

**Coached for the Classroom
Parents' Cultural Transmission and Children's Reproduction of Educational
Inequalities**

Abstract

While scholars typically view class socialization as an implicit process, this study shows that cultural transmission involves the active efforts of both parents and children.

Through observations and interviews with children, parents, and teachers, I found that middle-class and working-class parents—in light of status differences in their relationship to the school—had different beliefs about appropriate classroom conduct. Those beliefs prompted parents to coach their children to adopt class-stratified approaches to problem-solving, and those deliberate coaching efforts prompted even reluctant children to activate the kinds of class-based strategies that generate stratified profits. Such findings suggest that the transmission of class-based culture is less implicit than scholars typically recognize, and that these dynamic processes play a critical role in the reproduction of social inequalities.

Children are not passive players in the reproduction of social inequalities. We know that children's classroom behaviors vary with social class, and that those behaviors generate stratified profits (Calarco, 2011; Farkas, 1996; Streib, 2011). Less clear is how children learn to activate class-based strategies. Scholars typically treat this cultural acquisition as an implicit process in which children automatically adopt stratified habits in response to class-based childrearing practices (Arnett, 1995; Heath, 1983; Lareau, 2011). In reality, however, and given research highlighting parents' active management of children's lives (Edwards, 2004; Lareau, 2000; Nelson, 2010) and children's active resistance to parents' desires (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Pugh, 2009), cultural transmission may actually involve more agency than implicit socialization models tend to imply. Furthermore, if parents do deliberately coach children to adopt class-based strategies, then a key question to ask is why. While scholars typically link class-based childrearing patterns to differences in parents' work roles (Kohn, 1969), parents' positions in the status hierarchy (Bourdieu, 1990; Lareau, 2011) may also their beliefs about how children should behave at school.

To investigate these possibilities, this study examines how parents actively transmit culture to their children, how children respond to those efforts, and how those responses generate stratified profits in school. I conducted in-depth interviews with middle-class and working-class children, their parents, and their teachers and in-school observations of the children during third, fourth, and fifth grade. I found that parents contributed to the reproduction of inequalities by actively equipping their children with class-based strategies that yielded stratified profits when activated at school. In light of

their relationships with their children's schools and their beliefs about teachers' expectations for appropriate conduct, middle-class and working-class parents adopted different approaches to managing their children's challenges at school. They also coached their children to adopt similar approaches. Specifically, working-class parents stressed "no-excuses" problem-solving, encouraging children to respect teachers' authority by not seeking help. Middle-class parents instead taught children to solve problems "by any means," urging them to negotiate with teachers for assistance and accommodations. These ongoing and often deliberate coaching efforts also equipped even reluctant children with the tools needed to activate class-based strategies on their own behalf. Such activation, in turn, prompted stratified responses from teachers, and thus helped to ensure children's unequal advantages in school.

These findings have important implications. First, and in contrast to socialization models of social class and social reproduction, this study suggests that children learn to activate class-based strategies through a cultural transmission process that involves active efforts of both parents and children. Second, this study helps to explain class-stratified childrearing patterns, showing how parents' efforts reflect beliefs stemming from their positions in the social hierarchy. Third, this study shows that by recognizing the agency in parent-child relationships, we can better understand family processes like cultural transmission and social reproduction.

CLASS, CULTURE, AND THE REPRODUCTION OF INEQUALITIES

Scholars conceptualize culture in myriad ways ((Small, Harding, & Lamont, 2010). In this analysis, I conceptualize culture as a “tool kit” that includes both “strategies of action” (Swidler, 1986) and “logics of action” (DiMaggio, 1997). Strategies of action are specific skills or behaviors for use in social situations (Bourdieu, 1990; Lareau & Weininger, 2003). Logics of action, in turn, are specific frames for interpreting situations and choosing which strategies to deploy (Harding, 2007; Small, 2004). This view of culture is useful in that recognizes that individuals might behave differently in the same situation because they possess different strategies for use in that situation and/or because they interpret that situation in different ways.

While cultural tool kits divide along numerous dimensions (e.g., gender, age, race and ethnicity), much of the research in this area has focused on social class (Bourdieu, 1990; Lareau, 2000). We know, for example, that middle-class and working-class individuals tend to perceive themselves differently in relation to schools and other dominant institutions, and also possess different strategies for navigating interactions in those settings (Brantlinger, 2003; Horvat, Weininger, & Lareau, 2003; Lareau, 2000).

Although there are various ways to operationalize social class (Lareau & Conley, 2008), I distinguish social classes by their educational and occupational attainment (Aschaffenburg & Maas, 1997; Condron, 2009). These factors play a critical role in shaping how individuals perceive and interact with their worlds (Lamont, 1992, 2009; Lubrano, 2004; Stuber, 2012). Compared to their working-class counterparts, middle-class individuals tend to be more familiar with dominant institutions and feel a stronger

sense of belonging in those settings (Carter, 2005; Khan, 2010; Lareau, 2000; Lubrano, 2004). They also see themselves as equal or greater in status relative to institutional professionals, and are thus more comfortable demanding accommodations from them (Brantlinger, 2003; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 2000).

From a toolkit perspective, culture is also closely linked to inequalities. These inequalities result from a convergence or “cultural mismatch” (Bourdieu, 1990; Lareau & Weininger, 2003; Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson, & Covarrubias, 2012) between individuals and institutions. Within a social setting, activating a particular strategy of logic of action will generate profits if that strategy or logic aligns with the culture of that setting. Poorly aligned strategies and logics, in turn, will produce little or no advantages, and may even result in sanctions. Research on family-school relationships shows, for example, that middle-class parents are better able to comply with schools’ expectations for appropriate parental involvement (Brantlinger, 2003; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 2000). In doing so, these parents also secure advantages for themselves and their families (Lee & Bowen, 2008; Roksa & Potter, 2011).

Yet, it is not simply adults who are able to reap the benefits of cultural convergence. Rather, *children’s* own classroom interactions can also generate unequal advantages. Children often behave in class-patterned ways, and those behaviors help to reproduce inequalities (Heath, 1983; Nelson & Schutz, 2007; Streib, 2011). Calarco (2011) finds, for example, that middle-class children more readily voice their needs and preferences in the classroom. These proactive efforts attract teachers’ attention more immediately and thus generate more support from them.

These inequalities, in turn, may result not from differences in teachers' expectations for middle-class and working-class students (Alexander, Entwisle, & Thompson, 1987; Rist, 1970), but from a convergence between student culture and the culture of the school. Studies show, for example, that schools expect students to behave in "middle-class" ways (Carter, 2005; Farkas, 1996; Mehan, 1980; Wren, 1999). Middle-class students, in turn, come to school already equipped with the strategies and orientations that teachers value, while working-class students are forced to play catch-up (Bernstein, 1990; Foley, 1990; Lubienski, 2000). As a result, middle-class students are better able to comply with teachers' expectations and reap the benefits—including higher grades and higher competence ratings from teachers—of doing so (Farkas, 1996; Jennings & DiPrete, 2010; Tach & Farkas, 2006).

What research on culture and classroom interactions has not examined, however, is how children learn to activate these different strategies, or how they acquire the cultural frames that guide them in doing so. Instead, scholars tend to imply that children acquire class-based culture through an implicit process of socialization. These socialization models are useful, but also limited in important ways.

