



In the Mix, Yet on the Margins: The Place of Families in Urban Neighborhood and Child Development Research

Author(s): Linda M. Burton and Robin L. Jarrett

Source: *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (Nov., 2000), pp. 1114-1135

Published by: National Council on Family Relations

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1566727>

Accessed: 16/01/2010 12:26

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ncfr>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



National Council on Family Relations is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Marriage and Family*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

In the Mix, Yet on the Margins: The Place of Families in Urban Neighborhood and Child Development Research

In the 1990s, the most popular theoretical and empirical research issue concerning the local ecologies of families focused on the impact of family structures (e.g., household composition) and processes (e.g., child management strategies) on the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child and adolescent development. In this article, we synthesize and critically examine the decade's prevailing literature on the topic, organizing this review into three areas: (a) the research designs of quantitative and ethnographic studies of urban neighborhoods, families, and child outcomes; (b) the conceptual approaches used in these studies; and (c) the role of structural and behavioral features of family and parenting as factors that influence the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child development in ethnically and racially diverse populations. Results suggest that although family has been center stage in the neighborhood effects research question of

the decade, it has remained on the margins in terms of theoretical and methodological specificity. Recommendations for future research are also offered.

In this decade review, we synthesize and critique the current scientific literature linking urban neighborhoods, families, and child and adolescent outcomes. Our focus emerged from the dominant conceptual and empirical question posed by researchers about this topic in the 1990s: What impact do structural (e.g., household composition) and process (e.g., child management strategies) features of families have on the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child and adolescent development?

Widespread scholarly and public interest in this question was driven by several coalescent forces, including the following: (a) a precipitous rise in concentrated poverty in urban, primarily ethnic and racial minority neighborhoods (Fine & Weis, 1998; Jargowsky, 1997; Kasarda, 1993; Moore & Pinderhughes, 1993; Wilson, Quane, & Rankin, 1998); (b) the dramatic influx of immigrants to the United States, accompanied by notable growth in the number and density of ethnic enclaves in urban and suburban settings (Alba, Logan, Stults, Maran, & Zhang, 1999; Freidenberg, 1995; Margolis, 1998; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996; Zhou,

Department of Human Development and Family Studies,
106 Henderson Building, Penn State University, University
Park, PA 16802 (burton@pop.psu.edu).

*Department of Human and Community Development,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, M-C 180, 269
Bevier Hall, 905 South Goodwin Avenue, Urbana, IL
61801.

Key Words: child development, families, urban neighborhoods.

1992); (c) vivid journalistic and media accounts of social pathologies in inner cities that heightened public concern about the safety of children growing up in economically disadvantaged, high-risk environments and catalyzed an intervention movement for youth and community development initiatives (Aber, Jones, Brown, Chaudry, & Samples, 1998; Armstead & Wexler, 1997; Colley-Quille, Turner, & Beidel, 1995; Gambone, 1999; Jessor, 1993; Kotlowitz, 1991; Melton, 1992; Schwab-Stone, Ayers, & Kaspro, 1995; Simon & Burns, 1997); and (d) a groundswell of efforts by individual social and applied scientists and interdisciplinary teams of researchers to develop new, and reframe existing, theories of urban neighborhoods and human development (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, & Aber, 1997; Moen, Elder, & Luscher, 1995; Sampson, 1999) and test innovative methodological and statistical procedures for examining the lives of families and children in multiple ecological contexts (Earls, McGuire, & Shay 1993; Robertson & Weir, 1998; Raudenbush & Sampson, 1999).

The decade's academic and applied research activities with regard to urban neighborhoods, families, and children led to a number of comprehensive literature reviews. Several focused on quantitative studies of urban neighborhoods and child outcomes and, to a limited degree, the impact of family structure and parental monitoring on this relationship (Gephart, 1997; Jencks & Mayer, 1990; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000). Others concentrated specifically on qualitative and ethnographic studies of family processes, low-income neighborhoods, and child development (Burton, Obeidallah, & Allison, 1996; Jarrett, 1998b). To date, no review has provided an integrated discussion of quantitative and qualitative studies, as well as conceptual and methodological issues, concerning the role of family structure and process in neighborhood effects and child development research. This article presents a synthesis and critique of relevant literature on the topic, devoting special attention to the conceptual, methodological, and empirical "place" of family in the prevailing discourse.

Paradoxically, our review of the literature indicates that although family has been a major focus of the contextual question of the decade, the conceptual and methodological treatment of family variables range from unspecified and vaguely implied to modestly defined and measured in most studies. We argue that, in part, this circumstance prevails because family scientists did not "weigh

in heavily" in neighborhood effects research efforts in the 1990s. Thus, we couch our review in the metaphor, "in the mix," connoting the designated centrality of family in the decade's prominent research question, "yet on the margins" in terms of both the modest theoretical and methodological specificity received by family variables in this line of research and family scientists' peripheral involvement in prevailing research efforts.

We begin our review with a brief description of the research designs used in recent quantitative and ethnographic studies on the topic. Next, we highlight the conceptual approaches and definitions of urban neighborhoods, family structure and process, and child development outcomes used in these studies. We then look intently at "the place" of family in this body of research. Specifically, we explore the role of structural and behavioral features of family and parenting as factors that impact the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child outcomes. We conclude our review and critique of the literature with recommendations for future research.

QUANTITATIVE AND ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDIES IN THE 1990S: A PROFILE OF RESEARCH DESIGNS

In tandem with Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn's (2000, p. 11) recent comprehensive review of survey and quasi-experimental research on neighborhoods and child development, the quantitative studies we evaluate represent a range of designs, including surveys that comprise national probability samples (Brewster, 1994; Chase-Lansdale, Gordon, Brooks-Gunn, & Klebanov, 1997); multicity studies of individuals and families (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1997; Elliott et al., 1996); city or regional studies on neighborhood effects (Ensminger, Lamkin, & Jacobson, 1996; Loeber & Wikstrom, 1993; Paschall & Hubbard, 1998; Spencer, Cole, Jones, & Swanson, 1997); neighborhood-based studies such as the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997); and experimental and quasi-experimental design studies in which families were randomly assigned to live in particular types of neighborhoods (Briggs, 1998; Ludwig, Duncan, & Hirschfield, 1998).

Most of the quantitative studies we examined test models in which family variables either mediate or moderate the influence of neighborhood effects on child outcomes (Cook, Shagle, & Degirmencioglu, 1997). Many of the data sets used

for these analyses have a limited repertoire of neighborhood and family variables and were not designed, *a priori*, to test such models.

Similar to quantitative studies, several of the qualitative and ethnographic studies we reviewed were not explicitly designed to explore the relationship among urban neighborhoods, family structure and process, and child outcomes, although the issue was addressed implicitly to some degree. These studies were primarily descriptive, representing a broad range of substantive foci, including family and kinship organization, parenting and childrearing practices, peer relationships, and schooling.

The studies included in this review are diverse in the ethnic and racial groups they involve, primarily featuring African Americans and including, to varying degrees, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, non-Hispanic Whites, and Asian immigrants. In the quantitative studies, Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans were often grouped indistinguishably under the ethnic categories of "Hispanic" or "Latino." Comparable ethnic grouping strategies were noted for Asian Americans and recent immigrants. Native American families were visibly absent in existing studies (Mitchell & Beals, 1997). Snipp (1996) indicated that the absence of Native Americans in urban neighborhoods is in part due to the reality that Native American families are more likely to live in rural, nonmetropolitan areas, and the few who do reside in large urban communities still consider the reservation their neighborhood or "homeplace" (John, 1998; Miller & Moore, 1979).

We also noted a significant limitation in the ethnographic studies relative to ethnic and racial comparisons and neighborhood quality. Many of the studies we reviewed did not focus equally on a range of urban neighborhood types (e.g., working class, suburban, "ghetto"). With the exception of Patillo-McCoy's (1998, 1999) recent ethnography of the neighborhood-based social life of middle-class African Americans and several ethnographies on middle-class Asian immigrants (Bacon, 1996; Min, 1998; Wong, 1998), most studies of ethnic and minority families were conducted in economically disadvantaged, unstable urban communities, whereas those involving non-Hispanic White families were conducted in stable, working-class neighborhoods (Freeman, 1995; Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, & Sameroff, 1999; MacLeod, 1995; Moore, 1991; Perez-Granados & Callanan, 1997). Comparable neighborhood selectivity biases and sample endogeneity

were noted in the quantitative studies we reviewed (Korbin, *in press*; Tienda, 1991).

CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVES: NEIGHBORHOODS, CHILD AND YOUTH OUTCOMES, AND FAMILIES

Conventional wisdom implies, and a number of studies suggest, that families play a major role in determining how urban environments impact the lives of their children. Nonetheless, conclusively identifying the precise paths through which families influence the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child outcomes was a significant challenge for researchers in the 1990s despite theoretical advances made in that decade. This challenge is particularly obvious in studies involving ethnically and racially diverse populations and comprising families with an array of culture- and situation-based family structures and processes. Burton (*in press*) and Duncan and Raudenbush (*in press*) have suggested that the challenge is mired in unmeasured neighborhood and family effects—the result, in part, of the multiple ways in which neighborhoods, families, and child and youth development have been conceptualized in existing empirical studies (Randolph, 1996).

Neighborhoods

During the 1990s several conceptual and methodological approaches were generated for studying neighborhood contexts and children. Jencks and Mayer (1990), in a now classic review, identified five theoretical frameworks for linking child outcomes with neighborhood effects: (a) neighborhood resources, which suggest that child outcomes are related to the level of resources (e.g., community centers, parks, day care) available in neighborhoods; (b) collective socialization, which proposes a relationship between child outcomes and the prevalence of neighborhood adults who can serve as role models and monitors of the behavior of neighborhood children; (c) the contagion or epidemic model, which posits that the negative behaviors of neighborhood peers strongly influences the spread of behavior problems among children in socioeconomic and racially homogeneous communities; (d) competition approaches, which argue that neighborhood effects on children are a function of community residents competing for scarce resources; and (5) relative deprivation models, which focus on how neighborhoods affect children and families via their evaluations of their circumstances relative to their neighbors and

peers. These five frameworks tend to focus on problem-based child and adolescent outcomes, differ with respect to the mechanisms through which neighborhoods influence child development, and often omit the active role that some families play in mediating negative neighborhood influences.

