it is important to consider not only how families are configured, but also how they function. Theory on social integration provides compelling reasons to expect family integration to be related to adolescents' educational performance. Social integration theory, developed by Emile Durkheim (1897 [1951]), asserts that individuals are social beings whose outcomes are unequivocally shaped by the nature of their social relationships. In the context of his study, Durkheim finds that weaker attachments (i.e., less integration) to social institutions such as family, religious, and political groups resulted in higher rates of suicide within a society. Conversely, individuals who were more integrated into social institutions were less likely to commit suicide. He reasoned that social integration influenced suicide rates in two ways. First, social integration, developed through positive and routine exchanges and interactions among group members, fosters the creation of shared values and goals that provide a guide for appropriate human behavior. Second, it promotes a sense of belonging and a supportive environment within which individuals can carry out group-defined goals, which leads to more positive psychosocial outcomes. Given that the family is regarded as one of the primary institutions for youths' socialization, it is reasonable to expect that a higher degree of integration into family life would reinforce socially-valued norms and behaviors related to academic achievement and provide a supportive environment within which academic

expectations can be actualized. Indeed, recent work indicates that adolescents who report higher levels of family involvement experience more positive outcomes. They report higher levels of self-esteem, coping, and locus of control, and are less likely to engage in delinquent behaviors (Knoester & Hayne, 2005; Rose, Joe, Shields, & Caldwell, 2014; Yabiku et al., 1999).

Furthermore, in the family solidarity-conflict framework developed by Bengtson and colleagues (1991, 1995, 2002), negative aspects of family integration are considered. This framework acknowledges that family integration exists on a continuum. Conflict, they maintain, is an inevitable feature of family relationships that impacts how family members perceive one another and their propensity to help each other. Increased conflict can decrease family members' sense of group belonging and willingness to be involved with and support one another, which can be adversely related to educational performance. Apart from research focused on parental relationship quality, few studies consider how conflict among family members potentially impacts adolescent wellbeing. Taking advantage of unique questions related to family conflict available in the NSAL-A, I consider how negative interactions within the broader family network relate to adolescents' educational performance, which represents an improvement upon prior work in this area.

Socioeconomic diversity in black family organization. Family structure, family processes, and youth outcomes are undeniably shaped by the social contexts within which they operate (Barnett, 2008; Garcia Coll et al., 1996; Mcloyd et al., 2000). Mounting evidence indicates that patterns of family formation and integration and their consequences for adolescent wellbeing are not uniform across groups (Amato, 2001; Brand, Moore, Song, and Xie, 2019; Cross, 2020; McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994). For example, recent studies have shown that while children of color are more likely to experience parental separation, the negative effects of family disruption

are less pronounced for these youths (e.g., Brand, et al., 2019; Cross, 2020). Indeed, Cross (2020) finds that while black youths are more likely to live in single-parent families than white youths, the negative effect of parental absence from the home on on-time high school completion is weaker for this group. Additionally, Brand et al. 2019's causal mediation analysis indicates that while parental divorce reduces the likelihood of college attendance and completion among white youths, it has no significant effect on these outcomes for children of color. These racial differences in the effects of family structure are largely attributed to group differences in access to socioeconomic resources. It is estimated that disparities in household resources between two-parent families and other family types explain up to two-thirds of the gap in educational attainment (Brand et al. 2019). Due to a legacy of structural racism in the U.S., black families are more likely to live in socioeconomically stressful environments than whites, regardless of family structure type (McLoyd et al. 2000; National Center for Education Statistics, 2020). Therefore, gaps in resources between two-parent families and other family structures may be smaller for this group, resulting in a weaker, negative effect of family disruption on their educational outcomes. In this way, exposure to socioeconomic deprivation may make the independent effect of family disruption less impactful, above and beyond existing social disadvantages.

Although within-group heterogeneity in family structure effects was not the focus of these two prior investigations, study findings highlight the importance of household resources in shaping the relationship between family organization and youth outcomes. It is common knowledge that black Americans do not collectively occupy the same socioeconomic position, and a straightforward extension of findings from previous work would suggest that the impact of family structure and family integration on black youths' educational performance will also differ by level of household resources. Therefore, I conduct all analyses separately for low-, middle-,

and high-income groups and test for group differences in any observed associations between family organization and adolescent outcomes.

The Current Study

This study explores intraracial diversity in family organization—that is family structure and family integration—among black Americans and examines its association with black adolescents’ educational performance. Specifically, I use nationally representative data from the National Survey of American Life Adolescent supplement (NSAL-A) to document the prevalence of various family structures and levels of family support, closeness, contact, and negative interactions reported by African American adolescents. I then investigate how these factors are associated with youths’ reported grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions. I also evaluate the extent to which patterns of family organization and its consequences differ by household income. Lastly, I compare the relative influence of family structure versus indicators of family integration on youths’ educational outcomes.

With its focus on cross-race comparisons, much of the research on black family organization has obscured within-group heterogeneity among African Americans. Given that patterns of family structure and integration are shaped by their social contexts (Barrett, 2008), and that there is significant variation in socioeconomic position within the U.S. black population (Dow, 2019; Haynes, 2001; Lacy, 2007; Patillo, 1999), I expect to find considerable diversity in family structure and integration by level of household resources (Hypothesis 1). Further, extant theories and findings indicate that children raised by both biological parents perform better in school than those raised outside this context. Recent work on racial differences in family structure effects has also suggested that the consequences of family organization differ by level of household resources, with more economically advantaged racial groups being the most

affected. Therefore, I hypothesize that black youth who are raised by both biological parents will report higher grades, fewer suspensions, and will be less likely to repeat a grade than youth raised in other family structures, and that any observed associations will be stronger for youth from higher-income households (Hypothesis 2). Moreover, social integration theory suggests that greater involvement with and support from social institutions such as the family is protective against a number of risk factors (Durkheim, 1897[1951]; Rose et al., 2014; Yabiku et al., 1991). Consonant with this logic, I anticipate that black youth who report higher levels of family integration will perform better academically, and that the impact of family integration will also be greater for more advantaged youths (Hypothesis 3). Finally, previous research has not compared the relative influence of the two key components of family organization. I hypothesize that family integration will be as strongly related to youths' educational performance as family structure (Hypothesis 4).

Data and Methods

Data

The data for my analyses are drawn from the National Survey of American Life Adolescent sample (NSAL-A). The NSAL-A is a supplemental sample of 1,170 adolescents who were attached to adult households from the National Survey of American Life (NSAL) parent study. The NSAL parent study is a nationally representative household survey of approximately 6,000 African American, non-Hispanic White, and Black Caribbean adults. The data were collected (February 2001 to June 2003) by the Program for Research on Black Americans at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, as part of the National Institute of Mental Health Collaborative Psychiatric Epidemiology Surveys initiative (Colpe, Merikangas, Cuthbert, & Bourdon, 2004). The NSAL provides extensive data on mental disorders, stressors, and risk

resilient factors for black Americans (see Jackson et al., 2004, for more detailed information about the NSAL).

