Original Paper

Family’s Subjective Economic Status and Children’s Matrix Reasoning: Blacks’ Diminished Returns

Shervin Assari and Shanika Boyce

1 Department of Urban Public Health, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, Los Angeles, CA, USA
2 Department of Family Medicine, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, Los Angeles, CA, USA
3 Department of Pediatrics, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, Los Angeles, CA, USA

* Shervin Assari, E-mail: assari@umich.edu; Tel.: +(734)-232-0445; Fax: +734-615-873

Received: November 5, 2020 Accepted: November 23, 2020 Online Published: November 29, 2020
doi:10.22158/rhs.v6n1p1 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/rhs.v6n1p1

Abstract

Background: Due to a pattern known as Marginalization-related Diminished Returns (MDRs), historically oppressed non-Hispanic Black Americans show weaker effects of economic status on health and development, when compared to socially privileged non-Hispanic White Americans. Such MDRs are also documented for the effects of economic status on the school performance of non-Hispanic Black children. However, the existing knowledge is minimal on similar diminished returns on children’s intelligence. Aim: To compare racial and ethnic groups for the effect of subjective economic status on children’s cognitive performance, we compared non-Hispanic White and non-Hispanic Black children for the effects of subjective economic status on children’s matrix reasoning. Methods: This cross-sectional study included 7898 children from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study. The predictor variable was subjective economic status, which was treated as a continuous measure. The primary outcome was children’s matrix reasoning, a domain of cognitive performance, measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children-IV (WISC-V) matrix reasoning total score. Results: Overall, high subjective economic status was associated with higher matrix reasoning score. Race showed a statistically significant interaction with subjective economic status on children’s matrix reasoning score. This interaction suggested that high subjective economic status has a smaller boosting effect on increasing matrix reasoning score for non-Hispanic Black children relative to non-Hispanic White children. Conclusion: The degree by which subjective economic status correlates with matrix
reasoning score, an important domain of cognitive performance, depends on race and racialization. Non-Hispanic Black children may show weaker gains in matrix reasoning from their subjective economic status than their non-Hispanic White counterparts. To minimize the racial gap in cognitive performance, we need to address diminished returns that occur as a result of the racialization of racial and ethnic minority children. Not only should we equalize economic status, but also increase the marginal returns of economic status for racial minorities, particularly non-Hispanic Black families. Such efforts require public policies that go beyond access and also consider how we can empower non-Hispanic Black communities and families so they can more effectively leverage and utilize their economic resources to secure measurable and tangible outcomes. Structural and societal barriers such as residential and school segregation may hinder non-Hispanic Black children from receiving the full effects of their family-level economic status on a variety of outcomes, including their cognitive performance.
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1. Introduction

Compared to non-Hispanic White children, racial minority children, particularly non-Hispanic Black children, show worse cognitive performance measured by poor academic achievement and school dropout rates (Bumpus, Umeh, & Harris). As cognitive performance and associated academic success is the main gateway for future success (Burchinal et al., 2011; Cohen & Sherman, 2005; Gorey, 2009; Hair, Hanson, Wolfe, & Pollak, 2015), researchers and policymakers have shown interest in dissolving the social factors that shape inequalities in cognitive performance. Such knowledge may help reduce or even eliminate subsequent inequalities later in life (Burchinal et al., 2011; Cohen & Sherman, 2005; Gorey, 2009; Hair et al., 2015).