In terms of defining and measuring neighborhoods, Burton, Price-Spratlen, and Spencer (1997) described four approaches used in existing work: neighborhood as physical site, perception, network, and culture. Neighborhood as site, the most commonly used conceptualization, is concerned with the sociodemographic milieu (e.g., racial mix, poverty levels, crime rates) and the physical quality (e.g., housing density, street maintenance) of a designated geographic space. Within this approach, designated boundaries of neighborhoods are typically defined by the researcher and usually constitute a census-tract, school or health district, or a zip code area (Bennett, 1993; Chaskin, 1997; Sawicki & Flynn, 1996).

Consistent with the unmeasured effects argument, the site approach has two major weaknesses. First, site analyses are too often driven by the convenience of census or survey data aggregation and do not properly acknowledge the loss of family and individual variability resulting from it. Second, this approach has a limited range of accountability for the diversity of neighborhood influences on any given family or individual. For example, its reliance on the "contextual moment" minimizes the temporal rhythms and life cycles neighborhoods possess. Among other outcomes, this can result in a blindness to dynamic elements critical to the neighborhood-family-child interaction.

Neighborhood as perception involves individuals' personal evaluations of the boundaries, risks, social milieu, and quality of the geographic areas they define as their neighborhood. Social scientists who employ this perspective note that perceptions of a neighborhood, and how that neighborhood is experienced by individuals, vary in meaning and interpretation by gender and race, as well as across generations in families (Aneshensel & Sufcoff, 1996; Burton & Price-Spratlen, 1999; Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1996; Garbarino, Kostelny, & Dubrow, 1991; Lee & Campbell, 1997). Problems in interpreting neighborhood and family effects on children arise most often when parents' perceptions of neighborhoods, rather than the child's own perspective of neighborhood risks and opportunities, are used to predict child outcomes.

The network approach in neighborhood research emphasizes the primacy of interpersonal linkages in context. In doing so, the network model focuses on identifying the types and content of relations with others in the local area. This approach is most commonly employed in studies of neighboring and the structural features of social networks in neighborhoods (Yen & Kaplan, in press). To date, few studies have used this approach to explore the relationship among urban neighborhoods, families, and child and adolescent outcomes (Logan & Spitze, 1994).

Neighborhood as culture is concerned with symbolic meanings, including actions, beliefs, language, gossip, and rituals of daily life in a geographic space. This framework is primarily used in the ethnographic studies we reviewed (Anderson, 1990; Fordham, 1996; Fernandez-Kelly, 1994; Newman, 1992; Williams & Kornblum, 1994). This perspective's principal weakness involves the definition of neighborhood boundaries relative to the loci of local culture. Because culture can be fluid across geographic spaces, identifying its epicenter or assigning concrete street boundaries to its perimeter is difficult. Thus, determining the impact of neighborhood culture on child outcomes is complicated by the spatial diffuseness of culture.

Developmental Outcomes of Children and Adolescents

Most of the quantitative studies on urban neighborhoods, families, and children published in the 1990s are embedded in traditional linear theories of normative development. Developmental outcomes of interest included, but were not limited to, birth weight and physical health (O'Campo, Xue, Wang, & Caughy, 1997; Roberts, 1997); school readiness (Attar, Guerra, & Tolan, 1994; Chase-Lansdale et al., 1997; Duncan, Brooks-Gunn, & Klebanov, 1994); educational attainment (Buchel & Duncan, 1998; Clark, 1992; Dornbush, Ritter, & Steinberg, 1991; Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 1994; Gonzales, Cauce, Friedman, & Mason, 1996); depression (Dubrow, Edwards, & Ippolito, 1997; Simmons, Johnson, Beaman, Conger, & Whitbeck, 1996); childhood aggression (Kuperschmidt, Griesler, DeRosier, Patterson, & Davis, 1995); juvenile delinquency (Gottfredson, McNeill, & Gottfredson, 1991; Loeber & Wikstrom, 1993); antisocial behavior (Seidman et al., 1998); substance abuse (Allison et al., 1999); child abuse (Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999; Kor-

bin, Coulton, Chard, Platt-Houston, & Su, 1998); and teenage pregnancy (Billy, Brewster, & Grady, 1994; Brewster, 1994; Burton, 1995; Crane, 1991; Ku, Sonenstein, & Pleck, 1993).

Although normative domains of development are clearly important, a number of social scientists have questioned whether traditional theories of development are appropriate for studying the lives of minority children and adolescents growing up in high-risk urban neighborhoods (Randolph, 1996; Spencer, in press). In these environments, children and teens may attach different meanings to their roles and behaviors than do their mainstream counterparts, thus calling into question the relevance of outcome variables derived from traditional developmental approaches and applied to these populations (Ogbu, 1991; Seidman, 1991). This issue is particularly salient given that most research on urban neighborhoods, families, and child outcomes focuses on ethnic and racial minorities, specifically low-income African Americans.

Many of the ethnographic studies integrate contextually relevant as well as traditional normative approaches to development. For example, Burton, Obeidallah, and Allison (1996, p. 4), in a review of the ethnographic literature on development among inner-city African American teens, identified contextually relevant adolescent outcomes, such as the "revised American dream," commitment to religious and spiritual activities, and kin-care abilities, and established the relative importance of these outcomes for understanding families' expectations concerning their children's behavior in high-risk urban environments. Spencer (in press) and Sullivan (in press) discussed the survival function of hypermasculinity as a developmental outcome for male African Americans growing up in hyperghettos; they also underscored the challenges created by this attribute for men who manifest it in normative contexts such as schools. Jarrett (1998a, p. 4), in a synthesis of the qualitative literature on neighborhood effects and African American children, described "street" and "nonstreet" developmental pathways and their implication for parental monitoring strategies and the social mobility of youth.

What is most relevant about highlighting the range of traditional and contextually relevant developmental outcomes present in the literature is that a number of studies on urban neighborhoods, although testing important normative outcomes, do not explore alternative outcomes that are consistent with the realities of the children's and ado-

lescents' environment. Moreover, when only traditional outcomes are considered, particularly when deficit-models undergird the research, youth may be erroneously assigned aberrant attributions when in fact their behaviors represent a cadre of actions that fit contextual demands (South, in press; Spencer, in press). This issue has conspicuous implications for assessing the "place" of family in neighborhood effects research. The questions this issue generates are comparable to the "getting the context right" dilemma posed by Duncan and Raudenbush (in press): Do existing studies focus on the "right" child and adolescent outcomes? Is the "fit" between these outcomes and the family structure and process variables tested in neighborhood effects research a contextually relevant one?

Families: Structures and Processes

Family characteristics assessed in existing studies fall into three general categories: collectivist perspectives, family structure and socioeconomic indicators, and familial and parenting processes.

Collectivist perspectives adopt a broad community view of family akin to the African proverb, "It takes a village to raise a child" (Booth & Crouter, in press; Schorr, 1997; Stevenson, 1998). The construct most endemic to this perspective is *collective efficacy* (Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999). Collective efficacy is the extent to which social ties among community residents facilitate the collective monitoring of children relative to shared neighborhood norms and practices.

During the 1990s, collective efficacy, defined as neighborhoods that operate as "families" on children's behalf, experienced conceptual and empirical rebirth and prominence, most notably in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). In addition, it has become a guiding principle in neighborhood-based youth development programs (McLaughlin, Irby, & Langman, 1994; Tarlov & Pittman, 1994). Darling and Steinberg (1997), however, suggested that the relative importance of collective efficacy in the lives of children requires further empirical investigation, given that current research does not indicate the conditions under which integration into a "community family" operates in the child's best interest. Moreover, to date, researchers have not empirically assessed whether this collectivist construct is linked to family- and parenting-level variables.

The second category of family variables, structural and socioeconomic indicators, were principally used in large survey studies. The most common conceptualization of family structure used in these studies was a dichotomized construct that contrasts the effects of intact (e.g., both biological parents are present in the household) and nonintact (e.g., single-parent households) families relative to a specific child or adolescent outcome. Socioeconomic indicators included family income and poverty level (Bowen, 1996; Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Klebanov, & Sealand, 1993; Chase-Lansdale & Gordon, 1996; Corcoran & Adams, 1995; Crane, 1991; Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn, McCarton, McCormick, 1998; Vartanian, 1999) and parents' education and occupational status (Buchel & Duncan, 1998; Dubrow, 1997; Duncan, 1994).

A number of social scientists have argued that although family structure and socioeconomic indicators provide broad insights on the role of family in neighborhood effects research, these indicators are, in effect, omnibus variables comprising multiple unmeasured features of relevant family conditions (Burton, in press; Elder, Eccles, Adelt, & Lord, 1995). These unmeasured features most likely represent the mechanisms that produce true family effects relative to urban neighborhoods and child outcomes.

What might these unmeasured features of family be? To address this question, we relied on the existing handful of survey and experimental studies that explored family- and parental-level process variables relative to neighborhood effects, but most notably, we looked to the qualitative and ethnographic literature for possible answers.

THE "PLACE" OF FAMILY IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

In discussing the "place" of family in neighborhood effects and child outcomes research, it is important to note that few researchers explicitly defined, conceptually or operationally, the family processes they explored. Many of these domains were implicit in their work and thus "on the margins" with respect to conceptual and methodological specificity.

Neighborhood Effects on Child Development: The Domains and Paths of Family Influence

Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn (2000, p. 325) reported four main findings from quantitative stud-

ies of neighborhood effects on child and adolescent development: (a) there is a positive relationship between the socioeconomic status of neighborhoods (comprising indicators such as household incomes, high school drop out rates, levels of female headship and female employment, number of managerial and professional workers) and the school readiness, academic achievement, mental health, externalizing and internalizing behavior problems, and coital and fertility outcomes of children and adolescents; (b) "the most consistent neighborhood effects are reported in studies involving national samples as compared with city- and regional-based studies"; (c) "many studies report small to modest neighborhood effects and account for five upwards of ten percent of the variance in child and adolescent outcomes"; and (d) "family-level variables tend to be more strongly associated with child and outcomes than neighborhood-level variables."

With respect to the "place" of family in this body of research, debate continues concerning the precise domains and paths of family influences on the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child outcomes. Most social scientists agree that the child's age and gender indirectly affect, via family structures and processes, neighborhood influences on child development. Cook et al. (1997) and Duncan and Raudenbush (in press, p. 16) have suggested that family variables play two substantial roles in neighborhood studies: "as mediators that account for the "reduced form" effects of neighborhood conditions on youth outcomes" and "as moderators in which families and neighborhoods jointly influence youth outcomes." Spencer (in press) and South (in press, p. 4) have suggested a reciprocal relationship between neighborhoods and family with this question: "Are parenting strategies a direct reaction to neighborhood conditions, or are they a reaction to children's behavior which, in turn, is partly a function of neighborhood attributes?"