FAMILIES AND THE REPRODUCTION OF INEQUALITIES

From a socialization perspective, cultural transmission is an involuntary process in which children passively internalize class-based culture to which they are exposed at home (Arnett, 1995; Maccoby, 1992). We know, for example, that middle-class and working-class parents tend to adopt different childrearing styles, and that those styles are

correlated with children's adoption of class-based cultural logics and strategies (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Edwards, 2004; Heath, 1983). Lareau (2011) finds that when middle-class parents allow their children to negotiate and assert themselves, the children display an "emerging sense of entitlement." Working-class parents, in turn, emphasize obedience and deference to authority, and their children demonstrate an "emerging sense of constraint." Lareau concludes from these patterns that children's behaviors are an implicit and automatic response to class-based childrearing practices. .

Such socialization explanations are incomplete, however, as they ignore the possibility of a more active cultural transmission process (Elder, 1974; Pugh, 2009; Thorne, 1993). Lareau (2000, 2011), for example, provides rich evidence of social class differences in family life, but does not describe the cultural frames—e.g., beliefs about schooling or goals for children—that guide parents' childrearing decisions. Nor does she examine how children behave in parents' absence, or how children's activation of class-based strategies contributes to larger patterns of inequality.

While scholars have documented families' agency in other arenas, little is known about active processes driving class-based cultural transmission. Studies show, for example, that middle-class parents engage in goal-oriented efforts to intervene for their children at school (Brantlinger, 2003; Lareau, 2000; Nelson, 2010), and that working-class parents carefully manage their families' identities (Edwards, 2004). Yet, we do not know why parents' efforts divide along social class lines or how parents might try to equip children with class-based strategies and logics for interpreting and managing challenges on their own behalf. Similarly, while research shows that children can be less

than compliant with parents' wishes (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Pugh, 2009; Zelizer, 2002), we know little about how children might gradually come to adopt and utilize parents' class-based lessons. In sum, while existing research highlights important social class differences in childrearing patterns, children's behaviors, and the profits that result from them, we know little about how the active efforts of parents and children contribute to cultural transmission and the reproduction of social inequalities.

RESEARCH GOALS AND METHODS

My goal is to address these gaps in our understanding by examining how parents prompt their children to activate class-based behaviors that contribute to broader patterns of inequality. I do so by answering the following research questions:

1. How do parents' understandings of appropriate classroom behavior vary with social class?
2. How do parents' actively teach children class-based behaviors?
3. How do children come to activate parents' preferred behaviors?
4. How does this activation reproduce social inequalities?

I answer these questions with data from a longitudinal, ethnographic study of middle-class and working-class, white families whose children attended the same elementary school.

Research Site and Sample

Maplewood (all names are pseudonyms) is a public elementary school near a large, Eastern city (see Figure 1). While most of Maplewood's families are middle-class, many (~30%) are working-class. This allowed me to compare how middle-class and working-class parents and children interacted with each other and with the same teachers. My connections to the community (a close relative is a Maplewood employee) helped me gain access to the site and facilitated acceptance of the project.

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

At Maplewood, I chose one cohort (four classrooms) of students to follow from third to fifth grade. The minority population at Maplewood was small and stratified, including middle-class Asian Americans and working-class Latinos. Thus, to avoid conflating race and class, I focused on white students. I also excluded students who moved away. See Table 1 for sample characteristics and recruitment procedures.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

I used surveys and school records to identify students' social-class backgrounds, grouping by their parents' educational and occupational status (Aschaffenburg & Maas 1997; Condrón 2009). Middle-class families had at least one parent with a four-year college degree and at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation.

Working-class families did not meet these criteria; parents typically had high-school diplomas and worked in blue-collar or service jobs. These were “settled-living” families (Edwards, 2004; Rubin, 1976) with steady jobs, stable relationships, and neat, clean homes. There were, however, a few single-parents in both class groups. While these parents sometimes felt overwhelmed with responsibilities, their efforts to teach children closely paralleled those of two-parent families from similar class backgrounds.

Research Methods

The three-year study included in-school observations, in-depth interviews with children, parents, and teachers, parent surveys, and analyses of students’ school records. Table 2 provides details. I observed during the students’ third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade school years. During this time, I visited Maplewood at least twice weekly, with each observation lasting approximately three hours. I divided time equally between the four classrooms in each grade and rotated the days and times I observed each class. During observations, I used ethnographic jottings to document interactions I observed and to record pieces of dialog from my informal conversations with teachers and students. After each observation, I expanded these jottings into detailed fieldnotes.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Ethnographers must make hard choices. In this study, I focused my three years of observations in classrooms so as to see the payoff of parents’ efforts. As a result, the

study does not include systematic home observations. Still, I was able to observe parent-child interactions during school events and during interviews in family homes. These observations corroborated the numerous reports of parent-child “coaching” that I gathered from interviews with children, teachers, and parents.

All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. I used these interviews to understand children’s home lives, school experiences, and interactions with parents, teachers, and classmates. When speaking with parents and students, I concluded each interview by asking interviewees to respond to four vignettes. These vignettes described typical classroom challenges (e.g., “Jason is struggling to understand the directions on a test”), and were based on situations that I had observed or learned about through conversations with teachers. With each vignette, I asked interviewees to describe how the characters should respond to the situation (e.g., “What do you think Jason should do?”). I also asked participants to discuss similar experiences in their own lives. I then coded these open-ended responses and used them to compare respondents’ attitudes across social-class and generational lines. I present the results of some of these comparisons to highlight patterns documented in the larger ethnographic study.

Data Analysis

I conducted an ongoing process of data analysis, regularly reviewing fieldnotes and interview transcripts, writing analytic memos (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995), and identifying emerging themes in the data. I used the memos to reflect on preliminary findings, discuss connections to existing research, and pose additional questions.

After creating a preliminary coding scheme from themes in the memos, I used ATLAS.ti to code sections of fieldnotes, interview transcripts, documents, and seating charts. While coding, I also developed data matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to clarify comparisons and identify disconfirming evidence.

PARENTS ADOPTING STRATEGIES OF ACTION

Before examining parents' coaching of class-based strategies, it is important to understand how social class shapes these efforts. Research highlights social-class differences in parents' interactions with their children (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Lareau, 2011) and with schools (Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 2000; Nelson, 2010). Yet, scholars say little about the origins of such patterns. At Maplewood, I found that middle-class and working-class parents had different strategies for managing problems at school. Parents' positions in the status hierarchy shaped their familiarity and relationships with the school, and also led them to adopt different class-based logics of action for interpreting the "appropriate" form of behavior in those settings.

Middle-Class Parents: Modeling By-Any-Means Problem-Solving

Middle-class parents adopted a by-any-means approach to solving problems with their children's schooling. They actively intervened to request support and accommodations, lobbying to have children tested for gifted or special needs programs and often writing notes excusing their children from homework and other activities. Ms. Bell sent this note to her son's third-grade teacher when he left his homework at school:

Dear Paula,

Aidan forgot his homework folder yesterday. As a result, he was not able to do his homework last night. I will have him complete it this evening. I apologize for the inconvenience. Last night I had him read and do math problems from a workbook to replace homework time. Again, sorry he won't be prepared today.

Susan

Middle-class parents seemed to intervene out of a belief that interventions had real benefits. Ms. Nelson, for example generally required students to stay in for recess if they forgot their homework. Given Ms. Bell's note, however, Ms. Nelson allowed Aidan to submit the homework the next day with no penalty.