Race and family economic status are two closely overlapping social constructs (Ahmad, Zulaily, Shahril, Syed Abdullah, & Ahmed, 2018; Merz, Tottenham, & Noble, 2018; Valencia, Tran, Lim, Choi, & Oh, 2019). Racial minority status, particularly non-Hispanic Blacks and low economic status, have separate, additive, and multiplicative effects on children’s cognitive development (Ahmad et al., 2018; Merz et al., 2018; Valencia et al., 2019). This is in part because both racial minority status and low economic status reflect poor access to resources, low parenting, social marginalization, and economic, housing, and food insecurity (DeSantis et al., 2007; Dismukes et al., 2018; Hanson et al., 2015; Miller & Taylor, 2012). As such, one of the strongest social determinants of children’s cognitive development is the family’s economic status (Alvarado, 2018; Barreto, de Figueiredo, & Giatti, 2013; Hemovich, Lac, & Crano, 2011; Schreier & Chen, 2013). High economic status is linked to a wide array of developmental outcomes among children (Alvarado, 2018; Barreto et al., 2013; Hemovich et al., 2011; Schreier & Chen, 2013). Several studies have consistently established a positive link between the economic status of the family
and desired cognitive, behavioral, developmental, and health outcomes (Harnett et al., 2019; Schulz et al., 2012; Yelin, Trupin, Bunde, & Yazdany, 2019). Families with high economic status show more supportive and engaged parenting, and invest more into the lives of their children (Cummings, 2014; Nogueira et al., 2005; Takada, Kondo, Hashimoto, & Committee, 2014). Children from wealthy families can afford to send their children to high-quality schools with sufficient resources and skilled teachers (Jefferson et al., 2011; Manly, Jacobs, Touradji, Small, & Stern, 2002; Richards et al., 2019). Both inside and outside of school, children from families with economic means have stimulating environments that can contribute to their cognitive development (Larson, Russ, Nelson, Olson, & Halfon, 2015). Finally, economic well-being buffers against stress, which is a risk factor for undesired cognitive outcomes in children (Gerra et al., 2020; Kelishadi et al., 2017; Rodriguez et al., 2019; Schibli, Wong, Hedayati, & D’Angiulli, 2017; Vargas et al., 2020). All these mechanisms have cumulative effects on children’s cognitive development in families with economic resources (Bouthoorn et al., 2014; Christensen, Schieve, Devine, & Drews-Botsch, 2014; Karlsson, De Neve, & Subramanian, 2018; Madhushanthi, Wimalasekera, Goonewardena, Amarasekara, & Lenora, 2018; Poh et al., 2019).

Although both subjective and objective aspects of economic well-being and economic status matter (Senn, Walsh, & Carey, 2014), most of the existing literature has focused on objective economic indicators such as parental education, household income, parental employment, marital status, and wealth (Marmot, 2004). These indicators, however, only reflect some specific domains of economic well-being. Complementary to these objective measures are subjective indicators of economic well-being that capture how the individual and family perceives the sufficiency of economic means on a day-by-day basis. These subjective indicators have the potential to reflect economic strains and describe how an individual values their social status relative to others (Assari, Boyce, & Bazargan, 2020; Manuck, Phillips, Gianaros, Flory, & Muldoon, 2010; Moon, 1987; Wright & Steptoe, 2005).

The subjective economic status may have some health effects that are not due to objective indicators such as income, wealth, education, and occupation (Feldman & Steptoe, 2004; Manuck et al., 2010; Moon, 1987; Senn et al., 2014; Ursache, Noble, & Blair, 2015; Wright & Steptoe, 2005). For racial and ethnic minorities, subjective economic status reflects economic distress and insecurity of housing and food (Assari, Smith, Mistry, Farokhnia, & Bazargan, 2019; Assari, Smith, Saqib, & Bazargan, 2019). Some research, however, suggests that social groups, particularly racial and ethnic groups, may differ in the protective effects of subjective economic status on health (Assari, 2018a; Assari, 2018b). As mentioned before, traditionally, health inequality research has predominantly measured objective rather than subjective indicators of economic well-being (Link & Phelan, 1995, 2009; Phelan, Link, Diez-Roux, Kawachi, & Levin, 2004). As such, there is a need to explore how racial and ethnic groups differ in the effects of subjective economic indicators (Assari, Preiser, Lankarani, & Caldwell, 2018; Assari, Smith, Mistry, et al., 2019).

Two competing and complementary models have been used to study the simultaneous and joint effects of race and subjective economic status on children’s outcomes. The first approach, which has traditionally
and historically dominated the field, attributes racial and ethnic gaps in children’s outcomes to the scarcity of economic resources and a high prevalence of risk factors in the lives of racial minority families such as non-Hispanic Blacks (Bell, Sacks, Thomas Tobin, & Thorpe, 2020; Fuentes, Hart-Johnson, & Green, 2007; Kaufman, Cooper, & McGee, 1997; Samuel, Roth, Schwartz, Thorpe, & Glass, 2018). Some of the researchers who follow this line of work have suggested that economic status may partially mitigate the effects of race on children’s outcomes (Assari, 2016, 2017a; Assari, Khoshpouri, & Chalian, 2019). This research advocates for enhancing the economic status of racial and ethnic minority groups as the main strategy to close the racial differences in children’s outcomes (David R Williams, 1999; D. R. Williams, Costa, Odunlami, & Mohammed, 2008).