Whatever the analytic approach adopted by researchers, most studies suggest that family is "in the mix" relative to neighborhood effects and child development and the influence occurs at the family (e.g., households and extended kin networks) and parent (e.g., mother, father, primary care provider) levels. The following overview of these influences highlights ethnic and racial similarities and differences to the extent allowed by the literature.

TABLE 1. FAMILY LEVEL FEATURES AND RELEVANT STUDIES BY RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE STUDY SAMPLES

Feature	African American	Non-Hispanic Whites	Mexican American	Puerto Rican	Asian American
Structure and socio-economic indicators	Aber et al., 1998; Aneshensal & Sucoff, 1996; Bowen, 1996; Brewster, 1994; Brooks-Gunn et al., 1993, 1996, 1998; Chase-Lansdale et al., 1996; Corcoran et al., 1995; Coulton et al., 1995, 1996, 1997; Crane, 1991; Dubow et al., 1997; Duncan, 1994; Earls et al., 1994; Ensminger et al., 1996; Entwistle et al., 1994; Gonzales 1996; Gordon et al., 1997; Gottfredson et al., 1991; Klebanov et al., 1994, 1996, 1998; Kuperbin et al., 1996, 1998; Kuperbin et al., 1996, 1998; Lewisperschmidt et al., 1995; Lamborn et al., 1996; Lewis-Epstein, 1986; Ludwig et al., 1998; Paschall et al., 1998; Peoples & Loeber, 1994; Quane & Rankin, 1998; Sampson et al., 1997; Seidman et al., 1998; Stern & Smith, 1995; Sucoff, 1996; Vartanian, 1999	Aber et al., 1998; Aneshensal & Sucoff, 1996; Bowen, 1996; Brewster, 1994; Brooks-Gunn et al., 1993, 1996, 1998; Chase-Lansdale et al., 1996; Corcoran et al., 1995; Coulton et al., 1995, 1996, 1997; Crane, 1991; Dubow et al., 1997; Duncan, 1994; Earls et al., 1994; Entwistle et al., 1994; Klebanov et al., 1994, 1996, 1998; Kuperbin et al., 1996, 1998; Kuperbin et al., 1996, 1998; Lewis-Epstein, 1986; Ludwig et al., 1998; Paschall et al., 1998; Peoples & Loeber, 1994; Quane & Rankin, 1998; Sampson et al., 1997; Seidman et al., 1998; Stern & Smith, 1995; Sucoff, 1996; Vartanian, 1999	Aber et al., 1998; Aneshensal & Sucoff, 1996; Brooks-Gunn et al., 1993, 1998; Crane, 1991; Dubow et al., 1997; Gottfredson et al., 1991; Klebanov et al., 1994; Lamborn et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 1997; Seidman et al., 1998; Stern & Smith, 1995	Aber et al., 1998; Aneshensal & Sucoff, 1996; Brooks-Gunn et al., 1993, 1998; Dubow et al., 1997; Earls et al., 1994; Klebanov et al., 1994; Lamborn et al., 1996; Seidman et al., 1998	Aber et al., 1998; Aneshensal & Sucoff, 1996; Dubow et al., 1997; Lamborn et al., 1996; Seidman et al., 1998
Residential mobility	Briggs, 1998; Burton & Graham, 1998; Ensminger et al., 1996; Stack, 1996	Furstenberg, 1993	Gandara, 1995; Moore & Pinderhughes, 1993; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 1995	Alicea, 1997; Hidalgo, 1992; Sullivan, 1993; Toro-Morn, 1995; Volk, 1994, 1997	Kibria, 1993
Extended kin network	Anderson, 1990; Burton & Jayakody, in press; Davidson, 1993; Gordon et al., 1997; Jarrett, 1998b; Jarrett & Burton, 1999; Stack, 1996; Stevenson, 1998				
Family role flexibility	Anderson, 1990; Burton, Obaidallah, & Allison, 1996; Jarrett, 1998; Stack & Burton, 1993		Romo & Falbo, 1996		

TABLE 1. CONTINUED

Feature	African American	Non-Hispanic Whites	Mexican American	Puerto Rican	Asian American
Family routines	Burton, 1991; Jarrett, 1992		Gandara, 1995; Vigil, 1997	Soto, 1990; Volk, 1997	
Family protection strategies	Anderson, 1990; Brodsky, 1996; Burton, 1991; Burton & Graham, 1998; Cole & Hoffman, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995; Dubow et al., 1997; Edin & Lein, 1997; Fordham, 1993, 1996; Furstenberg, 1993; Punterney, 1997	Dubow et al., 1997	Dubow et al., 1997; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Vigil 1997	Bourgois, 1991, 1995; Dubow et al., 1997; Furstenberg, 1993	Dubow et al., 1997
Family orientation	Brodsky, 1996; Jarrett, 1992		Gandara, 1995; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 1995; Vigil, 1997	Alicea, 1997; Toro-Morn, 1995; Volk, 1997	
Ideology of distinctiveness	Brodsky, 1996; Fordham, 1993, 1996; Jarrett & Burton, 1999; Newman, 1999; O'Connor, 1997			Bourgois, 1991, 1995; Soto, 1990	

Family-Level Variables

The family-level variables that emerged in our review of the decade's quantitative and ethnographic studies of neighborhood effects include family structure and socioeconomic indicators, residential movements, extended kin networks, family role flexibility, family routines, family protection strategies, family orientation, and ideology of distinctiveness (see Table 1).

Family structure and socioeconomic indicators. As Table 1 illustrates, family structure and socioeconomic indicators have been the most commonly used family variables in neighborhood effects research, particularly studies involving African American and non-Hispanic White populations. Taken as a whole, these studies suggest that the effects of neighborhoods on child outcomes via family structural and socioeconomic characteristic are not uniform, and the number of replications of any one study has not been sufficient to conclusively support a particular relationship.

In effect, most of the studies that explore the impact of family structure and socioeconomic characteristics relative to neighborhood effects and child outcomes examine whether neighborhoods *or* families are more powerful predictors of child outcomes. Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, and Aber (1997), summarizing findings of five quantitative studies, noted that although neighborhood conditions were often significant predictors of children's development (depending on factors, including race, age, and gender of the child, and the outcome of interest), "the *size* of the estimated effects of neighborhood conditions were usually much smaller than the estimated effects of family structure and socioeconomic indicators were. For example, when available in the data, family income and mother's education were almost always fairly powerful predictors of children's cognitive development; these measures and family structure were usually significant predictors of behavioral development as well" (p. 281).

Researchers who use family structure and socioeconomic indicators acknowledge the "proxy" status of these variables and suggest that to unpack the influence of these indicators on neighborhood effects and child outcomes, more dynamic features of family should be tested in these models. Examples of more dynamic features include the fluidity of family structure, which comprises the frequency and pace of changes in family composition as a function of marriage, childbear-

ing, conjugal dissolutions, death, economic hardship, familial excommunication, or personal choice (Burton & Jayakody, in press; Jarrett & Burton, 1999) and the timing and persistence of a family's economic and social resources relative to neighborhood risks and opportunities (Duncan, 1994; Entwisle et al., 1994).

The Residential Moves of Families. Poverty, race, social mobility, and place are innate themes in neighborhood effects studies. Not surprisingly, they also are cornerstone constructs in residential mobility research. Recent state-of-the-art discussions of neighborhood effects have encouraged a marriage between the two (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, & Aber, 1997). Furstenberg and Hughes (1997), for example, suggested that residential mobility data, particularly length of time in the neighborhood, reasons for moving, and characteristics of the previous neighborhood, are aspects of family life that are critical to assessing the effects of neighborhoods on children.

To date, only a few studies have explored the impact of families' residential moves relative to neighborhood effects on child outcomes (Crane, 1991; Ensminger et al., 1996; Wood, Halfon, Scarlata, Newacheck, & Nessim, 1993). A guiding assumption of this research is that parents often move to better neighborhoods to reduce their children's involvement in "noxious neighborhood activities" (Long, 1992, p. 865). Several studies indicate, however, that although families change their children's residence by moving, they do not necessarily change the types of neighborhoods in which their children spend most of their time. For example, Solon, Page, and Duncan (1997) suggested that residential moves, particularly for economically disadvantaged families, occur between similar neighborhoods. Burton and Graham (1998), reporting findings from an ethnographic study of neighborhoods, families, and teenage pregnancy among African Americans, noted that when families moved to better neighborhoods, their teens frequently visited and retained strong ties with troubled peers in the previous neighborhood or other high-risk communities.

Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, and Aber (1997) noted that the most likely source of information for advancing knowledge on the impact of neighborhoods, families' residential moves, and child outcomes is housing demonstration data from the Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program (Kaufman & Rosenbaum, 1992; Rosenbaum, 1991) and the Moving to Opportunity Program (Briggs, 1998;

Galster & Killen, 1995; Ludwig et al., 1998). In these programs, low-income families are randomly assigned to reside in particular types of neighborhoods (e.g., suburban areas), providing unique opportunities to use a quasi-experimental design in examining the impact of neighborhood influences as they operate through the families' residential moves, and controlling for the unmeasured characteristics of families that previously allowed them to self-select into certain communities (Tien-da, 1991).

Extended kin networks. Ethnographic research suggests that using extended family models rather than dichotomous constructs of family structure provides crucial insights on how the compositional features of family mediate neighborhood effects on children. Extended families can include both blood and nonblood members related by marriage, adoption, and friendship, and sharing domestic and familial caregiving obligations. In many of the ethnographies we reviewed, groups of affiliated relatives were often found in highly functioning families and were able to assist children in circumventing the dangers of high-risk neighborhoods (Patillo-McCoy, 1999; Stevenson, 1998; Sullivan, 1993). Extended kin were frequently geographically dispersed within and across local neighborhoods and, in some cases, other states and countries (Alicea, 1997; Davidson, 1996; Stack, 1996; Toro-Morn, 1995). Center locales in the extended family system served as "outposts" as children and family members moved between households and regions.