Middle-class parents adopted this by-any-means approach to problem-solving because they interpreted classroom interactions through a logic of entitlement. In light of their educational and occupational attainment, middle-class parents perceived themselves as equal or greater in status relative to children's teachers. As a result, they were very comfortable speaking up and questioning teachers' judgments regarding classroom assignments, ability group placements, testing procedures, and even homework policies. One interview vignette described a student, "Brian," who came home complaining about being "bored" in math class. As Table 3 shows, parents' responses to this vignette divided sharply along social class lines. While all of the middle-class parents saw the situation as requiring immediate requests for accommodations from the teacher, working-

class parents instead tended to view deference to teachers' judgments as the appropriate response.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

When asked open-ended questions about how Brian's parent should respond in this situation, all of the middle-class parents said either that they would talk to the teacher, or that they would have Brian talk to the teacher, instead. Ms. Matthews' response was typical of middle-class parents:

I would ask for a higher math class. I think that would be the obvious first step. And if that's not a possibility, then I think asking for additional work, or asking if Brian could mentor one of the other children. That way he could use the knowledge that he has to help another child learn. I think that would be a good lesson for him.

Although the teachers worked hard to determine the appropriate math level for each student, Ms. Matthews, like many middle-class parents, perceived herself as a better judge of her child's needs. These parents also believed they were entitled to negotiate with teachers, and saw such requests as an "obvious first step." At Maplewood, teachers were reluctant to change students' placement. Due to their parents' persistence, however, many middle-class students (but no working-class students) were moved up in that way.

Middle-class parents' logic of entitlement reflected both their educational and occupational attainment and their insider status at Maplewood. While many of the

middle-class mothers at Maplewood were full-time parents, even employed mothers were highly involved at school, running volunteer programs, bake sales, and evening events that raised more than \$50,000 annually for the PTO. In light of their involvement, middle-class parents were often deeply familiar with school expectations, procedures, and personnel. They also readily exchanged this information with other (typically middle-class) parents during play-dates, soccer games, school events, and phone conversations. As a result, middle-class parents knew the sequence and timing of state assessments, the weekly schedule of their children's classes, and the procedures for requesting accommodations. They also understood that—unlike when they were in school—teachers had come to value proactive efforts on the part of both parents and students. As Ms. Shore, who works full-time but contacts her children's teachers regularly by email, explained:

It's become more than just a gentle encouragement. It's official. You're a high-quality learner if you're willing to ask questions when you have one, and the [teachers] actually reward the asking.

Middle-class parents recognized that although their own teachers might have balked at such requests, school expectations had changed over time. They assumed that teachers valued and rewarded proactive help-seeking, and thus adopted a logic of entitlement in parent-school interactions.

Working-Class Parents: Modeling No-Excuses Problem-Solving

Unlike their middle-class counterparts, working-class parents adopted a no-excuses approach to educational challenges. In light of their limited educational and occupational attainment, working-class parents generally trusted the school to decide what was best for their children. Even when working-class parents were frustrated with the outcomes of teachers' decisions, they tended not to intervene. Ms. Campitello's son Zach, for example, often went to school without having completed his assignments. In our interview, Ms. Campitello explained that while she had tried to help Zach with homework, both she and Zach struggled with the material. Tears brimming in her eyes, she recalled:

Zach gets so frustrated that he just won't do it. And I tried, but it was really, really hard. It got to the point, honestly, where I just gave up.... I wish the teachers would just help him at school. Cuz they get this stuff. They know what the kids are supposed to be doing.

Ms. Campitello believed that the school could do more to help Zach with homework and with his understanding of the material. Yet, like other working-class parents, she did not inform Zach's teachers or ask for additional support.

Working-class parents adopted this no-excuses approach to problem-solving because they interpreted classroom interactions through a logic of constraint. They perceived themselves as less knowledgeable than "expert" educators, and thus did not seem comfortable questioning teachers' judgments. Responding to the Brian vignette, for example, none of the working-class parents said that they would ask the teacher to move

Brian to a higher math level (see Table 3). Similarly, in second grade, Ms. Trumble noticed that her son, Jeremy, was not reading as well as his older siblings had at that age.

Ms. Trumble worried, but she did not intervene:

I thought maybe there was something wrong, but I didn't wanna say anything. I think the teachers are pretty good. If there's any kind of problem, I think they'd jump on it right then and there to help. Like [in Kindergarten] they figured out that Jeremy had some speech problems and they got him into speech therapy.

Even when their children were struggling, working-class parents “didn't wanna say anything.” They assumed that teachers had a better understanding of children's academic needs, and that they as non-professionals were not equipped to influence decisions about children's schooling.

Working-class parents' logic of constraint reflected both their educational and occupational attainment and their outsider status at Maplewood. Unlike their middle-class counterparts, working-class parents had limited involvement in their children's schooling: they occasionally attended conferences or concerts, but spent much less time volunteering, and even the few working-class parents who did not work full-time were not a regular presence at school. As a result, working-class parents tended not to be very familiar with school expectations, procedures, and personnel. This lack of familiarity was compounded by the fact that working-class parents tended to have few social connections with teachers or other Maplewood parents. Without inside information, working-class parents tended to rely on their own experiences in school as a guide to teachers'

expectations. During an interview, Mr. Graham remembered a formative incident from fifth grade:

...the teacher gave us a test and *none* of us understood. We were like, “What are you talking about?” I mean, it was like she thought she explained it clear as day. And we read it, but it just didn’t *jive*.ⁱ

When I asked Mr. Graham what happened next, he continued, shaking his head:

Well, she was upset because we asked her about it. She yelled at us, cuz she just didn’t understand why we didn’t get it! That was a rough little time in school. I mean, a number of us were upset about it, crying upset about it. I think I probably took the brunt of it, cuz I was the one that challenged her.

While the teachers at Maplewood did reprimand students for offenses like being off-task, name-calling, and running in the hallways, I never saw a teacher punish a student for seeking help. Middle-class parents, by virtue of their insider involvement, recognized that school expectations around question-asking had changed over time. Working-class parents, drawing only on their own school experiences, assumed that teachers would perceive personal requests as disrespectful, and thus tended to adopt a logic of constraint in parent-school interactions.

PARENTS COACHING STRATEGIES OF ACTION

Parents’ class-based logics shaped not only their comfort interacting with teachers, but also their beliefs about the appropriate way to manage challenges at school. Such beliefs, in turn, prompted parents to coach their children to activate similar

strategies in their own interactions with teachers. Although these coaching exchanges were generally serendipitous rather than planned, their messages were more deliberate and their intended consequences were more explicit than research on social class and childrearing tends to imply (Arnett, 1995; Heath, 1983; Lareau, 2011).

Middle-Class Parents: Coaching By-Any-Means Problem-Solving

Middle-class parents actively coached their *children* to adopt a by-any-means approach to dealing with classroom challenges. In first grade, for example, Danny Rissolo was being “bullied” by a classmate. As Ms. Rissolo explained:

The kid he was sitting next to was a bully, and was making fun of him. Danny wanted me to fix it for him, but I said to him, ‘You know what Danny, I’ll do that for you, but I want you to do something first. I want you to go to Ms. Girard, and say something like “Ms. Girard, can I talk to you for a minute?”’ I said, ‘Ask her what she thinks you should do.’ At first [Danny] was like: ‘You want me to do all that?’ And I said: ‘You can do it! You’re a smart guy. You’re very articulate. You can do this. And if it’s still a problem, I’ll call her also, but you need to do this first.’