The NSAL-A differs from other national studies in two important ways that make it well-suited for this investigation. Rather than oversampling for black Americans in major metropolitan areas, the NSAL-A uses a multi-stage stratified and clustered sample design that follows the population distribution of U.S. blacks, which differs from the broader U.S. population distribution (Jackson et al., 2004). This allows for greater socioeconomic diversity among sample members and more precision in the estimation of within-group differences in family organization, which enables me to make accurate inferences about the national population of African American adolescents. The NSAL-A also includes a rich set of indicators of family integration (i.e., family support, contact, closeness, and negative interactions) that are typically unavailable in social surveys. This allows me to explicitly focus on both elements of black family organization (family structure and family integration) and compare their relative influence on black youths' outcomes.

To generate the NSAL-A sample, every African American and Black Caribbean household that included an adult participant was screened for an eligible adolescent living in the household, and adolescents were chosen using a random selection procedure. In instances where more than one adolescent in the household was eligible for participation, up to two adolescents were selected for the study, and when possible, the second adolescent was of a different gender (Seaton et al. 2008). The data include detailed information about youths' household income, educational background, family structure, and family interactions. My analytic sample includes African American adolescents who provided complete information on all study variables; this includes 98% of the original adolescent sample (n=791). The NSAL-A weight was designed to

adjust for non-independence in probabilities of selection within households and non-response rates across households and adolescents.

Measures

Outcome variables. Three outcome variables are used as indicators of youths' educational performance: self-reported grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions. For self-reported grades, adolescents were asked whether they earned mostly A's, B's, C's, D's, or F's in school. Although actual grade information from participants' academic transcripts was not collected, prior work has shown strong correlations (Pearson's $r = .76$ to $.97$) between self-reported and actual grades (Cassady, 2001; Hishinma, 2001; Thomas, Caldwell, Faison, and Jackson, 2009). This suggests that students tend to be fairly accurate and unbiased in their reports of grades earned. Self-reported grades were coded categorically: 1=F/D, 2=C, 3=B, 4=A. Grade repetition is a binary variable indicating whether respondents ever repeated a grade level (no=0, yes=1). Number of suspensions is a continuous variable based on the number of times participants reported being suspended from school.

Independent variables. Family structure and integration are the key independent variables. Consistent with the approach of Gavin, Chae, and Takeuchi (2009), family structure is constructed based on adolescents' responses to questions about who raised them the majority of childhood. Specifically, respondents were asked "What woman (and man) mostly raised you?" Responses were coded into the following categories: (1) both biological parents (reference); (2) single parent, (3) biological parent and parent's non-biological partner, (4) extended relative(s) and/or nonrelative(s) only. For many African Americans, childrearing extends beyond the boundaries of households, marriage, or even blood relation (Collins, 2000; Garcia Coll et al. 1996; McAdoo, 2007; Billingsley, 1992). This measure of family structure reflects this

longstanding tradition of communal childrearing in the black community in that rather than focusing on coresidence, biological parentage, and parents' union status, it identifies the adults who are most influential in raising black youths. Additional measures that focus solely on parental coresidence and union status are not available in NSAL-A. To assess the robustness of my findings, I re-ran my analyses using a traditional longitudinal measure of family structure constructed by Gaydosch and Harris (2018), that draws on data from The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). While Add Health does not permit the inclusion of several key indicators of family integration, results related to the distribution of family structure among African Americans align with results from NSAL-A, with one notable exception. The share of African American respondents in single-parent families is substantially higher in Add Health than NSAL-A (see Appendix 1). This may be the case if youths who live apart from a parent still benefit from the caregiving of their nonresident parent or other parental figures and thus report being raised by them. Nevertheless, results from multivariate analyses using Add Health data support findings from the main analyses (see Appendix 2).

Family integration is measured based on three commonly used indicators: family support, subjective family closeness, and family contact, as well as a salient aspect of family integration that is often overlooked in previous research, negative interaction. Family support involves the frequency of emotional and instrumental support that adolescents receive from their family members. Emotional support was assessed with a three-item index in which respondents were asked how often their family members (both nuclear and extended) (1) "Make you feel loved and cared for?", (2) "Listen to you talk about your private problems and concerns?", and (3) "Express interest and concern in your wellbeing?" Each question used the same response format: (4), fairly often (3), not too often (2), or never (1). Values for the three questions were summed,

resulting in a range of 3 to 12. Higher values represent more frequent emotional support received from family members. Cronbach's alpha for this three-item index was .65. While this value indicates moderate internal consistency, this same scale is used in other work using the NSAL adult sample (Cronbach's alpha= .72) and it is consistent with prior work assessing exchanges of family support (e.g., Lincoln et al., 2013; Sarkisian and Gerstel, 2004). Instrumental support refers to the tangible assistance that family members provide to each other. In this study, it is measured based on the frequency of financial and transportation help that adolescents receive from their relatives. Respondents were asked how often their family members provided them with transportation and how often their family members help them financially. Response formats for these two questions used a 4-point Likert scale with a response range of never = 1 to very often = 4. Values for these two questions were combined and summed to produce a range of 2 to 8. Higher values indicate receiving instrumental support from family more frequently (in analyses not shown, I separated these measures and obtained similar results).

Subjective family closeness was assessed by the question: How close do you feel towards your family members? Would you say very close (4), fairly close (3), not too close (2) or not close at all (1)?". Family contact was measured by the question: "How often do you see, write, or talk on the telephone with family or relatives who do not live with you? Response categories are: every day (5), at least once a week (4), a few times a month (3), a few times a year to at least once a month (2), hardly ever or never (1). Higher scores represented stronger feelings of family closeness and higher frequency of family contact, respectively. Negative interaction is measured based on a three-item index that asks participants how often their nuclear and extended family members (1) "Make too many demands on you?", 2 "Criticize you and the things you do?", 3 "Try to take advantage of you?". The response format for this question ranges from never=1 to

very often=4. Higher values indicate higher frequencies of negative interaction. Cronbach's alpha for the three-item index was .71.

Controls. I include several controls in this analysis, some of which pertain to individual characteristics of adolescents that may impact their educational performance (i.e., gender and age). Other controls relate to characteristics of the adolescents' households that may influence how the family is organized (i.e., region and number of children in the household). Gender is measured as female (reference) or male and age is coded in years. Region is classified into four categories: Northeast (reference), North Central, South, and West. Number of children is a continuous measure that represents the number of individuals living in the adolescents' household that are under the age of 18. This variable does not include the adolescent her or himself; it was top-coded at four by the data collectors.