Many strong and resilient families were embedded in networks with "better off" kin in these various locales. Extended kin networks, such as those described in Kibria's (1993) work with Vietnamese immigrant families, expanded the resource base of the poorer family members and their children and teens. Kin with higher socioeconomic status provided resources in the form of money, clothing, and housing, as well as access to resource-rich communities with a wider array of institutional, information, and economic assets (Gandara, 1995; Jarrett, 1999b). Extended kin members linked children and adolescents into institutions and social networks that facilitated optimal development.

Relative to other ethnic and racial groups, non-Hispanic White families exhibited the least geographic dispersal of kin networks. The geographic concentration of these kin groups in part reflected earlier patterns of immigration from Europe and

the attenuation of kin ties over several generations (Sullivan, 1989).

Family role flexibility. Families' ability to reassign roles as needed emerges in a few of the ethnographic studies as an important family domain relative to the study of neighborhood effects and child outcomes. This flexibility allows some families in high-risk environments to function with little external institutional support without compromising parents' ability to work and children's needs for contextual monitoring. Moreover, interdependence and team work are critical to the dual management of responsibilities and neighborhood dangers.

Jarrett's (1992) case study of a multigeneration family detailed how the youngest adult daughter in an extended family system took responsibility for the daily management of the household, caring for her sister's children (and her own), and nursing her ailing father. This woman's assumption of key family roles facilitated her mother's and sister's employment and the close monitoring of children and adults by kin. Anderson's (1990) observational study of an impoverished neighborhood blighted by drugs chronicled the important role of grandmothers. These women assumed a maternal role, taking full responsibility for the children of addicted parents. Burton (1991), in studies of drug-infested urban neighborhoods, found that uncles and great-grandfathers, as well as grandmothers, assume parenting roles for children, helping them to navigate the negative pulls of high-risk environments.

Family routines. According to a number of studies, families who avoid many of the stresses associated with residence in impoverished neighborhoods have a reoccurring and orderly schedule for executing domestic and household tasks (Clark, 1983). Soto's (1990) observational study of Puerto Rican American families with young children noted that a "feeling of organization" permeated these homes. Family routines resulted in "well-kept" households and meals prepared ahead of time. Findings from Volk's (1994) study of Puerto Rican American families were complementary. She observes that kindergarten-age children contributed to family routines—dusting and putting away groceries, among other activities.

Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn (2000) noted that in the past, the link between neighborhood effects and child outcomes vis-a-vis routines has not been empirically examined in quantitative studies, al-

though it is central to models of community socialization as proposed by Wilson (1987). There are several emerging and on-going national studies of welfare reform and families that are explicitly designed to test this issue, however (Winston et al., 1999).

Family protection strategies. Several studies underscore the point that families institute unit-based actions to safeguard members from the physical and moral dangers of impoverished neighborhoods (Duncan, 1996; Elder et al, 1995; Furstenberg et al., 1999; Peeples & Loeber, 1994; Richters & Martinez, 1993). Family members avoid dangerous sections of the neighborhood (Brodsky, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995); identify "safe" neighborhood "niches" (Furstenberg, 1993); carry out domestic chores during "safe" times (Burton, 1991; Burton & Graham, 1998); require older brothers, sisters, cousins, or family friends to accompany children on their daily rounds in and out of the neighborhood (Clark, 1983; Jarrett, 1998b); facilitate children staying in contact with their care givers via telephone contact or beepers (Edin & Lein, 1997); evade unconventional neighbors (Anderson, 1990); restrict neighborhood relations to "desirable" neighbors (Puntenney, 1997); and generate ruses to avoid home burglary and personal victimization (Jarrett, 1992). In addition, consistent with notions of collective efficacy, many families work with neighbors to institute group-based strategies to defend and survey neighborhoods, as well as to keep them socioeconomically segregated (DeSena, 1990).

Family orientation. In a handful of ethnographic studies, families who reject street values and emphasize a commitment to family relations are able to mediate the impact of high-risk neighborhoods on their children. Women in Brodsky's (1996) case studies of "resilient" single mothers stressed the importance of their homes as havens for themselves and their children. They also viewed themselves as "homebodies." Vigil's (1997) study of Mexican-descent youth exemplified family orientation in action. Family members shared "ethnic" meals, watched television, and participated in recreational and festive activities such as birthday parties, coming-of-age ceremonies, and father's day observances.

Ideology of distinctiveness. One of the strategies employed by families to survive and thrive in high-risk environments is to believe and act as

though they are distinct from their neighbors (Patillo-McCoy, 1999). This "ideology of distinctiveness" symbolically isolates families from disreputable neighbors and insulates them from the stigma associated with individual and neighborhood impoverishment. In the East Harlem Puerto Rican American neighborhood studied by Bourgois (1995) and the Harlem neighborhoods studied by Newman (1999), respectable families "shunned" the lifestyles of local drug dealers and unemployed residents who dominated the streets. Families in Fordham's (1996) case studies of high-achieving African American teens denigrated the lifestyles of nonmobile residents, viewing themselves as more ambitious and disciplined.

Parental-Level Processes

The parental-level factors we identified in the literature comprise the following: parental role commitment, generational role boundaries, parenting styles, resource-seeking behaviors, advocacy efforts, child-monitoring strategies, in-home learning strategies, and normative value orientations concerning education, social mobility and humanistic values (see Table 2).

Parental role commitment. Studies view the quality of and commitment to the parental role as a central variable in assessing the impact of family on the relationship between neighborhood effects and child outcomes. Jarrett (1997) noted that the sheltered development of promising children and youth relied on the dedication and commitment of at least one parent, usually a mother. Multiple accounts document the sacrifices made by mothers rearing children and teens in impoverished neighborhoods. Mothers in Fordham's (1996) study quit critically needed jobs to supervise and protect their adolescents "from the streets." Studies on the role of extended kin in the lives of families residing in economically disadvantaged contexts indicate that grandparents similarly left jobs to care for their grandchildren or to facilitate their adult child's employment or academic plans (Burton, 1995). Brodsky's (1996) work further identified mothers who sacrificed their own companionship needs to nurture the development of their daughters.

Generational role boundaries. A small number of studies specifically examine the impact of the generational age distance between parents and their children and the parents' ability to effectively help

their child or adolescent negotiate their environment (Burton, 1996). The more positive outcomes for children are noted when parents, in part as a function of a reasonable age distance (e.g., 21 years) between generations compared with a truncated one (e.g., 14 years), encourage superior-subordinate role distinctions between themselves and their adolescents.

Qualitative studies by Fordham (1996) and Romo and Falbo (1996) revealed that parents demand "respect" or make rules that are not to be questioned. These parents assert superiority by virtue of their status as parents. As a means to insure firm authority and compliance, mothers did not "run around" with their teens. Such behaviors enhanced mothers' abilities to enforce neighborhood regulations on their children. Mothers in Jarrett and Burton's (1999) research reinforced generational boundaries and, relatedly, respect, by differentiating their behavior from that of their children. Kibria's (1993) and Freeman's (1995) studies revealed that the focus on generational boundaries is particularly strong among Vietnamese immigrant families.

Parenting styles. Parenting styles are second only to structural and socioeconomic indicators and parental monitoring as important factors to consider in neighborhood effects and child development research (Alicea, 1997; Garbarino & Kostelny, 1993; Gonzales et al., 1996; Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Steinberg, 1996; Stern & Smith, 1995). Qualitative accounts of well-functioning families in urban neighborhoods document two key parenting styles: individualistic and communal (Jarrett, 1998b). Furstenberg's (1993) comparative neighborhood study of African American and Latino families with adolescents detailed the nature of the individualistic pattern. Some parents rear teens alone, receiving little or no assistance from other adults. They assert that neighbors cannot be trusted and assume full responsibility for their teen's development. For some of these families kin also are unavailable because of geographic distance (e.g., Puerto Rico) or lifestyle differences (involvement in drug dealing).

Jarrett's (1995) interviews with mothers of Head Start children detailed the communal pattern. Mothers in this study reared children with assistance from kin. Childcare responsibilities were dispersed among grandmothers, great-grandmothers, and aunts and sometimes took place in different households. Effective communal parent-

TABLE 2. PARENTAL LEVEL FEATURES AND RELEVANT STUDIES BY RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

Feature	African Americans	Non-Hispanic Whites	Mexican Americans	Puerto Rican	Asian Americans
Parental role commitment	Brodsky, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995; Edin & Lein, 1997; Jarrett, 1998	Edin & Lein, 1997	Gandara, 1995; Vigil 1997	Furstenberg, 1993	
Generational role boundaries	Brodsky, 1996; Burton, 1996; Fordham, 1993, 1996; Jarrett & Burton, 1999		Romo & Falbo, 1996		Freeman, 1995; Kibria, 1993
Parenting styles	Anderson, 1990; Brodsky, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995; Elder et al., 1995; Fordham, 1993, 1996; Furstenberg, 1993; Furstenberg et al., 1999; Jarrett, 1992, 1994, 1998; Spencer, 1999	Elder et al., 1995; Furstenberg, 1993; Furstenberg et al., 1999	Romo & Falbo, 1996; Vigil, 1997	Alicea, 1997; Furstenberg, 1993	
Parental resource seeking behaviors	Brodsky, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995; Furstenberg, 1993; Newman, 1999; Polakow, 1993; Punitenny, 1997; Williams & Kornblum, 1994	Furstenberg, 1993	Romo & Falbo, 1996	Furstenberg, 1993	
Parental advocacy efforts	Brodsky, 1996; Coley & Hoffman, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995; Fordham, 1993, 1996; Furstenberg, 1993; Furstenberg et al., 1999; MacLeod, 1995; O'Connor, 1997	Coley & Hoffman, 1996; Furstenberg, 1993; Furstenberg et al., 1999	Gandara, 1995; Okagaki & Frensch, 1995; Romo & Falbo, 1996	Furstenberg, 1993; Soto, 1990; Volk, 1994	
Parental monitoring strategies	Anderson, 1990; Brodsky, 1996; Burton, 1991; Coley & Hoffman, 1996; Cook & Fine, 1995; Darling & Steinberg, 1997; Davidson, 1997; Edin & Lein, 1997; Fordham, 1993, 1996; Furstenberg, 1993; Furstenberg et al., 1999; Jarrett, 1992; Korbin & Coulton, 1997; Patillo-McCoy, 1999; Punitenny, 1997; Quane & Rankin, 1998	Coley & Hoffman, 1996; Darling & Steinberg, 1997; Edin & Lein, 1997; Furstenberg, 1993; Furstenberg et al., 1999 Korbin & Coulton, 1997	Darling & Steinberg, 1997; Reese, et al., 1995; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Vigil, 1997	Furstenberg, 1993; Soto, 1990; Volk, 1994	Darling & Steinberg, 1997

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

Feature	African Americans	Non-Hispanic Whites	Mexican Americans	Puerto Rican	Asian Americans
In-home learning strategies	Cook & Fine, 1995; Fordham, 1996; MacLeod, 1995; Rosier & Corsaro, 1993		Gandara, 1995; Okagaki & French, 1995; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Perez-Granados & Callaman, 1997; Vigil, 1997	Soto, 1990; Volk, 1994, 1997	Freeman, 1995; Kibria, 1993
Stress on education and social mobility	Brodsky, 1996; Fordham, 1996; Jarrett, 1995; MacLeod, 1995; Newman, 1999; Williams & Kornblum, 1994		Gandara, 1995; Lucas, Henze & Donato, 1997; Reese et al., 1995; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 1995; Vigil, 1997	Soto, 1990; Volk, 1997; Williams & Kornblum, 1994	
Stress on humanistic values	Cook & Fine, 1995; MacLeod, 1995; Williams & Kornblum, 1994			Soto, 1990	

ing depended on accessible and trustworthy kin who shared similar lifestyles and values.