Smiling, Ms. Rissolo went on to describe proudly how Danny—barely seven years old at the time—successfully convinced Ms. Girard to change his seat and move him away from the bully:

Well, he did it. He talked to Ms. Girard and asked her what she could do. And she was able to say: ‘You know what, I’m gonna be changing where

you're all sitting next week. Why don't we change tomorrow instead? And no one has to know why.' And his problem went away. And so he saw, he learned, early on, how to advocate for himself.

Ms. Rissolo could have just contacted Ms. Girard on Danny's behalf. Instead, and like other middle-class parents at Maplewood, she coached her son to seek assistance for himself.

Middle-class parents' coaching efforts reflected their belief that children should draw on all available resources when managing problems at school. In interviews, these parents stressed that children should be comfortable approaching teachers with questions and requests for individualized support. These beliefs were particularly apparent in middle-class parents' responses to an interview vignette describing "Jason's" struggles to understand a question on a science test. As Table 4 shows, parents' responses to this vignette divided sharply along social class lines. Middle-class parents all stressed that Jason should solve the problem by-any-means, while all of the working-class parents emphasized a no-excuses approach.

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

When asked how they thought Jason should respond, all of the middle-class parents said that Jason should "go to the teacher" for help. Ms. Long, for example, expressed sentiments commonly echoed by middle-class parents.

Jason should ask the teacher to clarify for him. Cuz if Jason was having the problem then everybody else is probably having the same problem. You want a kid to be able to answer the question, to make sure that he understands, rather than just not doing anything. So I think Jason should ask the teacher and the teacher should tell the whole class.

Like Ms. Long, the middle-class parents at Maplewood generally believed that children should readily seek assistance, and that teachers are obligated to provide such support.

As with Danny and the bully, middle-class parents' active coaching efforts equipped their children to activate by-any-means problem-solving strategies. This can also be seen with an example from the Giordano family. When Gina Giordano began getting Bs and Cs on tests in fourth grade, Gina's parents coached her to go to her teacher for help:

We always tell her, "You go up and you talk to the teacher. You find out – you don't use your friends. You go to the teacher and find out." Like, Gina was [struggling]...and I told her, "Well, go ask your teacher what that means. That's your resource."

Parents' active coaching efforts inspired middle-class children to "use their resources" when confronting problems in school. Gina, for example, recognized that her parents taught her strategies to utilize in managing problems for herself:

Like, I was having trouble staying organized, and I kinda talked to my parents about it. They told me to go talk to my teacher, Ms. Hudson.[So]

I asked her if she could help me with my organization and stuff, [and] ...
she just brought me to the back of the class and showed me a few things.

I also regularly observed Gina enacting these strategies at school. During a fifth-grade math class, Gina was working with her (middle-class) partner Beth. Following instructions, Gina and Beth found a recipe (for six servings), and using what they had learned about multiplying fractions, tried to determine how much of each ingredient they would need to feed 25 people. These complex calculations soon had the girls arguing. Frustrated, they sought out Ms. Dunham.

As they approach, Gina calls out loudly, “Ms. Dunham!” Ms. Dunham turns, and Gina begins to explain. “We don’t really get how to do this. We don’t know what we need to multiply by to get to twenty-five servings.” Ms. Dunham walks them through the process of multiplying the amount of each ingredient by $25/6$, and then reducing each fraction to its simplest form.

Gina could have continued working or asked a classmate for help. Instead, she went straight to the teacher. In doing so, Gina drew on the by-any-means problem-solving strategies that she learned from her parents’ instruction at home. As with most of the middle-class students, I also observed Gina become more confident in deploying those strategies over time.

Working-Class Parents: Coaching No-Excuses Problem-Solving

Unlike their middle-class counterparts, working-class parents coached their children to adopt a no-excuses approach to problem-solving. Ms. Trumble, for example, noted that her son Jeremy sometimes “will forget stuff.” She went on to describe how she uses these situations to teach Jeremy to be more responsible.

And I’ll say, “You have to tell your teacher that you forgot it, and stay in for recess and get it done then.” And that’s what he ends up doing. Because I tell him, “There’s nothing I can do. You forgot your homework. I don’t know what it was.”

These explicit messages seemed to lead Jeremy to activate a no-excuses approach when managing problems at school. In fifth grade, the day his book report was due, Jeremy arrived without it.

Slumping into his seat between Riley and Alan (both middle-class students), Jeremy laments, “I finally finished my book report last night, and then I left it at home...” Riley, head cocked, looks at Jeremy. She asks, puzzled, “Can’t your mom bring it for you?” Jeremy drops his chin down and shakes his head. “She has to work, so if I forget things, she says it’s my responsibility.” Riley blinks, bewildered. Later, when Ms. Dunham checks his homework, Jeremy apologizes and admits that he does not have his project. Ms. Dunham says disappointedly: “You’ll have to stay in for recess.”

In similar situations, middle-class students generally adopted a by-any-means approach, asking to call a parent to bring in the assignment or to receive an extension on the deadline. Like other working-class students, however, Jeremy followed his mother's instructions and accepted his punishment without excuse.

Working-class parents' coaching efforts reflected their belief that children should draw only on their own resources and avoid inconveniencing teachers by asking for help. These beliefs were particularly apparent in working-class parents' responses to the interview vignette describing Jason's struggles with the science test. After reading this vignette, working-class parents typically responded by saying that Jason should just work hard and try his best (see Table 4). As Ms. Marrone explained:

Jason should just try his best. I tell my kids to work hard. And they all learned how to do it. Like with Shawn, he reads better now. So he doesn't ask me for help as much. Like, he can do his homework by himself now.

Some working-class parents believed that help-seeking would undermine their children's willingness to work hard. Others noted that children might "get in trouble" for seeking help, and thus encouraged their children to "skip it and come back" or wait for the teacher to offer assistance, instead. Although they varied somewhat in their reasoning, working-class parents consistently emphasized that children should avoid proactively making requests.

As with Jeremy and the forgotten project, parents' active coaching efforts helped to equip working-class children to activate no-excuses problem-solving strategies. This can also be seen with an example from the Graham family. In an interview, for example,

Mr. Graham recalled a problem with his daughter Amelia's report card in third grade. As they read the report card together, Amelia noted to her father that one of the teacher comments "didn't seem to make sense." As Mr. Graham recalled: "I told Amelia not to ask about it, cuz the teacher probably wouldn't be too happy." Explaining this approach, Mr. Graham noted:

I just want my kids to be respectful and responsible.... My kids, I always told 'em: 'Look, if you've gotta give somebody a hard time, give it to me. Don't give it to your teachers. Don't give it to other parents.' And I've never had a teacher complain. Or, if my kids go and play at somebody else's house, I've never had a parent say: 'Your child can't come back.' You know? My kids are good for the teachers and for other parents.

These active coaching efforts taught working-class children to work hard and avoid "complaining" when confronting problems in school. In my conversations with teachers, they would often complain to me about middle-class students' "lack of problem-solving skills" and their reluctance to tackle difficult challenges. In these same conversations, teachers would often praise working-class students like Shawn and Amelia for their "work-ethic."

This willingness to work hard and avoid excuses was readily apparent in working-class students' management of challenges at school. Near the end of the year, for example, the fifth- graders invited their parents to attend an outdoor "rocket day" event marking the culmination of their study of space exploration. The students had spent class time assembling and decorating plastic model rockets, readying them for launch at the

event. On the big day, the students, giddy with excitement, waited in four lines on the field behind the school. Teachers and parent volunteers helped them load tubes of explosives into their rockets. The children launched the models using a remote device. After watching their rockets fly about 100 yards across the playground, they retrieved them and re-joined the line to try again.