Household income. This study conducts multivariate analyses separately for children from low-, middle-, and high-income households. Income was first coded into five categories: (1) at or below the poverty threshold (reference); (2) 101–200% of the poverty threshold; (3) 201–300%; (4) 301–400%; and (5) greater than 400% of the poverty threshold. These categories are constructed by dividing the reported household income by the poverty threshold for the year that the adolescent was interviewed. Consistent with the work of Jiang, Ekono, and Skinner, 2015, youths whose household incomes were at or below 200% of the poverty threshold were categorized as low-income. Based on federal guidelines, these families are typically considered poor or near poor and they often struggle financially to meet their basic needs, (Jiang, Ekono, and Skinner, 2015). Those whose household incomes were between 201-300% of the poverty threshold were assigned to the middle-income category, and adolescents whose household incomes were above 300% were classified as high-income. As a point of reference, in 2003, the

median household income was \$43,318 for a family of four (Department of Health and Human Services, 2003) and 300% of the poverty threshold was \$55,200 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). Thus, adolescents in the middle-income category had household incomes that approximate the national median; youths assigned to the high-income category lived in households with incomes well above (at least 25% higher than) the national median.

Analysis Strategy

To explore variation in black family organization, I display descriptive statistics indicating the frequency with which adolescents report being raised in the each of the four types of family structure, as well as their reported frequency of each of the indicators of family integration. To assess the relationship between family organization and children's educational performance, I perform three types of analyses. Consistent with prior research (e.g., Thomas et al., 2009), I treat reported grades as an ordinal variable, and I use generalized ordered logit models to examine the association between family organization and adolescents' grades. I rely on logistic regression to predict the likelihood of having repeated a grade in school. In my analysis of number of suspensions, the outcome is a count variable, and it is skewed toward 0 and has overdispersion (the variance of the variable is greater than its mean). Therefore, I use negative binomial regression. I compare the relative influence of family structure and family integration by calculating predicted values for each outcome by family structure and each indicator of family integration, and then I contrast the magnitudes of these predicted values. To assess whether indicators of family organization were differentially associated with educational performance by income level, I ran all models separately for adolescents from low-, middle-, and high-income households and then conducted Chow tests on the fully interacted model that compared the three groups. Significant differences by income in family structure and family

integration, as well as in the factors that predict reported grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions are indicated with footnotes.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the distribution of sample characteristics by household income. In general, the demographic characteristics of respondents are representative of the U.S. population of African American adolescents. The sample is nearly evenly split by gender, the average age is 15 years, and most adolescents reside in the South (62%). Sixty-three percent of respondents live in low-income households, 17% are considered middle-income, and 20% live in high-income families.

Turning to family structure, there is significant variation in family structure both within and across income groups. Being raised by both biological parents was the most common family structure for black adolescents overall; approximately 50% of African American youth reported being raised in this context (this estimate for African Americans is similar to estimates produced using a traditional measure of family structure from Add Health data [Appendix 1]). The second most common arrangement is a single-parent family (25%), followed by being raised by a biological parent and his or her non-biological partner (16%), and extended relatives or nonrelatives in the absence of biological parents (10%). The most striking differences in family structure by household income were between low-income and high-income groups. Whereas 42% of youths in low-income families were raised by both biological parents, 65% of youths from high-income families lived in this arrangement. Additionally, nearly three times as many low-income households were single parent (33%) or extended (11%), as high-income households, with values of 12% and 4%, respectively. Overall, these estimates confirm that there

is considerable heterogeneity in family structure among black adolescents by household resources, with youths from lower-income families being less likely to be raised by both biological parents than those from high-income families, and they are more likely to be raised by a single parent or extended relatives and nonrelatives. They also show that while research on black families is characterized by a focus on low-income, typically single-mother families (Billingsley, 1992 McLoyd et al., 2000), this overemphasis is misleading and obscures the diversity of family structures that black youths experience. Twenty-five percent of adolescents reported being mostly raised by a single parent; 75% were raised by both biological parents, a biological parent and a nonbiological partner of their parent, or extended relatives and nonrelatives.

In terms of family integration, African American adolescents report similarly high levels of subjective family closeness, negative interaction, and receipt of family support, irrespective of household income. For example, the average scores for instrumental and emotional support are 7 (out of 8) and 10 (out of 12), respectively for all income groups. Research on family social support among African American adults has shown greater socioeconomic variation in receipt of these forms of support (Cross, Nguyen, Taylor, and Chatters, 2018; Nguyen, Chatters, and Taylor, 2016). However, these reports of high levels of family support appear consistent with their reliance on their families to meet many of their basic needs at this stage in the life course.

Multivariate Results

Reported grades. Table 2 displays odds ratios from generalized ordered logit models predicting grades for African American and Black Caribbean adolescents. This model is preferred over ordinal logistic regression because unlike the former model, the proportional odds assumption is not violated, and it still allows for a relatively straightforward interpretation of coefficients (Williams, 2016). Coefficients for earned grades are not equal across all grade

categories (e.g., odds ratios for mostly D/F's differ for those for mostly A's); therefore, odds ratios are shown separately for each grade category. Results indicate that family structure is unrelated to grades for African American youths from low- and middle-income households, but they are associated with earning higher grades for the most advantaged group. Among adolescents from high-income households, being raised by a single parent instead of both biological parents is associated with a 92% decrease in the odds of earning mostly C's, versus earning mostly D's or F's. Similarly, among adolescents from high-income households, being raised by a biological parent and their nonbiological partner or extended relatives and nonrelatives is associated with a 67% and 100% decrease, respectively, in the odds of earning mostly C's, compared to earning mostly D's or F's. Further, adolescents from high-income backgrounds who are raised by a single parent are 86% less likely to earn mostly B's versus mostly C's than those raised in a two-parent family, and those raised by a biological parent and their nonbiological partner are 67% less likely to do so. Living outside a two-parent family is not associated with lower odds of earning mostly B's versus earning mostly A's. Altogether, results indicate that for adolescents from high-income households, family disruption is associated with a decrease in the odds of earning mostly B's or mostly C's compared to earning failing grades.

Among indicators of family integration, instrumental support is related to earning higher grades for youths from low-income households, and subjective family closeness is associated with higher grades for youths for high-income households. Consistent with expectations from social integration theory, each one-point increase in low-income adolescents' instrumental support score is associated with a 39% increase in the likelihood of earning mostly C's instead of mostly D's or F's and each one-point increase in high-income adolescents' family closeness

score is associated with a seven-fold increase in the likelihood of earning mostly C's rather than failing grades.

Grade repetition. Table 3 shows odds ratios from logistic regression analysis estimating the likelihood of grade repetition. After individual and household characteristics are taken into account, we observe little association between family organization and grade repetition for adolescents from low- and middle-income households. Family structure is unrelated to this outcome. One indicator of family integration, negative interaction, is associated with grade repetition; each one-point increase in low-income African American youths' negative interaction score is associated with a 12.2% increase in the likelihood of repeating a grade. Family structure is related to grade repetition for adolescents from high-income families. Youth who are raised by a single parent are nearly three times more likely to repeat a grade. Adolescents raised by extended relatives and/or nonrelatives in the absence of a parent were also substantially more likely to experience grade repetition (the odds ratio for youths in this arrangement is imprecise due to a small cell size, but the coefficient is highly significant). Like youth in low-income families, negative interaction is associated with a higher likelihood of grade repetition.