Other aspects of parenting styles deemed important in this area of research include the indicators of parental warmth, harshness, and control (Elder et al., 1995; Gonzales et al., 1996; Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn, & Duncan, 1994); parents' potential for violence and child abuse (Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999; Deccio, Horner, & Wilson, 1994; Earls et al., 1994; Korbin et al., 1998; Paschall & Hubbard, 1998) and the different socialization styles employed by parents for their male and female children and their young compared with their adolescent offspring (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; MacLeod, 1995; Rosier & Corsaro, 1993).

Parental resource-seeking behaviors. Parents' ability to locate opportunities for their children and teens is highlighted as critical in impoverished neighborhoods with relatively few resources. Rosier and Corsaro (1993) and Polakow (1993), detailed how African American mothers of preschool children used Head Start programs to enhance their children's development. Romo and Falbo's (1996) study of Mexican-descent teens, Williams and Kornblum's (1994) study of African American and Latino teens, and MacLeod's (1995) study of African American youth described the significant investment of time by parents in identifying institutional resources for their teens, such as after-school programs, youth social service agencies, tutoring programs, job training programs, and recreational and sports centers. Parents believe their investments will increase the likelihood of their offsprings' success.

Parental advocacy efforts. As part of their resource-seeking activities, parents not only identify supportive institutions and programs, but also ensure that their children and teens receive benefits from them. Two studies of parents of young children identified a collaborative form of advocacy. Okagaki and Frensch (1995) detailed how parents formed a partnership with school staff to enhance their children's prospects. These parents were in frequent contact with teachers and staff, discussing their children's progress. Similarly, Volk (1994) found that mothers of young children advocated on behalf of their children by volunteering in the classroom. As volunteers, parents could ensure that their children received their share of teachers' attention and time.

Other research has revealed more defensive patterns of parental advocacy. Parents in

O'Connor's (1997) study of African American high achievers actively challenged teachers who were unresponsive or withheld learning opportunities from their teens. Similarly, African American mothers interviewed by Cook and Fine (1995) scheduled meetings with "uppity" school staff when they believed that their children's educational needs were not being met.

Parental monitoring strategies. Perhaps more than any other parenting process, monitoring strategies have been the most extensively documented in the ethnographic literature. Korbin (in press) raised a major question here: Are parenting strategies a direct reaction to neighborhood conditions or to children's behavior, which, in turn, is partly a function of neighborhood attributes? In other words, are certain parenting strategies more effective in some neighborhoods than in others?

Parents use a variety of supervisory strategies to control the time, space, and friendships of their offspring and to protect them from neighborhood dangers (Coley & Hoffman, 1996; Sampson, 1992). Jarrett (1998b) indicated that parents use verbal accounts in the form of stories, homilies, discussion, chastisements, and conversations to caution children against undesirable peers (Brodsky, 1996; Mark, 1993; Romo & Falbo, 1996); encourage relationships with conventionally oriented peers (Korbin & Coulton, 1997); chaperone children and teens on their daily rounds in the neighborhood (Cook & Fine, 1995; Puntunney, 1997; Soto, 1990; Volk, 1994); confine young children to the household (Burton 1991; Reese, Goldenberg, Loucky, & Gallimore, 1995); institute curfews (Ensminger et al., 1996; Fordham, 1996; Romo & Falbo, 1996); restrict teens' out-of-home activities (Clark, 1983; Furstenberg et al., 1999); prohibit children from wearing specific clothing or playing with toys that may put them in a threatening situation in the neighborhood (Jarrett, 1995); and in extreme cases, send teens to live in safer neighborhoods (Davidson, 1996).

Significantly, the most capable parents institute monitoring strategies while their children are young and continue them through adolescence. Although parents are sometimes less restrictive with adolescents, they nevertheless are well informed of their teens' friendships, activities, and whereabouts at all times.

In-home learning strategies. To supplement poorly functioning neighborhood schools, several studies have suggested that capable parents institute

in-home activities that enhance the intellectual development of their children and teens. These studies reveal that parents of young children are most directly involved with their children's academic development (Gandara, 1995; Goldenberg, Reese, & Gallimore, 1992; Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994; Perez-Granados & Callanan, 1997; Reese et al., 1995; Rosier & Corsaro, 1993; Soto, 1990; Volk, 1994, 1997). Parents assist with school assignments, use everyday activities to impart academic skills, supervise trips to the library, teach children simple educational tasks (such as learning their numbers, writing their names, and reciting the alphabet), and facilitate language proficiency when English is the second language. Using Infant Health and Development Program data, Brooks-Gunn et al. (1993) indicated that part of the effect of neighborhood on preschool children's IQ at age 3 is mediated by the provision of learning experiences in the home and that the addition of the home variables to the model increases the variance as well.

Parents of teens, especially those with limited literacy skills, use comparable means to facilitate their offsprings' academic performance. They institute and supervise homework routines, endorse teacher directives and authority, provide school supplies, emphasize their teens' intelligence, and acknowledge satisfactory school progress (Clark, 1983; Fordham, 1996; MacLeod, 1995).

Stress on humanistic values. Successful parents actively monitor the moral life of their children and youth. Studies of children and teens highlight the values stressed by some inner-city parents who taught their offspring "super morals" that focus on self-respect, personal dignity, a concern for others, and hope for the future. Humanistic values are sometimes tied to religion and serve several functions. They bolster positive self-esteem, discourage adoption of the predatory and competitive street ethos that pervade social relations in impoverished neighborhoods, counter the stigma and denigration associated with neighborhood impoverishment, and give meaning to deprivation and struggle (Cook & Fine, 1995; MacLeod, 1995; Williams & Kornblum, 1994).

Stress on education and social mobility. As a means to escape impoverished neighborhood, parents emphasize the importance of education and hard work to their children and teens. Parents in the Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco (1995) study firmly believed that education was the key

to social and economic mobility. As Lucas, Duncan, and Hirschfield (1997) discovered, parents sometimes used their own lack of education and the hardship it entailed to encourage striving. Romo and Falbo (1996) found that siblings who had not completed school or who had become involved in street life were similarly used to encourage social mobility. The research of Reese et al. (1995) summarized a widely shared belief held by parents: "[Education] is the best inheritance that a parent can give a child" (p. 210).

More generally, Jarrett (1995) identified the "community bridging" pattern of socialization as a strategy to promote the social mobility prospects of children and teens. This pattern entails a parental focus on mainstream values of success and "getting ahead" and characterizes families from diverse ethnic and racial groups. Parental emphasis on conventional means of striving for their offspring challenges unconventional behaviors and values that truncates developmental trajectories.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this decade review was to discuss the "place" of family in the link between characteristics of neighborhoods and developmental outcomes for children. We provided an overview of research designs and conceptual approaches used in existing studies of urban neighborhoods, family, and child development outcomes. We then looked at the place of family in this body of research. Specifically, we explored the role of structural (e.g., household composition) and behavioral (e.g., daily routines) features of family and parenting in ethnically and racially diverse families as factors which impact the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child outcomes.

What did research in the 1990s tell us about family influences on the relationship between urban neighborhoods and child and adolescent outcomes? Our review supported the notion that family domains are "in the mix" with respect to neighborhood effects studies but clearly "on the margins" in terms of the modest theoretical and methodological specificity they often receive in this literature. In light of this circumstance, a major challenge facing researchers is how to resolve the dilemma of unmeasured family effects.

Unmeasured family effects emerge from a number of sources. In part, the unmeasured effects dilemma reflects inconsistencies across studies in the ways in which family, neighborhood, and child development domains are theoretically and

operationally defined in existing research. A second source concerns the lack of attention given to cultural and contextual perspectives of family processes, most notably in the quantitative studies we reviewed. Most of the quantitative and several of the qualitative studies were not explicitly designed, a priori, to explore the relationship among family, neighborhoods, and child outcomes and thus had a limited repertoire of relevant variables. This issue posed a measurement specificity and relevance conundrum, given that most of the neighborhood effects studies, to date, focus on low-income urban African American populations.

Working within the limitations of available variables, family structure and socioeconomic indicators frequently were used as family process proxies in the quantitative studies we reviewed. Although these indicators provided some insights to the place of family in this research, they left us wanting in terms of understanding how dynamic family processes impact the relationship between neighborhoods and child outcomes. Looking to qualitative and ethnographic data, we were able to identify family- and parental-level domains that may be important to consider in future research, particularly studies that involve ethnically and socioeconomically diverse populations. These domains should be viewed as suggestive, however, and require further theoretical discussion and testing to determine the role they play in neighborhood effects research.

To be sure, in the 1990s, academic and public concern about urban neighborhoods and children propagated an important context-family question, and the field is moving toward providing the answer(s) to it. To furnish the answer(s), however, future research will need to address several issues. First, developing new and reframing existing (e.g., collective socialization) conceptual frameworks to incorporate distinct, contextually and culturally relevant, and dynamic process features of family is imperative. These frameworks need not be restricted to testing mediating and moderating models of family effects. Rather, a series of alternative models should be explored.