Although there are many parents milling around, Amelia's parents are at work. After her launch, Amelia retrieves her rocket and jogs slowly back toward the line, a crestfallen look on her face. Amelia is holding her rocket in one hand and the rocket's parachute in the other. The string attaching the parachute to the rocket broke during the flight. Rather than rejoin the line, Amelia sits down in the grass by herself. Her face set tight with concentration, Amelia tries to fix the rocket, carefully tying and retying the broken string.

As Amelia worked, Ted Peters, a middle-class student, ran toward the line. Instead of joining his classmates, Ted veered off, approaching his mother, who was chatting with other parents.

Ms. Peters turns, smiles broadly, and praises Ted for a "great flight." Ted, frowning, holds out his rocket and explains that the string attaching the rocket's parachute has broken. After inspecting the broken string, Ms. Peters says encouragingly, "Go ask Mr. Fischer for a new string. I'm sure he'll be able to help." Ted's grim expression brightens. He turns and dashes toward his teacher. When Mr. Fischer sees the broken string, he retrieves an

extra string from a supply bin and helps Ted reattach the parachute. Ted then immediately rejoins the line to launch his rocket again.

While Amelia eventually succeeded in tying the two broken ends of the string, it took her much longer. Ted immediately rejoined the line, stepping in behind the friend who had gone before him in the first round. As a result, Ted got to launch his rocket four times, while Amelia only got to launch hers twice. Despite this setback, however, Amelia did not complain or ask to move ahead in line. In doing so, and like other working-class students, Amelia drew on the no-excuses problem-solving strategies that she learned from her parents' instruction at home.

PARENTS TEACHING LOGICS OF ACTION

Given the possibility of children's resistance to parents' intentions (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Pugh, 2009), parents engaged in deliberate and ongoing efforts to teach children not only different strategies of action for managing challenges, but also different logics of action to use in deciphering the "appropriate" strategy for a given situation. Effectively, parents taught children to see the world—or at least the classroom—through their eyes. These coaching exchanges were rarely planned; instead, they tended to occur as a natural response to situations as they arose. Yet, parents did convey their messages deliberately, doing so not only by passively modeling different orientations, but also by actively shaping how children viewed themselves and their teachers. Through repeated exposure to such messages, even reluctant children tended to gradually adopt their

parents' logics and to use them as a guide in activating the "appropriate" strategy of action.

Middle-Class Parents: Teaching Entitlement

Middle-class parents actively encouraged their children to adopt a logic of entitlement in their interactions at school. They did so by teaching their children first, to feel deserving of support, and second, to recognize the benefits of entitlement and its by-any-means approach to problem-solving. As Ms. Matthews insisted:

I really feel like [my kids] need to have those skills... to be able to talk to [the] teacher to understand and to work through those problems. When you get into a boss situation, your mom doesn't call and say, "Sorry my daughter doesn't understand what she's supposed to come and do today at work." You know, you need to learn how to do that! And if you don't start at this stage, it makes it more difficult and then you get fired! So I tell my kids, "It's okay to ask those questions in that setting. This is a place where you go every day. You talk to this teacher every day. He's invested in your interests." And once they learn to overcome that hurdle, it becomes easier to then deal with asking for [other things].

Like other middle-class parents, Ms. Matthews stressed to her children both the benefits of help-seeking (e.g., you might get fired if you do not seek help) and their deservingness of support (e.g., the teacher is invested in your interests). In doing so, she actively

encouraged her children to develop a sense of entitlement in managing problems at school.

Messages emphasizing entitlement to support helped middle-class children—and especially shy children—to overcome reluctance around help-seeking. Keri Long’s mother, for example, realized early on that Keri was hesitant to seek assistance from teachers. She recounted this incident:

Keri was doing well in third grade. She had straight A’s until this one math test [on which Keri got a C]. She came down [from studying in her room] and said, ‘I’m confused about this.’ And I said, ‘Go talk to your teacher about it! You need to tell your teacher this is what you need help with.’

Despite her mother’s strategy-based coaching, Keri did not ask for help. Ms. Long, shaking her head in exasperation, continued:

She didn’t have the power in her to do it. To say: ‘I need help.’ ... And that brought her grade down! She got a C on the test and it brought her down.... Which, to me, was very upsetting, because I told her, ‘Go! Get help!’ And she just... I dunno. Keri’s very timid, very shy. I’m trying to teach her to look up and shake hands. That adults aren’t scary and that the teachers are there to help her. It’s getting better, but it’s taken her a really long time.

Although Keri was reluctant to follow her mother’s instruction, Ms. Long was not deterred. Like other middle-class parents, Ms. Long continued to work with Keri, repeatedly stressing that Keri deserved assistance and that the “teachers are there to help her.” Over time, and in light of such persistent encouragement, even very shy middle-

class children became more comfortable negotiating with teachers. From third to fifth grade, for example, I watched Keri grow more confident in these interactions. One day, Ms. Dunham's fifth-graders were working on a social studies test, using their books to answer short-answer essay questions about the Civil War. One question asked students to identify a main event and describe its significance.

Before setting the students to work, Ms. Dunham calls out "Use your resources. But it's open book, not open neighbor!" After working for a few minutes, Keri picks up her textbook and carries it with her as she approaches Ms. Dunham's desk. Pointing at a passage in the book, she asks quietly, "Does this count as a main event?" After glancing at the book, Ms. Dunham explains, "This is a good event, but you probably want to look for something larger." Ms. Dunham then helps Keri recall some significant events they discussed in class.

In an interview, Keri linked her increasing comfort with help-seeking to her mother's encouragement, explaining: "My mom tells me that I should do it [ask for help]. And so I usually go and ask Ms. Dunham." With time and intensive coaching from their parents, even very shy middle-class children gradually adopted a sense of entitlement to support. In doing so, they also developed the confidence needed to activate a by-any-means approach to problem-solving.

Messages about the benefits of entitlement and its by-any-means approach to problem-solving also helped to alleviate reluctance among middle-class children who worried that help-seeking might cause others to perceive them as "dumb." With a worried

frown, Ms. Dobrin described how she and her husband regularly remind their son Ethan of the importance of help-seeking:

Ethan's teacher evaluations always said, "He's a joy. He's bright. He's making great grades, but he needs to ask for help sometimes." Now, I don't think asking for help is comfortable for Ethan, but what we try to impress on him is, "Think about how *important* it is that you get that information. If you *need* that information to do the job correctly, then you *need* to ask the teacher."

Initially Ethan did not like seeking help: as a high-achieving student, he worried that help-seeking would prompt others to question his abilities. Given Ethan's reluctance, the Dobrin's worked with him repeatedly. They would stress the importance of help-seeking and "coach him to flag a teacher down, or get up and go talk to the teacher during a test." These messages, in turn, helped middle-class children to adopt a logic of entitlement and to view help-seeking primarily through its benefits. By fifth grade, for example, Ethan seemed very comfortable voicing his needs. I regularly watched him ask teachers to extend deadlines, clarify directions, and even provide assistance during tests. During the spring of fifth grade, Mr. Fischer's class was taking a math test. Mr. Fischer circled, glancing at students' work and answering questions about the test.

Ethan taps his pencil eraser lightly against his cheek, frowning. As Mr. Fischer circles past, Ethan calls out quietly but hopefully, "Mr. Fischer?" Mr. Fischer immediately stops and turns toward Ethan, asking with genuine concern, "You okay?" Ethan shrugs and admits that he is not sure if he is

interpreting a question correctly. Squatting down, Mr. Fischer does not give Ethan the answer, but helps him recognize his mistake. Ethan nods, quickly finishing the problem correctly.