Number of suspensions. Table 4 presents incidence rate ratios from negative binomial regressions estimating number of suspensions. Family structure is associated with suspensions for adolescents from middle- and high-income households. Youths from these families who were raised by a single parent had rates of suspension that are nearly three times that of youths raised by both biological parents. Adolescents from high-income families who were raised by extended relatives or nonrelatives also had suspension rates roughly three times higher than those raised in a two-parent family. One indicator of family integration, negative interaction, is associated with suspensions. Each one-point increase in low- and high-income youths' negative interaction score

is associated with an increase in their suspension rates by a factor of 1.083 and 1.213, respectively.

These estimates show the links between family structure and family integration and African American youths' educational performance, but they do not show the relative influence of family structure versus family integration on each outcome. To demonstrate this, I calculated the expected changes in the likelihood of earning high grades (mostly A's), repeating a grade, and number of suspensions if: 1) youth who were raised by both biological parents were instead raised in one of the three other family structures and if 2) youths' family closeness, contact, emotional and instrumental support, and negative interaction scores increased by one standard deviation (holding all variables at their mean or modal values). Table 5 presents the estimated changes in predicted probabilities for high grades and grade repetition, as well as the predicted changes in number of suspensions (calculated by using the *mchange* command in STATA 16). In general, we see that family structure (whenever significantly related to each outcome) has a larger "effect size" than family integration on each outcome. For example, if adolescents from high-income households who were raised by both biological parents were instead raised by a single parent, their predicted probability of grade repetition would increase by 17.5 percentage points (Column 2). If their negative interaction score was raised by one standard deviation, their predicted probability of grade repetition would increase by 8 percentage points (Column 2). Similarly, if adolescents from high-income families who were raised in a two-parent family were instead raised by extended relatives and/or nonrelatives, their predicted number of suspensions would increase by 2 (Column 3). If their negative interaction score increased by one standard deviation, their estimated number of suspensions would decrease by 0.87 (Column 3).

Although family structure appears to have a greater impact on black youths' educational performance than family integration, the total effect of family structure on this population's educational outcomes is substantively small. The total effect of family structure is relatively small because the share of youth raised in family structures that tend to be associated with worse outcomes (e.g., single-parent family) is substantially smaller than the share of youth raised in family structures that are associated with better outcomes (e.g., two-parent family). Referring to my previous example of youth from high-income households who were raised by a single parent, we see that that these adolescents comprise less than three percent of the sample (Column 4). When we multiply the percentage of the sample affected (2.91%) (Column 4) by the estimated effect of the change (17.5%) (Column 2), we see that the total effect (or population-level) change in grade repetition would be an increase of 0.5 percentage points (Column 6). Thus, while this simulation illustrates the greater relative influence of family structure and it identifies youth who are at higher risk of experiencing negative outcomes, it does not indicate that promoting the two-parent family over other family structures would substantially improve African American youths' grades or decrease grade repetition and number of suspensions.

Discussion

This study investigated how key components of family organization, specifically, family structure and family integration, are associated with African American adolescents' educational performance. It builds on prior research in several important ways. Unlike work that largely focuses on cross-race differences in family organization, I focus on within-group heterogeneity among black Americans. Given that differences in socioeconomic position may lead to distinct patterns of family structure and integration, and outcomes for youth, I compare differences in family organization and its relation to educational performance by level of household income. Additionally, previous studies typically use family structure as a proxy for family organization,

without reference to qualitative aspects of family relationships that may also matter for adolescent wellbeing. I consider these factors, namely, family closeness, contact, support, and negative interaction to assess how each factor is related to black youths' grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions. Finally, I compare the relative impact of family structure and family integration on each outcome.

Concordant with my first hypothesis, I find that there is considerable within-group heterogeneity in family organization among black Americans. Prior work is characterized by a focus on low-income, black single-mother families. However, when I use a flexible measure of family structure that incorporates adults most responsible for raising black adolescents, I find that 25% were raised by a single parent and approximately 50% were raised by both biological parents. When a traditional measure of family structure is used, the gap in estimates between single- and two-parent families is smaller (see Appendix 1). However, two-parent families remain the most common arrangement that black adolescents experience. When differences in household income are considered, I find that youths from the most economically disadvantaged households were significantly more likely to be raised outside a two-parent family, which is consistent with broad trends in family structure within the U.S. and research indicating that economic stability is important for union stability (Billingsley, 1992; Brown, 2010). With respect to family integration, all black youths report high levels of family closeness, contact, and support. Recent work focused on African American adults has found greater variation in the receipt of instrumental and emotional support, key indicators of family integration, by socioeconomic position (e.g., Nguyen, Chatters, and Taylor, 2016). The universally high levels of family integration among black adolescents may reflect their greater reliance on their family systems to provide for their basic needs at this developmental stage.

Bearing in mind a longstanding scholarly tradition that emphasizes the importance of family organization for the life chances of black Americans, I was interested in evaluating the extent to which family structure and integration matter for black adolescents' educational performance. I observe that family structure is unrelated to the grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions of the most economically disadvantaged adolescents, but it is associated with these outcomes for more advantaged youths. In general, youth from high-income households who grow up apart from a parent are less likely to earn higher grades and are more likely to repeat a grade than those raised by both biological parents. For middle- and high-income groups, being raised outside a two-parent family is also associated with being suspended more frequently. The finding that differences in family structure are not associated with differences in educational performance among low-income youths aligns with recent work suggesting that sustained exposure to socioeconomic disadvantage renders the effect of family disruption less severe (Brand et al. 2019). This finding has important implications for social policy. Key social welfare programs have sought to improve youth outcomes through the allocation of funds to promote of two-parent families (e.g., Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [U.S. House of Representatives, 1996]). However, results indicate that these programs may be less effective than they otherwise would be if they fail to pair these efforts with strategies to substantially improve the economic wellbeing of disadvantaged groups.

In terms of indicators of family integration, I find that high levels of instrumental support from family is associated with a decreased likelihood of earning failing grades among youths from low-income families, and subjective family closeness is related to reduced odds of earning failing grades among high-income families. Additionally, negative interactions with family members are associated with an increased likelihood of grade repetition and number of

suspensions for both income groups. Both findings provide support for my third hypothesis that indicators of family integration are positively associated with youths' educational performance. Although not all aspects of family integration appear to influence youths' educational performance, significant findings for instrumental support, subjective family closeness, and negative interaction highlight factors that may protect black youth or put them at risk of experiencing negative educational outcomes. Results also demonstrate the need for greater work that considers not only the role of family structure in adolescent wellbeing, but also dynamic features of family relationships that may also be consequential for youth outcomes. Further, black adolescents across all income groups reported receiving similar levels of instrumental support, experiencing feelings of family closeness to the same degree, and having negative interactions with family members with similar frequency, but these factors were differentially associated with outcomes by income level. Extant literature does not offer a compelling explanation for these differences, and thus, these findings highlight the need for a more nuanced understanding of the role of socioeconomic position in shaping the relationship between family integration and outcomes for black Americans.