Drawing on the insights gleaned from the ethnographic literature, a plausible line of research might involve examining the impact of parenting strategies on neighborhood environments. A related research question is: How do individualistic parenting strategies in a neighborhood impact larger neighborhood stability or decline? Other approaches include testing reciprocal models of influence and given that neighborhoods, families,

and children all have their own unique developmental courses, exploring the "goodness" of fit between these stages, for example, posing the question: How do older neighborhoods, with mid-life parents, and very young children influence each other's development?

Second, future studies need to move beyond the current focus on concentrated disadvantage and explore the relationship between neighborhood, family, and child development in understudied contexts and populations. Information on neighborhood effects relative to economically advantaged populations (DeFrances, 1996; Patillo-McCoy, 1999) is sorely needed, as is data on rural families (Davidson, 1995; Dill, 1999; Duncan, 1999; Elder & Conger, 2000; Fitchen, 1991; Snipp, 1996; Stack, 1996), young children (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, & Aber, 1997), the elderly (Cummings, 1998), and Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Asian American, and recent immigrant populations (Friedenberg, 1995).

Third, the study of neighborhood effects is an enterprise that requires interdisciplinary thinking and the integration of survey, quasi-experimental, and ethnographic methods. Several recently initiated studies involving ethnically and socioeconomically diverse populations in urban neighborhoods have adopted this perspective (Duncan & Raudenbush, in press; Winston et al., 1999). The initial promise of these studies is that they will wrestle with the unmeasured effects dilemma and, perhaps, move the field forward with respect to clearly defining the place of family in neighborhood effects research.

Our review of the literature suggests that there are many avenues to explore and much work to be done in discerning the place of family in neighborhood effects studies. Research conducted in the 1990s has primed the field to meet the challenge. We hope this review encourages more family scientists to participate actively in this discourse. Moving family from the margins in neighborhood effects research to theoretically and methodologically precise places in the mix is an assuredly worthy pursuit.

NOTE

Writing and research for this article were supported by grants to Linda M. Burton from the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R29 MH46057-01, RO1 MH49694-07, and RO1 HD36093-02); by support services provided by the Population Research Institute, The Pennsylvania State University, which has core support from National Institute of Child Health and

Human Development Grant 1-HD 28263; by a National Science Foundation Award for the Study of Race, Urban Poverty, and Social Policy at Northwestern University, a Hatch Award, a University of Illinois Research Board Award, and a Visiting Scholar Award from the Russell Sage Foundation to Robin L. Jarrett; and by a Faculty Scholars Award from the William T. Grant Foundation and grants from the Social Science Research Council's Program on the Urban Underclass to Linda M. Burton and Robin L. Jarrett. We extend thanks to Frank Avonilla, Davon Carter, Tera Hurt, Stephanie Jefferson, Marla Kibler, Monica McManus, Zena Mello, Romney Norwood, Aureen Roach, and Rachel Ryterske for their assistance in the preparation of the bibliographic materials for this article. We also wish to thank Sonya Salmon, Dawn Obeidallah, and members of the Social Science Research Council's Working Group on Communities, Neighborhoods, Families, and Individuals and the Family Research Consortium on Diversity, Family Process, and Child/Adolescent Mental Health for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this article.

REFERENCES

- Aber, J. L., Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Chaudry, N., & Samples, F. (1998). Resolving conflict creatively: Evaluating the developmental effects of a school-based violence prevention program in neighborhood and classroom context. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 187-213.
- Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R., Stults, B. J., Maran, G., & Zhang, W. (1999). Immigrant groups in the suburbs: A reexamination of suburbanization and spatial assimilation. *American Sociological Review, 64*, 446-460.
- Alicea, M. (1997). A chambered nautilus: The contradictory nature of Puerto Rican women's role in the social construction of a transnational community. *Gender and Society, 11*, 597-626.
- Allison, K. W., Burton, L., Marshall, S., Perez-Febles, A., Yarrington, J., Kirsh, L. B., & Merriwether-deVries, C. (1999). Life experiences among urban adolescents: Examining the role of context. *Child Development, 70*, 1017-1029.
- Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aneshensel, C. S., & Sucoff, C. A. (1996). The neighborhood context of adolescent mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 37*, 293-310.
- Armstead, P. J., & Wexler, M. B. (1997). *Community development and youth development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Attar, B. K., Guerra, N. G., & Tolan, P. H. (1994). Neighborhood disadvantage, stressful life events, and adjustment in urban elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 23*, 391-400.
- Bacon, J. (1996). *Lifelines: Community, family, and assimilation among Asian Indian immigrants*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, L. (1993). Rethinking neighborhoods, neighborhood research, and neighborhood policy: Lessons from uptown. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 15*, 245-257.
- Billy, O. J., Brewster, K. L., & Grady, W. R. (1994). Contextual effects on the sexual behavior of adoles-

- cent women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 387–404.
- Booth, A., & Crouter, A. C. (Eds.). (in press). *Does it take a village? Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bourgeois, P. (1995). *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowen, G. L. (1996). Poverty, neighborhood danger, social support, and the individual adaptation among at-risk youth in urban areas. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 641–666.
- Bradley, R. H. (1995). Environment and parenting. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (pp. 235–261). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brewster, K. L. (1994). Race differences in sexual activity among adolescent women: The role of neighborhood characteristics. *American Sociological Review*, 59, 408–424.
- Briggs, X. (1998). Brown kids in White suburbs: Housing mobility and the many faces of social capital. *Housing Policy Debate*, 9, 177–212.
- Brodsky, A. E. (1996). Resilient single mothers in risky neighborhoods: Negative psychological sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 24, 347–363.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., & Aber, J. L. (Eds.). (1997). *Neighborhood poverty* (Vols. I & II). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., Klebanov, P. K., & Sealander, N. (1993). Do neighborhoods influence child and adolescent development? *American Journal of Sociology*, 99, 353–395.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Klebanov, P. K., & Duncan, G. J. (1996). Ethnic differences in children's intelligence test scores: Role of economic deprivation, home environment, and maternal characteristics. *Child Development*, 67, 396–408.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., McCormick, M. C., Klebanov, P. K., & McCarton, C. (1998). Health care use of 3-year-old low birth weight premature children: Effects of family and neighborhood poverty. *Journal of Pediatrics*, 132, 971–975.
- Buchel, F., & Duncan, G. J. (1998). Do parents' social activities promote children's school attainments? Evidence from the German socioeconomic panel. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60, 77–90.
- Burton, L. M. (1991). Caring for children: Drug shifts and impact on families. *American Enterprise*, 2, 34–37.
- Burton, L. M. (1995). Family structure and nonmarital fertility: Perspectives from ethnographic research. *Report to congress on out-of-wedlock childbearing* (Pub. No. (PHS) 95-1257; pp. 147–165). Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- Burton, L. M. (1996). Age norms, the timing of family role transitions, and intergenerational caregiving among aging African American women. *Gerontologist*, 36, 199–208.
- Burton, L. M. (in press). One step forward and two steps back: Neighborhoods and adolescent development. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a village? Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Burton, L. M., & Graham, J. (1998). Neighborhood rhythms and the social activities of adolescent mothers. In R. Larson & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Temporal rhythms in adolescence: Clocks, calendars, and the coordination of daily life* (pp. 7–22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burton, L. M., & Jayakody, R. (in press). Rethinking family structure and single parenthood: Implications for future studies of African-American families and children. In A. Thorton (Ed.), *Family and child well-being: Research and data needs*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Burton, L. M., Obeidallah, D. A., & Allison, K. (1996). Ethnographic insights on social context and adolescent development among inner-city African-American teens. In R. Jessor, A. Colby, & R. Shweder (Eds.), *Ethnography and human development: Context and meaning in social inquiry* (pp. 395–418). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burton, L. M., & Price-Spratlen, T. (1999). Through the eyes of children: An ethnographic perspective on neighborhoods and child development. In A. Masten (Ed.), *Minnesota symposium on child psychology: Cultural processes in child development* (Vol. 29, pp. 77–96). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Burton, L. M., Price-Spratlen, T., & Spencer, M. (1997). On ways of thinking about and measuring neighborhoods: Implications for studying context and developmental outcomes for children. In G. Duncan, J. Brooks-Gunn, & L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Context and consequences for children* (Vol. II, pp. 132–144). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Gordon, R. A. (1996). Economic hardship and the development of five- and six-year-olds: Neighborhood and regional perspectives. *Child Development*, 67, 3338–3367.
- Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Gordon, R. A., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Klebanov, P. (1997). Neighborhood and family influences on the intellectual and behavioral competence of preschool and early school-age children. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Context and consequences for children* (Vol. I, pp. 79–118). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Chaskin, R. J. (1997, December). Perspectives on neighborhood and community: A review of the literature. *Social Service Review*, 521–547.
- Clark, R. (1983). *Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, R. (1992). *Neighborhood effects on dropping out of school among teenage boys*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Coley, R. L., & Hoffman, L. W. (1996). Relations of parental supervision and monitoring to children's functioning in various contexts: Moderating effects of families and neighborhoods. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 17, 51–68.
- Colley-Quille, M. R., Turner, S. M., & Beidel, D. C. (1995). Emotional impact of children's exposure to community violence: Preliminary study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34, 1362–1368.
- Cook, D. A., & Fine, M. (1995). Motherwit: Childbearing lessons from African-American mothers of low-income. In B. B. Wadener & S. Lubeck (Eds.), *Children and families "at promise"* (pp. 118–142). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Cook, T. D., Shagle, S. C., & Degirmencioglu, S. M.