Ethan's logic of entitlement seemed to prompt him to activate this by-any-means approach to problem-solving. Responding to my question about why he asked for help on occasions like that one, Ethan explained:

I didn't want to guess and risk getting it wrong. I don't want to get it wrong, because then I won't get as high a grade as I should have gotten. So it's just better to go up and ask the teacher. And then normally I would get it right.

Like other middle-class students, Ethan was initially reluctant to seek help. Through his parents' repeated, active encouragement, however, Ethan eventually came to recognize the benefits of help-seeking. In doing so, Ethan was able to draw on a logic of entitlement to overcome his fears and to feel comfortable voicing his needs.

Working-Class Parents: Teaching Constraint

Working-class parents actively encouraged their children to adopt a logic of constraint in their interactions at school. They did so by teaching their children, first, to perceive their own needs as secondary to those of others, and second, to recognize the importance of hard work.

Working-class parents equated help-seeking with selfishness and sought to discourage such behaviors by actively downplaying their children's individual needs. Ms. Webb, for example, jokingly, but with a hint of annoyance, described her daughter Sadie

as “spoiled.” Ms. Webb also worked to suppress such behavior, as she did while I was interviewing her in the kitchen of the Webb’s mobile home. Sadie, Ms. Webb’s daughter, entered the room to ask (politely) for the powdered iced tea mix:

Ms. Webb gives Sadie a skeptical look and laughs, “Get it yourself! What’re you asking me for?” Sadie nods and pulls a chair out from the kitchen table, using it to climb up and retrieve the can of iced tea mix from the cabinet over the refrigerator. As Sadie does this, Ms. Webb, turning to me, says playfully, “She’s a spoiled brat. Not gonna make it in the real world.”

Although Sadie tried to ask for help, her mother quickly denied this request. Over time, and in light of such messages, working-class children appeared to perceive help-seeking as selfish and disrespectful of others. Sadie, for example, was loud and outgoing with her friends, but very polite and deferent to her teachers. As Sadie explained in an interview, she also rarely asked for help:

If you have a question about homework, you should just skip it. You don’t wanna go up and bug the teacher. And then, if she [the teacher] says: “Did anybody have any problems with the homework?” Then you can raise your hand.

With time and intensive coaching from their parents, working-class children gradually came to view classroom challenges through a logic of constraint. Doing so prompted working-class children to adopt a no-excuses approach to problem-solving and to avoid seeking help.

Working-class parents also equated help-seeking with laziness. To discourage such behaviors, they emphasized the importance of hard work. Ms. Compton, for example, struggled to help her son Jesse with homework. She described, close to tears, how overwhelmed she felt by frequent, complex assignments, and by her own work schedule, which prevented her from being home in the afternoons. Given those challenges, Ms. Compton tried to motivate Jesse to do his homework on his own. As Ms. Compton explained:

Jesse can be lazy. He's very 'I can't do it. I don't know what I'm doing.' But he just needs a push to do it on his own. I just tell him, "You can do it. I know you can do it. I've seen you do this. I want you to try." Then he gets his confidence up and he snaps out of that low moment.

Jesse hated homework, but his mother repeatedly encouraged him to just keep trying. Such messages helped Jesse and other working-class children to adopt a logic of constraint and to view help-seeking primarily through its drawbacks. Jesse, for example, worked very hard, but still struggled with schoolwork. Despite these struggles, however, Jesse believed that he should not seek help:

Some of the stuff Ms. Dunham told me, it didn't really make sense, but I just had to say: "Okay, I'll try." Like, sometimes I feel like I can't do it, but my mom says I can't say that. And I don't wanna get in trouble.

In interviews, other working-class students also stressed both the importance of hard work and the potential drawbacks of help-seeking, saying things like:

You need to work hard and learn things. Like, teachers give you homework to learn things. And then if you get help from your mom and dad, you're not learning that stuff. And if you get it from a calculator, you still don't learn it.

In light of their parents' active encouragement, working-class students came to view classroom interactions through a logic of constraint. They recognized the benefits of hard work and the possible negative consequences (social and academic) of actively voicing their needs.

This recognition, in turn, tended to prompt working-class students not to ask for help at school. In the classroom, for example, I rarely saw either Sadie or Jesse ask for help. As I learned from a conversation with Ms. Dunham, she took her fifth-graders to the school library one Monday to take out books on African American historical figures. She gave her students until Thursday to find ten facts for a biography project. Jesse was absent on Monday, so Ms. Dunham left the assignment on his desk. On Tuesday, however, Jesse did not ask for permission to go to the library. Instead, he asked his mother to take him to the public library. Ms. Compton did not have time; she said he would "just have to figure it out." On Wednesday, however, Jesse did not explain the situation to Ms. Dunham or ask for special permission to go to the school library. Instead, he came to school on Thursday without his facts.

Jesse is slumped low in his seat, his shoulders sagging. When Ms.

Dunham [who is checking students' homework] approaches, she asks, "Do you have your facts?" Jesse shakes his head but does not look up. Sensing

that something is wrong, Ms. Dunham squats down next to Jesse, asking softly, “You okay?” Jesse waits for a long moment, and then whispers, “I tried to do them, but my mom got mad, cuz I said we needed to go to the library.” Ms. Dunham’s eyes widen, as if recalling that Jesse was absent when the class went to the library. She reassures Jesse, promising to “give mom a call” to explain the mix-up and giving him a library pass and an extension on the assignment. Jesse thanks Ms. Dunham earnestly, giving her a tentative smile.

Like other working-class students, Jesse often concealed his challenges and tried to deal with them on his own. Had Ms. Dunham not intervened, however, Jesse would have received a lower grade on his project, and he might not have turned it in at all. Ironically, then, while Jesse likely wanted to avoid appearing lazy or disrespectful by asking for help, his failure to explain the situation could have led Ms. Dunham to see him as lazy and disrespectful for not completing his work.

CULTURE AND CONSEQUENCES

As such examples suggest, the active transfer of class-based culture from parents to children helped to reproduce social inequalities. We know from prior research that children’s activation of class-based strategies can generate stratified profits in the classroom (Calarco, 2011; Farkas, 1996; Streib, 2011), and that those profits results from teachers’ responses to different strategies (Mehan, 1980; Tach & Farkas, 2006; Wren, 1999).

This study provides further evidence of such patterns, showing that teachers responded differently to by-any-means and no-excuses problem-solving, and that those different responses had significant consequences. During art class one morning, the students were taking an assessment that would determine part of their grade. For the assessment, students had 15 minutes to choose a print of a famous painting and answer a series of questions about its mood, tone, and style. During the assessment, Ted, Melanie, Kelly, and Kal, all middle-class students, raised their hands, and Ms. Cantore circled around, answering their questions.

Melanie thrusts her hand high in the air, twisting around in her seat to look for Ms. Cantore. Spotting her, Melanie calls out in a loud whisper: “Ms. Cantore!” Ms. Cantore, who was across the room, strides quickly toward Melanie. As Ms. Cantore approaches, Melanie explains: “I’m not sure what to write for the mood part. Like, I know the tone is light, but I’m not sure how to describe the mood.” Ms. Cantore smiles, asking: “Well what do you feel when you look at all of those pastel colors?” Melanie thinks for a moment, scrunching her forehead before asking: “Um... happy?” Ms. Cantore nods vigorously, adding: “Now you just need to think about other ways you can tell this is a happy painting.” Melanie nods confidently, saying: “Okay, got it!”