A consideration of the substantive significance of family structure and family integration demonstrates that the former dimension of family organization has greater relative impact on black adolescents' educational performance than the latter, which is counter to my fourth hypothesis that these dimensions are equally influential. Although family structure appears to have greater relative influence, we see that simulated changes in family structure would only marginally influence changes in educational outcomes for the African American adolescent population. These findings suggest that while family organization plays a role in shaping black

youths' academic outcomes, greater attention should also be paid to other aspects of youths' social environment that may facilitate positive outcomes.

This study is not without its limitations. First, due to the cross-sectional nature of the study design, estimates produced from this study are not causal. The future availability of longitudinal data will assist with the establishment of causal links between black family organization and youth outcomes. However, empirical association is the first criterion for the identification of causal relationships, meaning that even in the absence of longitudinal data, evidence that key indicators of family organization are largely unrelated to low-income African American adolescents' educational performance is noteworthy. Such evidence suggests that family organization has limited explanatory power in accounting for the educational performance of black youths who are at an elevated risk of experiencing negative outcomes (i.e., those from low-income households), which counters popular and academic perceptions of the centrality of family organization in shaping the life chances of economically disadvantaged black Americans. Second, due to data limitations, I am unable to include a traditional measure of family structure that focuses solely on parental coresidence and union status. Instead, the NSAL-A provides a more flexible measure that is concerned with identifying the adults most involved in raising youths. While this approach differs from traditional ones, additional analyses using an established measure of family structure support findings from the main analyses (see Appendices 1 and 2). Third, this study relies on self-reports of grades. Although research suggests that self-reported grades are fairly reliable measures (Cassady, 2001; Jivraj, Goodman, Ploubidis, and de Oliveira, 2017), they likely include some level of social desirability and/or recall bias. Finally, findings from this study are representative of African American adolescents who were aged 13 to 17 between 2001 and 2004. If the link between family organization and youth outcomes has

strengthened over time, my findings would be less reflective of the experiences of present-day adolescents. Research on the potential changing association between family organization and youth outcomes is virtually nonexistent. Nonetheless, recent studies using nationally representative longitudinal data also find little to no relationship between family structure, a key component of family organization, and the educational attainment of economically disadvantaged racial groups, which is congruent with results from this study (Brand et al., 2019; Cross, 2020). Notwithstanding these limitations, this study advances research on family organization, race/ethnicity, social stratification, and education by highlighting the diversity of familial arrangements that black youth experience and shedding light on important mechanisms that explain variation in their educational performance. These factors may go unnoticed in studies that focus on cross-group analyses. Given prevailing academic debates and social policy's focus on the role of family organization in explaining persistent racial inequality, this work has important implications for research and policy.

References

- Allen, Walter R. "Black family research in the United States: A review, assessment and extension." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 9, (1978):167-189.
- Allen, Walter R. "Class, culture and family organization: The effects of class and race on family structure in urban America." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 10, (1979): 301–313.
- Amato, Paul R. and Bruce Keith. "Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, (1991): 43-58.
- Anderson, Elijah. *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Barnett, Melissa. "Economic disadvantage in complex family systems: Expansion of family stress models." *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 11, (2008): 145-161.
- Bengtson, Vern L. and Rober E.L. Roberts. 1991. "Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53 (1991): 856–870.
- Bengtson, Vern L., Roseann Giarrusso, J. Beth Mabry, and Merrill Silverstein. "Solidarity, conflict, and ambivalence." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, (2002): 568-576.
- Bengtson, Vern. L., C.J. Rosenthal, and Linda M. Burton. "Paradoxes of families and aging." *Handbook of aging and the social sciences*, edited by R. H. Binstock and L. K. George, 1995, pp. 253–282. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Billingsley, Andrew. *Black Families in White America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Billingsley, Andrew. *Climbing Jacob's ladder: The enduring legacy of African-American families*. New York, NY: Touchstone, 1992.
- Brand, Jennie E., Ravaris Moore, Xi Song, and Yu Xie. "Why does parental divorce lower children's educational attainment? A causal mediation analysis." *Sociological Science*, 6 (2019): 264-292.
- Brown, Susan L. "Marriage and child well-being: Research and policy perspectives." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72 (2010): 1059-1077.
- Cassady, Jerrell C. 2001. "Self-reported GPA and SAT: A methodological note." *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, 7, (2001):1-4.
- Collins, Patricia H. *Black feminist thought*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2000.
- Colpe, Lisa, Kathleen Merikangas, Bruce Cuthbert, and Karen Bourdon. "Guest editorial." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 13, (2004): 193–195.
- Cross, Christina J. "Racial/ethnic differences in the association between family structure and children's education." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, (2020): 691-712.
- Cross, Christina J., Robert Joseph Taylor, and Linda M. Chatters. "Family social support networks of African American and Black Caribbean Adolescents." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27, (2018): 2757-2771.
- Dager, Edward Z. and Claire B. McCullough. "Family integration: a multidimensional concept." *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 12, (1982): 173-187.

- Department of Health and Human Services. "The 2003 Health and Human Services poverty guidelines." *Federal Register*, 68 (2003): 6456-6458.
- Dow, Dawn. *Mothering while black: boundaries and burdens of middle-class parenthood*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. *The Philadelphia Negro: A social study*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1899.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. *The Negro American family*. Atlanta, GA: The Atlanta University Press, 1909.
- Durkheim, Emile. *Suicide: A study in sociology*. New York, NY: Free Press, 1897[1951].
- Fomby, Paula and Andrew J. Cherlin. Family instability and child wellbeing. *American Sociological Review*, 72, (2007): 181-204.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. *The Negro family in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1932.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. *The Negro family in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Garcia Coll, Cynthia, Gontran Lamberty, Renee Jenkins, Harriet P. McAdoo, Keith Crnic, Barbara Hanna Wasik, and Heidie Vazquez Garcia. "An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children." *Child Development*, 67, (1996): 1891-1914.
- Gavin, Amelia R., David Chae, and David Takeuchi. "Association between family structure in childhood and lifetime depressive disorder in adulthood among a nationally representative sample of Blacks." *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 31 (2009): 484-493.
- Ginther, Donna K. and Robert A. Pollak. "Family structure and children's educational outcomes: Blended families, stylized facts, and descriptive regressions." *Demography*, 41, (2004): 671-696.
- Gutman, Herbert G. *The black family in slavery and freedom, 1750-1925*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1976.
- Haynes, Bruce. *Red lines, black spaces: The politics of race and space in a black middle-class suburb*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hays, William C. and Charles H. Mindel. "Extended kinship relations in black and white families." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 35, (1973): 51-57.
- Hishinima, Earl S. "Association between actual and self-reported grades for ethnically diverse Asian/Pacific Islander adolescents." *Research in Education*, 65, (2001): 53-69.
- Hunter, Andrea G. "Teaching the classics in family studies: E. Franklin Frazier's *The Negro Family in the United States*." *Family Relations*, (2006): 55:80-92.
- Jackson, James S., Myriam Torres, Cleopatra H. Caldwell, Harold H. Neighbors, Randolph Nesse, Robert Joseph Taylor, and David R. Williams. "The National Survey of American Life: A study of racial, ethnic and cultural influences on mental disorders and mental health." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 13, (2004): 196-207.
- Jiang, Y., Ekono, M., & Skinner, C. (2015). Basic facts about low-income children: Children under 18 years, 2013. New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University.