- (1997). Capturing social process for testing mediational models of neighborhood effects. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Policy implications in studying neighborhoods* (Vol. II, pp. 94–119). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Corcoran, M., & Adams, T. (1995). Family and neighborhood welfare dependency and sons' labor supply. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 16*, 239–264.
- Coulton, C. J., Korbin, J. E., & Su, M. (1996). Measuring neighborhood context for young children in an urban area. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24*, 5–32.
- Coulton, C. J., Korbin, J. E., & Su, M. (1999). Neighborhoods and child maltreatment: A multi-level study. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 23*, 1019–1040.
- Coulton, C. J., Korbin, J. E., Su, M., & Chow, J. (1995). Community level factors and child maltreatment rates. *Child Development, 66*, 1262–1276.
- Crane, J. (1991). The epidemic theory of ghettos and neighborhood effects on dropping out and teenage childbearing. *American Journal of Sociology, 96*, 1226–1259.
- Cummings, S. (1998). *Left behind in Rosedale: Race relations and the collapse of community institutions*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cutright, P. (1995). Neighborhood social structures and lives of Black and White children. *Sociological Focus, 27*, 243–255.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1997). Assessing neighborhood effects using individual-level data. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty* (Vol. I, pp. 120–131). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Davidson, A. L. (1996). *Making and molding identity in schools: Student narratives on race, gender, and academic engagement*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Davidson, O. G. (1995). *Broken heartland: The rise of America's rural ghetto*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Deccio, G., Horner, W. C., & Wilson, D. (1994). High-risk neighborhoods and high-risk families: Replication research related to the human ecology of child maltreatment. *Journal of Social Science Research, 18*, 123–137.
- DeFrances, C. J. (1996). The effects of racial ecological segregation on quality of life: A comparison of middle-class Blacks and middle class Whites. *Urban Affairs Review, 31*, 799–809.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Parenting in two generations of Mexican American families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 16*, 409–427.
- DeSena, J. N. (1990). *Protecting one's turf: Social strategies for maintaining urban neighborhoods*. New York: University Press of America.
- Dill, B. (1999). *Poverty in the rural U.S.: Implications for children, families, and communities*. Literature review prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
- Dornbush, S. M., Ritter, L. P., & Steinberg, L. (1991). Community influences on the relation of family status to adolescent school performance: Differences between African Americans and non-Hispanic Whites. *American Journal of Education, 38*, 543–567.
- Dubrow, E. F., Edwards, S., & Ippolito, M. F. (1997). Life stressors, neighborhood disadvantage, and resources: A focus on inner-city children's adjustment. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 26*, 130–144.
- Duncan, C. M. (1999). *Worlds apart: Why poverty persists in rural America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Duncan, D. F. (1996). Growing up under the gun: Children and adolescents coping with violent neighborhoods. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 16*, 343–356.
- Duncan, G. J. (1994). Families and neighbors as sources of disadvantage in the schooling decisions of White and Black adolescents. *American Journal of Education, 103*, 20–53.
- Duncan, G. J., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Klebanov, P. K. (1994). Economic deprivation and early childhood development. *Child Development, 65* (2), 296–318.
- Duncan, G. J., & Raudenbush, S. (in press). Neighborhoods and adolescent development: How can we determine the links? In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a village? Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Earls, F., McGuire, J., & Shay, S. (1993). Evaluating a community intervention to reduce the risk of child abuse: Methodological strategies in conducting neighborhood surveys. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 18*, 473–485.
- Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). *Making ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., & Conger, R. (2000). *Children of the land: Adversity and success in rural America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., Eccles, J. S., Ardel, M., & Lord, S. (1995). Inner-city parents under economic pressure: Perspectives on the strategies of parenting. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 771–784.
- Elliott, D. S., Wilson, W. J., Huizinga, D., Sampson, R. J., Elliot, A., & Rankin, B. (1996). The effects of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent development. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33*, 389–426.
- Ensminger, M. E., Lamkin, R. P., & Jacobson, N. (1996). School leaving: A longitudinal perspective including neighborhood effects. *Child Development, 67*, 2400–2416.
- Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., & Olson, L. S. (1994). The gender gap in math: Its possible origins in neighborhood effects. *American Sociological Review, 59*, 822–838.
- Fernandez-Kelly, P. (1994). Towanda's triumph: Social and cultural capital in the transition to adulthood in the urban ghetto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 18*, 88–111.
- Fine, M., & Weis, L. (1998). *The unknown city: The lives of poor and working class young adults*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Fitchen, J. M. (1991). *Endangered spaces, enduring places: Change, identity, and survival in rural America*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity and success at Capital High*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Freeman, J. M. (1995). *Changing identities: Vietnamese Americans 1975–1995*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Freidenberg, J. (Ed.). (1995). *The anthropology of lower income urban enclaves: The case of East Harlem*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (1993). How families manage risk and opportunity in dangerous neighborhoods. In W. J. Wilson (Ed.), *Sociology and the public agenda* (pp. 231–258). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Furstenberg, F. F., Cook, T., Eccles, J., Elder, G. H., Jr., & Sameroff, A. (1999). *Managing to make it: Urban families in high-risk neighborhoods*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Furstenberg, F. F., & Hughes, M. E. (1997). The influence of neighborhoods on children's development: A theoretical perspective and a research agenda. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Context and consequences for children* (pp. 23–47). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Galster, G. C., & Killen, S. P. (1995). The geography of metropolitan opportunity: A reconnaissance and conceptual framework. *Housing Policy Debate*, 6, 10–47.
- Gambone, M. A. (1999). *Community action and youth development*. Queensland, Maryland: Aspen Institute Roundtable for Comprehensive Community Initiatives.
- Gandara, P. (1995). *Over the ivy walls: The educational mobility of low-income Chicanos*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Garbarino, J., & Kostelny, K. (1993). Neighborhood and community influences on parenting. In T. Luster & L. Okagaki (Eds.), *Parenting: An ecological perspective* (pp. 203–226). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Garbarino, J., Kostelny, K., & Dubrow, N. (1991). What children can tell us about living in danger. *American Psychologist*, 46, 376–383.
- Gephart, M. (1997). Neighborhoods and communities as contexts for development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. Duncan, & L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Context and consequences for children* (pp. 1–43). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Goldenberg, C., Reese, L., & Gallimore, R. (1992). Effects of literacy materials from school on Latino children's home experiences and early reading achievement. *American Journal of Education*, 100, 497–536.
- Gonzales, N. A., Cauce, A., Friedman, R. J., & Mason, C. A. (1996). Family, peer and neighborhood influences on academic achievement among African-American adolescents: One-year prospective effects. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24, 365–387.
- Gordon, R. A., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Matjasko, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1997). Young mothers living with grandmothers and living apart: How neighborhood and household contexts relate to multigenerational coresidence in African American families. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1, 89–106.
- Gottfredson, D. C., McNeill, R. J. M., III., & Gottfredson, G. D. (1991). Social area influences on delinquency: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*, 28, 197–226.
- Harvey, D. L. (1993). *Potter addition: Poverty, family, and kinship in a heartland community*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Jargowsky, P. A. (1997). *Poverty and place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1992). A family case study: An examination of the underclass debate. In J. Gilgun, G. Hande, & K. Daley (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in family research* (pp. 172–197). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1995). Growing up poor: The family experiences of socially mobile youth in low-income African American neighborhoods. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 10, 111–135.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1997). African American family and parenting strategies in impoverished neighborhoods. *Qualitative Sociology*, 20, 275–288.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1998a). African American children, families, and neighborhoods: Qualitative contributions to understanding developmental pathways. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2, 2–16.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1998b). *Indicators of family strengths and resilience that influence positive child-youth outcomes in urban neighborhoods: A review of quantitative and ethnographic studies*. Background paper prepared for the Neighborhood Transformation and Family Development Initiative of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
- Jarrett, R. L., & Burton, L. M. (1999). Dynamic dimensions of family structure in low-income African American families: Emergent themes in qualitative research. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 30, 177–188.
- Jencks, C., & Mayer, S. E. (1990). The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighborhood. In L. E. Lynn, Jr., & M. G. H. McGeary (Eds.), *Inner-city poverty in America* (pp. 111–186). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Jessor, R. (1993). Successful adolescent development among youth in high-risk settings. *American Psychologist*, 48, 117–126.
- John, R. (1998). Native American families. In C. H. Mindel, R. W. Habenstein, & R. Wright, Jr. (Eds.), *Ethnic families in America: Patterns and variations* (4th ed., pp. 382–421). New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Kasarda, J. D. (1993). Inner city concentrated poverty and neighborhood distress. *Housing Policy Debate*, 4, 253–302.
- Kaufman, J., & Rosenbaum, J. (1992). The education and employment of low-income Black youth in White suburbs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14, 229–240.
- Kibria, N. (1993). *Family tightrope: The changing lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Klebanov, P. K., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. J. (1994). Does neighborhood and family poverty affect mothers' parenting, mental health, and social support? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 441–455.
- Klebanov, P. K., Brooks-Gunn, J., McCarton, C., & McCormick, M. C. (1998). The contribution of neighborhood and family income upon developmental test scores over the first three years of life. *Child Development*, 69, 1420–1436.
- Korbin, J. (in press). Context and meaning in neighborhood studies of children and families. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a village: Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Korbin, J. E., & Coulton, C. J. (1997). Understanding the neighborhood context for children and families: Combining epidemiological and ethnographic approaches. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Context and consequences for children* (Vol. II, 65–79). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Korbin, J. E., Coulton, C. J., Chard, S., Platt-Houston, C., & Su, M. (1998). Impoverishment and child maltreatment in African American and European American neighborhoods. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 215–233.
- Kotlowitz, A. (1991). *There are no children here*. New York: Anchor.
- Ku, L., Sonenstein, F. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1993). Neighborhood, family, and work: Influences on the premarital behaviors of adolescent males. *Social Forces, 72*, 479–503.
- Kupersmidt, J. B., Griesler, P. C., DeRosier, M. E., Patterson, C. J., & Davis, P. W. (1995). Childhood aggression and peer relations in the context of family and neighborhood factors. *Child Development, 66*, 360–375.
- Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Steinberg, L. (1996). Ethnicity and community context as moderators of the relations between family decision making and adolescent adjustment. *Child Development, 67*, 283–301.
- Lee, B. A., & Campbell, K. E. (1997). Common ground? Urban neighborhoods as survey respondents see them. *Social Science Quarterly, 78*, 922–936.
- Leventhal, T. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of neighborhood residence upon child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 309–337.
- Loeber, R., & Wikstrom, P. H. (1993). Individual pathways to crime in different types of neighborhoods. In D. P. Farrington, R. J. Sampson, & P. H. Wikstrom (Eds.), *Integrating individual and ecological aspects of crime* (pp. 1169–1204). Stockholm, Sweden: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Logan, J. R., & Spitze, G. D. (1994). Family neighbors. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*, 453–476.
- Long, L. (1992). International perspectives on the residential mobility of America's children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*, 861–869.
- Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1997). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. In A. Darder, R. D. Torres, & H. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Latinos and education: A critical reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Ludwig, J., Duncan, G. J., & Hirschfeld, P. (1998). *Urban poverty and juvenile crime: Evidence from a randomized housing-mobility experiment*. Unpublished manuscript, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
- MacLeod, J. (1995). *Ain't no makin' it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income community*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Margolis, M. L. (1998). *An invisible minority: Brazilians in New York city*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mark, D. L. (1993). *High-achieving African American children in low-income families: The home learning environment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New York, Buffalo.
- McLaughlin, M. W., Irby, I. A., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries: Neighborhood organizations in the lives and futures of inner-city youth*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Melton, G. B. (1992). It's time for neighborhood research and action. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 16*, 909–913.
- Miller, D. L., & Moore, C. D. (1979). The Native American family: The urban way. In National Institute on Mental Health (Ed.), *Families and the outside world* (pp. 441–484). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Min, P. G. (1998). *Changes and conflicts: Korean immigrant families in New York*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mitchell, C. M., & Beals, J. (1997). The structure of problem and positive behavior among American Indian adolescents: Gender and community differences. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*, 257–274.
- Moen, P., Elder, G. H., & Luscher, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Moore, J. W. (1991). *Going down to the barrio: Homeboys and homegirls in change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Moore, J. W., & Pinderhughes, R. (1993). *In the barrios: Latinos and the underclass debate*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Newman, K. S. (1992). *The view from the corner: Neighborhood influences on children and adolescents*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Newman, K. S. (1999). *No shame in my game: The working poor in the inner city*. New York: Knopf and Russell Sage Foundation.
- O'Campo, P., Xue, X., Wang, M. C., & Caughy, M. O. (1997). Neighborhood risk factors and low birth weight in Baltimore: A multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*, 1113–1118.
- O'Connor, C. (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.
- Ogbu, J. (1991). Minority coping responses and school experience. *Journal of Psychohistory, 18*, 433–356.
- Okagaki, L., & Frensch, P. A. (1995). Parental support for Mexican-American children's school achievement. In H. I. McCubbin, E. A. Thompson, A. I. Thompson, & J. E. Fromer (Eds.), *Resiliency in ethnic minority families: Native and immigrant American families* (Vol. 1, pp. 325–342). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Paschall, M. J., & Hubbard, J. (1998). Effects of neighborhood and family stressors on African American male adolescents' self worth and propensity for violent behavior. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 66*, 825–831.
- Patillo-McCoy M. (1998). Sweet mothers and gangbangers: Managing crime in a Black middle-class neighborhood. *Social Forces, 76*, 747–774.
- Patillo-McCoy, M. (1999). *Black picket fences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pease-Alvarez, C. & Vasquez, O. (1994). Language socialization in ethnic minority communities. In F. Genese (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The*

- whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community (pp. 82–102). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Peeples, F., & Loeber, R. (1994). Do individual factors and neighborhood context explain ethnic differences in juvenile delinquency? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *10*, 141–157.
- Perez-Granados, D. R., & Callahan, M. (1997). Parents and siblings as early resources for young children's learning in Mexican-descent families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *19*, 3–33.
- Polakow, V. (1993). *Lives on the edge: Single mothers and their children in the other America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait (2nd ed.)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Puntenney, D. L. (1997). The impact of gang violence on the decisions of everyday life: Disjunctions between policy assumptions and community conditions. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, *19*, 143–161.
- Quane, J. M., & Rankin, B. H. (1998). Neighborhood poverty, family characteristics, and commitment to mainstream goals. *Journal of Family Issues*, *19*, 769–794.
- Randolph, S. M. (1996). Studying the role of family and school in the development of African American preschoolers in violent neighborhoods. *Journal of Negro Education*, *6*, 282–294.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Sampson, R. J. (1999). Econometrics: Toward a science of assessing ecological settings, with application to the systematic social observation of neighborhoods. *Sociological Methodology*, *29*, 1–41.
- Reese, L., Goldenberg, C., Loucky, J., & Gallimore, R. (1995). Ecocultural context, cultural activity, and emergent literacy: Sources of variation in home literacy experiences of Spanish-speaking children. In S. W. Rothstein (Ed.), *Class, culture, and race in American schools: A handbook* (pp. 199–224). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Richters, J. E., & Martinez, P. E. (1993). Violent communities, family choices, and children's chances. *Development and Psychopathology*, *5*, 609–627.
- Roberts, E. M. (1997). Neighborhood social environment and the distribution of low birthweight in Chicago. *American Journal of Public Health*, *87*, 597–603.
- Robertson, J. G., & Weir, K. R. (1998). Using geographic information systems to enhance community-based child welfare services. *Child Maltreatment*, *3*, 224–234.
- Romo, H. D., & Falbo, T. (1996). *Latino high school graduation: Defying the odds*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Rosenbaum, J. (1991). Black pioneers—do their moves to the suburbs increase economic opportunities for mothers and children? *Housing Policy Debate*, *2*, 1179–1213.
- Rosier, K. B., & Corsaro, W. A. (1993). Competent parents, complex lives: Managing parenthood in poverty. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *22*, 171–204.
- Sampson, R. J. (1992). Family management and child development: Insights from social disorganization theory. In J. McCord (Ed.), *Facts, frameworks, and forecasts: Advances in criminological theory* (Vol. 3, pp. 63–93). New Brunswick, NJ: Transition Press.
- Sampson, R. J. (1999). What "community" supplies. In R. Ferguson & W. T. Dickens (Eds.), *Urban problems and community development*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review*, *64*, 633–660.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*, 918–924.
- Sawicki, D. A., & Flynn, P. (1996). Neighborhood indicators: A review of the literature and assessment of conceptual and methodological issues. *Journal of American Planning*, *62*, 165–183.
- Schorr, L. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America*. New York: Doubleday.
- Schwab-Stone, M., Ayers, T. S., & Kaspro, W. (1995). No safe haven: A study of violence exposure in an urban community. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *34*, 1343–1352.
- Seidman, E. (1991). Growing up the hard way: Pathways of urban adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *19*, 173–205.
- Seidman, E., Yoshikawa, H., Roberts, A., Chesir-Teran, D., Allen, L., Friedman, J. L., & Aber, J. L. (1998). Structural and experiential neighborhood contexts, developmental stage, and antisocial behavior among urban adolescents in poverty. *Development and Psychopathology*, *10*, 259–281.
- Simmons, R. I., Johnson, C., Beaman, J. J., Conger, R. D., & Whitbeck, L. B. (1996). Parents and peer group as mediators of the effect of community structure on adolescent behavior. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *24*, 145–171.
- Simon, D., & Burns, E. (1997). *The corner: A year in the life of an inner-city neighborhood*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Snipp, C. M. (1996). Understanding race and ethnicity in rural America. *Rural Sociology*, *61*, 125–142.
- Solon, G., Page, M. E., & Duncan, G. J. (1997). *Correlations between neighboring children in their subsequent educational attainment* (Mimeo). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Soto, L. D. (1990). *Families as learning environments: Reflections on critical factors affecting differential achievement*. Technical Report, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- South, S. J. (in press). Issues in the analysis of neighborhoods, families, and children. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a village? Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spencer, M. B. (in press). Resiliency and fragility factors associated with the contextual experiences of low resource urban African American male youth and families. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a village? Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spencer, M. B., Cole, S. P., Jones, S. M., & Swanson, D. P. (1997). Neighborhood and family influences on young urban adolescents' behavior problems: A multisample, multisite analysis. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J.

- Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty* (Vol. I, pp. 200–218). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Stack, C. B. (1996). *Call to home*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stern, S. B., & Smith, C. A. (1995). Family processes and delinquency in an ecological context. *Social Service Review*, 69, 703–731.
- Stevenson, H. C. (1998). Raising safe villages: Cultural-ecological factors that influence the emotional adjustment of adolescents. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24, 44–59.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (1995). *Transformations: Immigration, family life, and achievement motivation among Latino adolescents*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Suocff, C. A. (1998). Neighborhood context and the risk of childbearing among metropolitan-area black adolescents. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 571–585.
- Sullivan, M. L. (1989). *Getting paid: Youth crime and work in the inner city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sullivan, M. L. (1993). Puerto Ricans in Sunset Park, Brooklyn: Poverty amidst ethnic and economic diversity. In J. Moore & R. Pinderhughes (Eds.), *Poor Latino communities in the United States: Beyond the underclass debate* (pp. 1–26). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sullivan, M. L. (in press). Hyperghettos and hypermasculinity: The phenomenology of exclusion. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a village: Community effects on children, adolescents, and families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tarlov, S. M., & Pittman, K. (1994). *Integrating youth participation and neighborhood development: Expressions from the field*. Washington, DC: Center for Youth Development and Policy Research, Academy for Educational Development.
- Tienda, M. (1991). Poor people in poor places: Deciphering neighborhood effects on poverty outcomes. In J. Huber (Ed.), *Macro-micro linkages in sociology* (pp. 244–262). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Toro-Morn, M. (1995). Gender, class, family, and migration: Puerto Rican women in Chicago. *Gender and Society*, 9, 706–720.
- Valdes, G. (1996). *Con respto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.
- Vartanian, T. P. (1999). Childhood conditions and adult welfare use: Examining neighborhood and family factors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 225–237.
- Vigil, J. D. (1997). *Personas Mexicanas: Chicano high schoolers in a changing Los Angeles*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College.
- Volk, D. (1994). A case study of parent involvement in the homes of three Puerto Rican kindergartners. *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 14, 89–113.
- Volk, D. (1997). Questions in lessons: Activity settings in the homes and school of two Puerto Rican kindergartners. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 28, 22–49.
- Williams, T., & Kornblum, W. (1994). *The uptown kids: Struggle and hope in the projects*. New York: G. P. Putnam.
- Wilson, W. H. (1998). *Hamilton Park: A planned Black community in Dallas*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W. J., Quane, J. M., & Rankin, B. H. (1998). The new urban poverty: Consequences of the economic and social decline of inner-city neighborhoods. In F. R. Harris & L. A. Curtis (Eds.), *Locked in the poorhouse: Cities, race, and poverty in the United States*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Winston, P., Angel, R., Burton, L., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Cherlin, A., Moffitt, R., & Wilson, W. J. (1999). *Welfare, children, and families: A three city study. Overview and design*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wong, B. P. (1998). *Ethnicity and entrepreneurship: The new Chinese immigrants in the San Francisco Bay Area*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wood, D., Halfon, N., Scarlata, D., Newacheck, D., & Nessim, S. (1993). Impact of family relocation on children's growth, development, school function, and behavior. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 270, 1334–1338.
- Yen, I., & Kaplan, G. (in press). Neighborhood social environment and risk of death: Multilevel evidence from the Alameda County Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*.
- Zhou, M. (1992). *Chinatown: The socioeconomic potential of an urban enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.