Meanwhile, Zach Campitello, a working-class student, appeared to be struggling with the assessment, but never asked for help.

Zach is sitting hunched over his paper, a deep-set frown on his face. Zach glares at the print for a long time before eventually starting to write. When Ms. Cantore circles past, she notices that Zach has only brief answers for each question. Ms. Cantore reaches down and taps Zach's paper. She explains quietly but firmly: "You need to write more than one sentence for each answer." Zach nods, but does not look up.

Ms. Cantore hesitated, as though she might ask Zach if he needed help. Simultaneously, however, Colin, a middle-class student, called out for help, and Ms. Cantore went to assist him.

Zach lets out a harsh sigh. His face red with frustration, Zach begins furiously erasing everything he has written, nearly tearing the paper with the force. With forceful swipes of his hand, Zach then begins to scatter eraser dust all over the table. As Zach finishes erasing, Ms. Cantore calls out to inform the class that they have five minutes left to work. Zach sighs again and begins writing a longer answer to the first question. When time is up, however, Zach has not finished the other questions. Rather than explain, he simply drops his assessment in the box, submitting it incomplete.

As with Melanie, by-any-means problem-solving prompted teachers to quickly recognize students' struggles and to respond with immediate assistance. No-excuses approaches, on the other hand, were harder for teachers to diagnose, and thus prompted less frequent, less immediate, and less complete support.

Now, working-class students were sometimes able to overcome challenges on their own (as with Amelia in the rocket example), and they often took pride in their do-it-yourself attitudes. In Mr. Potter’s math class, the students were working on a set of tricky word problems.

As Mr. Potter circles around, many of the middle-class students call out to ask for help with number 29. Mr. Potter eventually decides to give a hint to the whole class rather than help each student individually. He announces: “If you’re stuck on 29, you need to think about...” Before Mr. Potter could finish, Jared, an outgoing working-class student, interrupts, calling out: “Wait! I wanna try it first!” Mr. Potter smiles broadly at Jared, nodding approvingly, and then explains to the class: “If you get stuck on 29, skip it, and we’ll go over it together.”

Although it took him much longer than classmates who got help, Jared smiled proudly when he eventually completed the assignment on his own.

At times, however, working-class students failed to overcome problems on their own, and those setbacks often left them discouraged. Zach, for example, was clearly struggling with the assignment, but did not voice his needs. Instead, Zach tried to work hard on his own; eventually, though, the frustration became too much to bear. In the face of such setbacks, Zach chose to submit his assessment incomplete. As a result, Zach was one of only three students to receive an “unsatisfactory” in art for the marking period. Such patterns, in turn, provide further evidence of the stratified profits that can result—at least in the short-term—from students’ activation of class-based strategies of action.

DISCUSSION

While we know that social class differences in children's classroom behaviors contribute to inequalities (Calarco, 2011; Farkas, 1996; Streib, 2011), existing research says little about how children learn to activate class-based strategies. Instead, scholars tend to imply that children's habits are an implicit response to parents' class-based childrearing styles (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Heath, 1983; Lareau, 2011). In reality, however, cultural transmission processes may be more active and intentional than such models suggest. Given middle-class parents' proactive management of children's educational opportunities (Lareau, 2000; Nelson, 2010) and working-class parents' careful management of family identity (Edwards, 2004), parents might also deliberately teach children to behave in class-stratified ways. Despite these possibilities, however, scholars have not investigated how or why parents coach class-based strategies, or how children respond to those efforts.

In exploring these possibilities, I found that class-based cultural transmission is more intentional than scholars imply. The middle-class and working-class parents at Maplewood generally adopted different approaches to interacting with educators. They also actively taught their children to do the same. Specifically, middle-class parents coached children to problem-solve "by any means," including seeking assistance from teachers. Working-class parents instead stressed a "no excuses" approach to problem-solving, teaching their children to manage challenges on their own and to avoid pestering teachers with requests. These lessons, in turn, had important consequences for students.

While many children were initially reluctant to heed parents' instruction, this reluctance prompted more active and ongoing coaching from parents. Such efforts eventually led children to adopt class-based logics of action and use them to activate class-based problem-solving strategies.

These findings clarify the cultural transmission process, showing how children learn class-based strategies of action and how they acquire the logics of action needed to activate those strategies. Scholars of cultural transmission typically rely on top-down socialization models to explain similarities between parents and children (Kohn, 1969; Lareau, 2011). Childhood scholars critique these models for being overly deterministic (Corsaro, 1994; Pugh, 2009; Thorne, 1993) but focus on children's peer groups and thus offer little evidence of intergenerational exchange. Investigating these possibilities, I find that both children and parents have more agency in cultural transmission than socialization models imply. Parents, for example, worked to equip their children with skills and orientations they (by virtue of their own class-based knowledge and experience) believed were most appropriate. Furthermore, while children generally came to accept their parents' lessons, that process was far from automatic. Rather, it took an ongoing process of coaching, reluctance, and reinforcement to help children gradually acquire the skills and orientations needed to manage challenges in the "appropriate" (i.e., class-based) way.

Such findings also suggest that cultural transmission plays a critical role in reproducing social inequalities. Research on cultural transmission rarely shows the "payoff" of parents' class-based socialization (Chin & Phillips, 2004; Edwards, 2004;

Lareau, 2011). Similarly, studies of classroom behavior show that children's activation of class-based strategies of action generates unequal outcomes (Calarco, 2011; Farkas, 1996; Streib, 2011), but say little about how children acquire or learn to activate those strategies. By addressing these gaps, this study illuminates the mechanisms of social reproduction. It brings the process full-circle, linking parents' stratified beliefs and experiences to the lessons that they teach their children, linking those stratified lessons to the behaviors and orientations that children demonstrate in the classroom, and finally linking those stratified behaviors and orientations to stratified profits in school.

In doing so, this research may also help to clarify the relationship between social class and childrearing. Some scholars view these differences as stemming from the values and beliefs about success that parents acquire in their work roles (Kohn, 1969), while others see them as a function of status differences that affect parents' familiarity with dominant institutions (Bourdieu, 1990; Lareau, 2011). This study clearly highlights the importance of social hierarchies, with middle-class parents being more familiar with school procedures and personnel (Brantlinger, 2003; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 2000, 2011; Nelson, 2010). Yet, it also suggests that these differences in familiarity affect parents' beliefs about "appropriate" behavior. Middle-class parents recognized that the structure of schooling had changed over time, and thus encouraged their children to pursue success by any means. Working-class parents drew on their own school experiences, and thus believed that children would be best served by a no-excuses approach to problem-solving. Taken together, these patterns suggest that positions in the status hierarchy may influence not only individuals' familiarity with dominant

institutions, but also the logics of action that they use in determining what counts as “appropriate” or beneficial behavior in those settings.

This study is useful in that it traces class cultures from their home origins to their consequences at school. The in-depth processes needed to capture such processes—years of observations coupled with lengthy interviews triangulating key patterns—necessarily involved tradeoffs (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). It would have been interesting, for example, to examine how race and ethnicity contribute to within-class variations in cultural transmission and its consequences for inequalities. At Maplewood, however, there were few African American students, and the other minority groups (Asian American and Latino) were divided along social class lines. Thus, with reluctance, I focused only on whites. Given these limitations, I can only speculate about cultural transmission processes in minority families. While some scholars show that class-based parenting patterns often persist across racial and ethnic lines (Lareau, 2011), others find important cultural differences between African American and white parents from similar class backgrounds (Diamond, 1999). Given evidence of broader cultural differences in help-seeking (Mojaverian & Kim, 2013), it seems possible that parents’ lessons about managing problems at school might vary with the race, ethnicity or immigrant status of the family. Thus, future research should explore how class-based cultures are transmitted in other settings.