- Jivraj, Stephen, Alissa Goodman, George B. Ploubidis, and Cesar de Oliveira. "Testing comparability between retrospective life history data and prospective birth cohort study data." *Journals of Gerontology: Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, (2017): 1-11.
- Knoester, Chris and Dana L. Haynie. "Community context, social integration into family, and youth violence." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, (2005) :767-780.
- Lacy, Karyn R. *Blue-chip black: race, class, and status in the new black middle class*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007.
- Lincoln, Karen D., Robert Joseph Taylor, and Linda M. Chatters. "Correlates of emotional support and negative interaction among African Americans and Black Caribbeans." *Journal of Family Issues*, 34, (2013) :1262–1290.
- Leventhal, Tama, Julia A. Graber, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. "Adolescent transitions to young adulthood: Antecedents, correlates, and consequences of adolescent employment." *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11, (2001) :297-323.
- Manning, Wendy, Susan L. Brown, and J. Bart Stykes. "Family complexity among children in the United States." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654, (2014) :48-65.
- McAdoo, Harriet P. "Black mothers and the extended family support network." *The black woman*, edited by L.F. Rodgers-Rose, 1980, pp. 125-44, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- McAdoo, Harriet P. *Black Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007.
- McLanahan, Sara and Christine Percheski. "Family structure and the reproduction of inequalities." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, (2008) :257-276.
- McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. *Growing up with a single-parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- McLoyd Vonnie C., Ana Mari Cauce, David Takeuchi, and Leon Wilson. "Marital processes and parental socialization in families of color: A decade review of research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, (2000) :1070–1093.
- Monk, Ellis. "The cost of color: Skin color, discrimination, and health among African-Americans." *American Journal of Sociology*, 121, (2015) :396-444.
- Moynihan, Patrick D. *The Negro family: A case for national action*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1944.
- National Center for Education Statistics. "The condition of education: Characteristics of children's families." 2020:1-8.
- Patillo, Mary. 1999. *Black picket fences: Privilege and peril among the black middle class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rocque, Michael and Raymond Paternoster. "Understanding the antecedents of the "school-to-jail" link: The relationship between race and school discipline." *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 2, (2011) :633–655.
- Roschelle, Anne R. *No more kin: Exploring race, class, and gender in family networks*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.
- Rose, Theda, Joseph S. Shields, and Cleopatra H. Caldwell. "Social integration and the mental health of black adolescents." *Child Development*, 85, (2014) :1003-1018.

- Seaton, Eleanor K., Cleopatra H. Caldwell, Robert Sellers, and James S. Jackson. "The prevalence of perceived discrimination among African American and Caribbean Black youth." *Developmental Psychology*, 44, (2008) :1288-1297.
- Stack, Carol B. *All our kin: strategies for survival in a black community*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Sarkisian, Natalia and Naomi Gerstel. "Kin support among blacks and whites: Race and family organization." *American Sociological Review*, 69, (2004) :812-837.
- Schwartz, Sharon and Ilan H. Meyer. "Mental health disparities research: The impact of within and between group analyses on tests of social stress hypotheses." *Social Science and Medicine*, 70, (2010) :1111-1118.
- Shollenberger, Tracey L. "Racial disparities in suspension and subsequent outcomes." *Closing the school discipline gap*, edited by Daniel J. Losen, 2015, pp. 31-43. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sudarkasa, Niara. *The strength of our mothers: African and African-American women and families: Essays and speeches*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1996.
- Taylor, Robert Joseph, Linda M. Chatters, Amanda Toler Woodward, and Edna Brown. "Racial and ethnic differences in extended family, friendship, fictive kin, and congregational informal support networks." *Family Relations*, 62, (2013) :609-623.
- Thomas, Oseela N., Cleopatra H. Caldwell, Nkesha Faison, & James S. Jackson. "Promoting academic achievement: The role of racial identity in buffering perceptions of teacher discrimination on academic achievement among African American and Caribbean Black adolescents." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, (2009): 420-431.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Living arrangements of black children under 18 years old: 1960 to present." Washington, D.C.: Department of Commerce, 2016.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Median household income: 2003." Washington, D.C.: Department of Commerce, 2003.
- U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. (1996). Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996: Conference report to accompany H.R. 3734. Section 401, Purpose (p. 9), July 30. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wald, Johanna and Daniel J. Losen. "Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline." *New Directions for Youth Development*, 99, (2003) :9-15.
- Williams, Richard. "Understanding and interpreting generalized ordered logit models." *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 40, (2016): 7-20.
- Wilson, William J. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Wu, Lawrence. "Effects of family instability, income and income instability on the risk of a premarital birth." *American Journal of Sociology*, 68, (1996): 386-406.
- Yabiku, Scott T., William G. Axinn, and Arland Thornton. "Family Integration and Children's Self-Esteem." *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, (1991) :1494-1524.
- Yang, Mi-Youn, Erin Harmeyer, Zibei Chen, and Blaine Masinter Lofaso. "Predictors of early elementary school suspension by gender: A longitudinal multilevel analysis." *Children and Youth Services Review*, 93, (2008) :331-338.

Table 1. Sample characteristics and dependent variables by household income, National Survey of American Life Adolescent Supplement (NSAL-A)

Variables	Full sample M or percent	Low-income M or Percent	Middle-income M or Percent	High-income M or percent
Female	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.48
Age (mean, range 13-17)	14.96	14.87	15.13	15.02
(SD)	1.22	1.45	1.25	1.46
<i>Region</i>				
Northeast ^b	0.13	0.14	0.08	0.16
North Central	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.17
South	0.62	0.63	0.67	0.56
West	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.11
No. of children in household (mean, range 0-4) ^{ab}	0.88	1.13	0.68	0.36
(SD)	0.94	1.22	0.82	0.62
<i>Childhood family structure</i>				
Both biological parents ^a	0.49	0.42	0.55	0.65
Single parent ^a	0.25	0.33	0.19	0.12
Biological parent and non-biological partner	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.18
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s) ^{ab}	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.04
<i>Subjective family closeness</i>				
Not close at all/not too close	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.03
Fairly close	0.26	0.26	0.23	0.29
Very close	0.69	0.68	0.73	0.67
<i>Family contact</i>				
Never/hardly ever	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.07
Few times per year to at least once per month ^a	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.08
Few times per month	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.17
At least once per week	0.27	0.25	0.27	0.35
Nearly everyday	0.36	0.35	0.41	0.33
Emotional support (mean, range 3-12)	10.19	10.09	10.47	10.22
(SD)	1.57	1.97	1.52	1.66
Instrumental support (mean, range 2-8)	6.94	6.87	7.05	7.01
(SD)	1.20	1.46	1.30	1.30
Negative interaction (mean, range 3-12)	6.00	6.11	6.07	5.66
(SD)	1.89	2.33	1.90	2.03
<i>Self-reported grades</i>				
A	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.20
B	0.43	0.42	0.41	0.51
C ^{ab}	0.37	0.39	0.38	0.25
D/F	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Grade repetition ^a	0.30	0.35	0.19	0.19
No. of suspensions (mean, range 0-11)	2.14	2.31	1.64	1.71
(SD)	2.69	3.22	2.77	2.80
No. of observations	791	496	133	162

Notes: Values are percentages unless otherwise noted. Sample characteristics were weighted to account for the complex design of the NSAL-A sample. M=mean. SD=standard deviation. No=number. (-)=not applicable due to small cell size. ^aHigh-low income difference is significant at $p<.05$. ^bHigh-middle income difference is significant at $p<.05$.

Table 2. Odds ratios from generalized ordered logit models predicting grades for African American adolescents by household income

Variables	Low-income			Middle-income			High-income		
	Mostly D/F's	Mostly C's	Mostly B's	Mostly D/F's	Mostly C's	Mostly B's	Mostly D/F's	Mostly C's	Mostly B's
<i>Family structure (versus both biological parents)</i>									
Single parent ^a	0.961 (-0.138)	0.961 (-0.138)	0.961 (-0.138)	0.686+ (-1.723)	0.686+ (-1.723)	0.686+ (-1.723)	0.085** (-3.437)	0.137** (-3.288)	1.101 (0.170)
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	0.823 (-0.719)	0.823 (-0.719)	0.823 (-0.719)	0.726 (-1.549)	0.726 (-1.549)	0.726 (-1.549)	0.331* (-2.453)	0.331* (-2.453)	0.331* (-2.453)
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s) ^{ab}	0.940 (-0.077)	0.605 (-1.586)	1.649 (1.078)	0.530+ (-1.950)	0.530+ (-1.950)	0.530+ (-1.950)	0.003*** (-5.111)	0.360 (-1.634)	0.729 (-0.476)
<i>Family integration</i>									
Subjective family closeness ^{ab}	1.228 (1.034)	1.228 (1.034)	1.228 (1.034)	1.062 (0.411)	1.062 (0.411)	1.062 (0.411)	7.272* (2.738)	0.782 (-0.732)	0.601 (-1.052)
Family contact	0.877 (-1.657)	0.877 (-1.657)	0.877 (-1.657)	0.968 (-0.502)	0.968 (-0.502)	0.968 (-0.502)	1.242 (1.451)	1.242 (1.451)	1.242 (1.451)
Emotional support	1.026 (0.382)	1.026 (0.382)	1.026 (0.382)	1.028 (0.537)	1.028 (0.537)	1.028 (0.537)	0.975 (-0.263)	0.975 (-0.263)	0.975 (-0.263)
Instrumental support ^a	1.390** (2.789)	1.102 (0.949)	0.828 (-1.391)	1.008 (0.163)	1.008 (0.163)	1.008 (0.163)	0.597 (-1.587)	1.147 (0.795)	0.854 (-0.824)
Negative interaction	1.073 (1.474)	1.073 (1.474)	1.073 (1.474)	1.016 (0.479)	1.016 (0.479)	1.016 (0.479)	1.005 (0.055)	1.005 (0.055)	1.005 (0.055)
Constant	0.475 (-0.435)	0.111 (-1.478)	0.074 (-1.552)	0.164 (-1.578)	0.164 (-1.578)	0.164 (-1.578)	1.253 (0.065)	0.177 (-0.651)	0.140 (-0.654)
Observations	496	133	162	496	133	162	496	133	162

t-statistics in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.10

Notes: Analysis includes controls for gender, age, region, household income, and number of children in household. Analysis uses sample weights to account for the complex design of the NSAL-A sample.

^aHigh-low income difference is significant at p<.05. ^bHigh-middle income difference is significant.

Table 3. Odds ratios from logistic regression analysis predicting grade repetition for African American adolescents by household income

Variables	Low-income	Middle-income	High-income
<i>Family structure (versus both biological parents)</i>			
Single parent ^{ab}	1.033 (0.127)	1.047 (0.074)	2.938* (2.096)
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	1.060 (0.152)	1.112 (0.163)	2.200 (1.642)
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s) ^{ab}	1.410 (0.909)	1.273 (0.163)	25.394*** (5.502)
Subjective family closeness	1.453 (1.588)	0.979 (-0.041)	1.927 (1.073)
Family contact	1.029 (0.365)	1.227 (0.961)	1.034 (0.233)
Emotional support	0.993 (-0.097)	0.761 (-1.281)	1.058 (0.507)
Instrumental support	0.957 (-0.548)	1.122 (0.518)	1.184 (1.052)
Negative interaction	1.122* (2.136)	1.042 (0.297)	1.202* (2.687)
Constant	0.046* (-2.412)	0.050 (-1.023)	0.000+ (-2.056)
Observations	496	133	162

t-statistics in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.10

Notes: Analysis includes controls for gender, age, region, household income, and number of children in household. Analysis uses sample weights to account for the complex design of the NSAL-A sample. ^aHigh-low income difference is significant at p<.05. ^bHigh-middle income difference is significant at p<.05.

Table 4. Incidence rate ratios from negative binomial regression analysis predicting number of suspensions for African American adolescents by household income

Variables	Low-income	Middle-income	High-income
<i>Family structure (versus both biological parents)</i>			
Single parent ^a	1.215 (1.620)	2.628** (2.798)	2.820** (3.549)
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	1.280 (1.480)	1.533 (1.071)	1.646 (1.606)
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s) ^a	0.983 (-0.081)	1.680 (1.269)	2.869* (2.656)
Subjective family closeness	1.006 (0.047)	0.687 (-1.606)	0.972 (-0.109)
Family contact	0.991 (-0.167)	1.127 (1.445)	0.972 (-0.316)
Emotional support	0.955 (-1.118)	0.990 (-0.115)	0.990 (-0.139)
Instrumental support	0.936 (-1.395)	0.992 (-0.060)	1.023 (0.253)
Negative interaction	1.083** (2.899)	1.123 (1.643)	1.213** (3.165)
Likelihood ratio test of alpha	1.149+ (1.732)	1.265 (0.967)	1.400 (1.539)
Constant	1.241 (0.273)	0.030 (-1.686)	0.309 (-0.606)
Observations	496	133	162

t-statistics in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.10

Notes: Analysis includes controls for gender, age, region, household income, and number of children in household. Analysis uses sample weights to account for the complex design of the NSAL-A sample. ^aHigh-low income difference is significant at p<.05. ^bHigh-middle income difference significant at p<.05.