Scholars should also investigate the long-term consequences of parents’ lessons, exploring how their payoff might vary across different contexts or stages of the life course. In college or in the workplace, for example, those who use no-excuses problem-

solving might do better than those who are used to having parents or teachers solve problems for them. Regardless of such possibilities, however, there are also clear short-term benefits to by-any-means problem-solving. In the classroom, for example, middle-class students received more assistance from their teachers. Research shows, in turn, that this kind of support boosts students' academic achievement, their sense of academic competence, and their sense of attachment to the school (Karabenick, 1998; Stanton-Salazar, 1997), all of which are closely correlated with long-term outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Overall, this study examines how parents prompt their children to activate class-based behaviors that contribute to broader patterns of inequality. In doing so, it offers three primary contributions to the literature. First, it shows that children learn to activate class-based strategies of action through a cultural transmission process that is far less passive and automatic than socialization explanations tend to suggest. Second, it suggests that class-stratified childrearing practices reflect beliefs and goals stemming from parents' positions in the social hierarchy, and not just from the demands of their work roles. Finally, it emphasizes that recognizing the agency of both children and parents is critical to understanding processes like cultural transmission and social reproduction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Thompson, M. S. (1987). School Performance, Status Relations, and the Structure of Sentiment: Bringing the Teacher Back In. *American Sociological Review*, 52(5), 665–682.
- Arnett, J. J. (1995). Broad and Narrow Socialization: The Family in the Context of a Cultural Theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57(3), 617–628.
- Aschaffenburg, K., & Maas, I. (1997). Cultural and Educational Careers: The Dynamics of Social Reproduction. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 573–587.
- Bernstein, B. B. (1990). *Class, Codes, and Control*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brantlinger, E. (2003). *Dividing Classes: How the Middle Class Negotiates and Rationalizes School Advantage* (p. 264). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Calarco, J. M. (2011). “I Need Help!” Social Class and Children’s Help-Seeking in Elementary School. *American Sociological Review*, 76(6), 862–882.
- Carter, P. L. (2005). *Keepin’ It Real: School Success Beyond Black and White*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Chin, T., & Phillips, M. (2004). Social Reproduction and Child-rearing Practices: Social Class, Children's Agency, and the Summer Activity Gap. *Sociology of Education*, 77, 185–210.
- Condrón, D. J. (2009). Social Class, School and Non-School Environments, and Black/White Inequalities in Children's Learning. *American Sociological Review*, 74(5), 685–708.
- Corsaro, W. A. (1994). Discussion, Debate, and Friendship Processes: Peer Discourse in U.S. and Italian Nursery Schools. *Sociology of Education*, 67(1), 1–26.
- Diamond, J. B. (1999). Beyond Social Class: Cultural Resources and Educational Participation among Low-Income Black Parents. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 44, 15–54.
- DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and Cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology*.
- Edwards, M. L. K. (2004). We're Decent People: Constructing and Managing Family Identity in Rural Working-Class Communities. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(2), 515–529.
- Elder, G. H. (1974). *Children of the Great Depression*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

- Farkas, G. (1996). Skills, Habits, Styles, and School Success. In *Human Capital or Cultural Capital? Ethnicity and Poverty Groups in an Urban School District*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Foley, D. E. (1990). *Learning Capitalist Culture: Deep in the Heart of Tejas* (p. 247). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harding, D. J. (2007). Cultural Context, Sexual Behavior, and Romantic Relationships in Disadvantaged Neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review*, 72, 341–364.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms* (p. 421). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Horvat, E. M., Weininger, E. B., & Lareau, A. (2003). From Social Ties to Social Capital: Class Differences in the Relations between Schools and Parent Networks. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40, 319–351.
- Jennings, J. L., & DiPrete, T. A. (2010). Teacher Effects on Social and Behavioral Skills in Early Elementary School. *Sociology of Education*, 83(2), 135–159.
- Karabenick, S. A. (1998). *Strategic Help Seeking: Implications for Learning and Teaching* (p. 270). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Khan, S. R. (2010). *Privilege: The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School* (p. 248). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kohn, M. L. (1969). *Class and Conformity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Lamont, M. (2009). *The Dignity of Working Men* (p. 416). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lareau, A. (2000). *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education* (p. 262). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (p. 480). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lareau, A., & Conley, D. (2008). *Social Class: How Does it Work?* (p. 388). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society*, 32(5/6), 567–606.
- Lee, J.-S., & Bowen, N. K. (2008). Parental Involvement, Cultural Capital, and the Achievement Gap among Elementary School Children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 193–218.

- Lubienski, S. T. (2000). A Clash of Social Class Cultures? Students' Experiences in a Discussion-Intensive Seventh-Grade Mathematics Classroom. *The Elementary School Journal*, 100(4), 377–403.
- Lubrano, A. A. (2004). *Limbo: Blue Collar Roots, White Collar Dreams*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1992). The Role of Parents in the Socialization of Children. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 1006–1017.
- Mehan, H. (1980). The Competent Student. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 11(3), 131–152. doi:10.1525/aeq.1980.11.3.05x1865s
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mojaverian, T., & Kim, H. S. (2013). Interpreting a Helping Hand: Cultural Variation in the Effectiveness of Solicited and Unsolicited Social Support. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(1), 88–99.
- Nelson, M. (2010). *Parenting Out of Control: Anxious Parents in Uncertain Times* (p. 272). New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Nelson, M., & Schutz, R. (2007). Day Care Differences and the Reproduction of Social Class. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 36, 281–317.

- Pugh, A. J. (2009). *Longing and Belonging*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rist, R. C. (1970). Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(3), 411–451.
- Roksa, J., & Potter, D. (2011). Parenting and Academic Achievement: Intergenerational Transmission of Educational Advantage. *Sociology of Education*, 84, 299–321.
- Rubin, L. B. (1976). *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-class Family* (p. 272). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Small, M. L. (2004). *Villa Victoria: The Transformation of Social Capital in a Boston Barrio*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Small, M. L., Harding, D. J., & Lamont, M. (2010). Reconsidering Culture and Poverty. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 629(1), 6–27.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (1997). A Social Capital Framework for Understanding the Socialization of Racial Minority Children and Youth. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(1).
- Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C. S., & Covarrubias, R. (2012). Unseen disadvantage: How American universities' focus on independence

undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(6), 1178–1197.

Streib, J. (2011). Class Reproduction by Four Year Olds. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(2), 337–352.

Stuber, J. M. (2012). *Inside the College Gates: How Class and Culture Matter in Higher Education* (p. 208). Lexington Books.

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action : Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2), 273–286.

Tach, L. M., & Farkas, G. (2006). Learning-Related Behaviors, Cognitive Skills, and Ability Grouping when School Begins. *Social Science Research*, 35, 1048–1079.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender Play*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.

Wren, D. J. (1999). School Culture: Exploring the Hidden Curriculum. *Adolescence*, 34(135), 593–596.

Zelizer, V. (2002). Kids and Commerce. *Childhood*, 9(4), 375–396.

NOTES

ⁱ Italics in quoted passages reflect speakers' emphases.