Table 5. Estimated changes in grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions associated with changes in family structure

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Change in Pr(Earning A's)	Change in Pr(Grade rep.)	Change in (No. of susp.)	% of sample affected	Total % change in earning A's	Total % change in grade rep.	Total change in No. of susp.
Low-income							
<i>Family structure (versus both biological parents)</i>							
Single parent	0.017	0.008	0.365	20.99%	0.004	0.002	0.077
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	-0.049	0.014	0.474	9.23%	-0.005	0.001	0.044
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s)	0.119	0.083	-0.029	9.23%	0.011	0.008	-0.003
<i>Family integration</i>							
Subjective family closeness	0.005	0.052	0.006	68.64%	0.003	0.036	0.004
Family contact	-0.006	0.009	-0.021	27.11%	-0.002	0.002	-0.006
Emotional support	-0.011	-0.003	-0.148	16.69%	-0.002	-0.001	-0.025
Instrumental support	-0.029	-0.014	-0.164	18.16%	-0.005	-0.003	-0.030
Negative interaction	-0.001	0.061*	0.356**	19.33%	0.000	0.012*	0.069**
Middle-income							
<i>Family structure (versus both biological parents)</i>							
Single parent	-0.005	0.007	1.39*	3.29%	0.000	0.000	0.046*
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	0.020	0.016	0.456	2.78%	0.001	0.000	0.013
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s)	0.024	0.038	0.581	1.52%	0.000	0.001	0.009
<i>Family integration (+1 SD)</i>							
Subjective family closeness	0.040	-0.002	-0.238+	68.64%	0.027	-0.001	-0.163+
Family contact	0.056	0.046	0.214	27.11%	0.015	0.012	0.058
Emotional support	0.086	-0.064	-0.023	16.69%	0.014	-0.011	-0.004
Instrumental support	-0.035	0.026	-0.013	18.16%	-0.006	0.005	-0.002
Negative interaction	-0.021	0.014	0.352	19.33%	-0.004	0.003	0.068
High-income							
<i>Family structure (versus both biological parents)</i>							
Single parent	-0.043	0.175*	1.894*	2.91%	-0.001	0.005*	0.055**
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	-0.093	0.117	0.672	4.17%	-0.004	0.005	0.028
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s)	-0.048	0.661***	1.945*	0.76%	0.000	0.005***	0.015*
<i>Family integration (+1 SD)</i>							

Subjective family closeness	-0.041*	0.076	-0.027	68.64%	-0.028*	0.052	-0.019
Family contact	0.053	0.008	-0.061	27.11%	0.014	0.002	-0.017
Emotional support	0.013	0.019	-0.03	16.69%	0.002	0.003	-0.005
Instrumental support	-0.028	0.046	0.053	18.16%	-0.005	0.008	0.010
Negative interaction	0.011	0.08*	0.867**	19.33%	0.002	0.015*	0.168**
Sample mean (SD)	.15 (.31)	.29 (.39)	2.10 (2.68)				

Notes: This table displays estimated changes in predicted values of grades, grade repetition, and number of suspensions. Analysis includes controls for gender, age, region, and number of children. All variables are held at their mean or modal value. Analysis uses sample weights to account for the complex design of the NSAL-A sample. *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.10. Pr=probability. No=number. Susp=suspensions Rep=repetition. %=Percent.

Appendix 1. Distribution of family structure among African American adolescents, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health)

<i>Family structure</i>	Percent
Both biological parents	48.46
Single parent	37.56
Biological parent and nonbiological partner	9.79
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s)	4.18
Observations	2,339

Notes: The longitudinal family structure array variable developed by Gaydosch & Harris (2018) captures family structure from birth to the adolescent's latest age at follow-up at Wave I or II (ages 15 to 18). Analysis uses sample weights to account for the complex design of Add Health.

Appendix 2. Odds ratios from logistic and ordinal logistic regression analysis predicting grades, grade repetition, and suspension by household income among African American adolescents, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health)

Panel 1.		Grades		
Variables		Low-income	Middle-income	High-income
<i>Family structure (vs. both biological parents)</i>				
Single parent ^a		1.030 (0.220)	1.212 (0.577)	0.613* (-1.979)
Biological parent and nonbiological partner		0.486 (-1.273)	0.818 (-0.644)	0.933 (-0.171)
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s)		1.166 (0.258)	1.031 (0.037)	1.294 (0.566)
				(-0.894) (-0.609) (2.022)
Cut 1		0.016*** (-4.069)	0.061 (-1.368)	0.007** (-3.183)
Cut 2		0.232 (-1.452)	1.015 (0.007)	0.161 (-1.243)
Cut 3		3.417 (1.231)	17.806 (1.464)	1.426 (0.237)
Observations		1,279	409	651

Panel 2.		Grade repetition		
Variables		Low-income	Middle-income	High-income
<i>Family structure (vs. both biological parents)</i>				
Single parent ^a		1.334 (1.564)	1.016 (0.034)	3.615** (2.830)
Biological parent and nonbiological partner		1.307 (0.735)	1.254 (0.380)	2.116 (1.065)
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s) ^b		0.770 (-0.430)	2.869* (2.084)	0.702 (-0.361)
Constant		0.006*** (-6.306)	0.001** (-3.288)	0.000** (-2.795)
Observations		1,279	409	651

Panel 3.		Suspension		
Variables		Low-income	Middle-income	High-income
<i>Family structure (vs. both biological parents)</i>				
Single parent		1.223 (0.922)	1.304 (0.794)	1.618+ (1.693)
Biological parent and nonbiological partner		1.713+ (1.832)	1.872 (1.165)	1.085 (0.196)
Extended relative(s) or nonrelative(s)		1.151 (0.226)	1.039 (0.065)	0.455 (-1.038)
Constant		0.423 (-1.053)	0.124 (-0.951)	4.873 (1.231)
Observations		1,279	409	651

Notes: t-statistics in parentheses. Analysis includes controls for gender, age, region, and number of children in household. Analysis uses sample weights to account for the complex design of Add Health. Model predicting higher grades does not violate assumption of proportional odds; in the interest of parsimony, ordinal logistic regression is used instead of generalized ordinal regression. Model predicting suspension estimates whether adolescent has been suspended in prior year; number of suspensions is unavailable in Add Health. ^aHigh-low income difference is significant at p<.05. ^bHigh-middle income difference is significant at p<.05.