The second model, however, argues that economic resources may have differential effects on generating childhood outcomes across racial groups. Marginalization-related Diminished Returns (MDRs) (Assari, 2017b; Assari, 2018a) is defined as weaker effects of economic resources on tangible outcomes of non-Hispanic Black children than non-Hispanic White children. This model has received overwhelming support, suggesting that various indicators such as subjective economic status (Assari, Boyce, & Bazargan, 2020; Assari, Preiser, Lankarani, et al., 2018), parental education (Assari, Caldwell, & Bazargan, 2019), family income (Assari, C. H. Caldwell, & R. Minyc, 2018a; Assari, Thomas, Caldwell, & Minyc, 2018), employment (Assari, 2018d), and marital status (Assari & M. Bazargan, 2019) all generate fewer desired outcomes for non-Hispanic Black children than non-Hispanic White children.

Well-documented by the existing MDRs literature, economic resources of oneself (Assari, Farokhnia, & Mistry, 2019) and one’s parents (Assari, 2018e; Assari, 2018b; Assari, 2018f) generate fewer desired outcomes for racial and ethnic minority groups. Non-Hispanic Black children and non-Hispanic White children differ in their opportunities to mobilize their economic resources to secure tangible outcomes (Assari, 2017b, 2018a, 2018f; Assari, Caldwell, & Minyc, 2018a; Assari, Caldwell, & Zimmerman, 2018; Assari & Hani, 2018). Given the existing MDRs, non-Hispanic Black children develop worse than expected outcomes when compared to non-Hispanic White children, a pattern seen across all economic levels (Assari, 2017b; Assari, 2018a; Assari, Caldwell, & Minyc, 2018a; Assari, C. H. Caldwell, & R. B. Minyc, 2018b; Assari, Thomas, et al., 2018). While these MDRs are shown for elements such as attention, impulsivity, inhibitory control, and reward orientation, we are not aware of any studies on matrix reasoning, which is an important domain of cognitive performance.

Matrix reasoning (Chierchia et al., 2019; Harrison, Shipstead, & Engle, 2015) is a major element of cognitive performance. Matrix reasoning (Allen & Fong, 2008; Harrison et al., 2015; Knight, 2003) is a type of visual-spatial problem solving, and closely correlates with general intelligence (Gottfredson, 1998). Matrix reasoning measurement commonly involves a series of figures in which there is a pattern, with one figure in the series intentionally left blank. The individual is shown an array of possibilities so the person who indicate which figure would complete the series or pattern (Mayes & Calhoun, 2008). Matrix reasoning correlates with overall cognitive performance and is highly affected in psychiatric conditions such as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), autism, psychosis, and learning
disabilities. Matrix reasoning is commonly measured using the widely IQ measure, Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children-IV (WISC-IV) (Dombrowski, Canivez, & Watkins, 2018). Matrix reasoning is independent of the speed or motor planning. Such lack of requirements makes matrix reasoning a reliable test that is not confounded by executive function and executive control (Mayes & Calhoun, 2008). Matrix reasoning score also reflects strengths and weaknesses in verbal and visual reasoning, and attention in children with and without mental and intellectual disorders (Mayes & Calhoun, 2008).

1.1 Aims
To extend the knowledge that is already available regarding the combined effects of race/ethnicity and subjective economic status on children’s cognitive performance, we built a study on the MDRs theory to compare race/ethnic groups of children for the boosting effect of subjective economic status on children’s matrix reasoning, which is one of the main domains of cognitive function. Although we hypothesized a boosting effect of subjective economic status on children’s matrix reasoning, we expected this effect to be weaker for non-Hispanic Black children than non-Hispanic White children. Our motivation is to understand if MDRs in cognitive function explains the observed MDRs of economic status on school performance (Assari, 2019b; Assari & Caldwell, 2019), given that cognitive function is a strong determinant of school performance (Jacques & Seitz, 2020; King & Markant, 2020; Schibli et al., 2017).

2. Methods
2.1 Design
A secondary analysis of wave 1 data of the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study (Alcohol Research: Current Reviews Editorial, 2018; Casey et al., 2018; Karcher, O’Brien, Kandala, & Barch, 2019; Lisdahl et al., 2018; Luciana et al., 2018), a landmark children’s brain development study in the United States. More nuanced data on the details of the ABCD study is available here (Alcohol Research: Current Reviews Editorial, 2018; Auchter et al., 2018). The ABCD study’s baseline data collection occurred between 2016 and 2018.

2.2 Sampling
In the ABCD study, participants were limited to 9-10 years old children who were recruited from multiple cities across several states. In total, 21 ABCD centers were involved in the recruitment of the children. The main strategy to recruit participants to the ABCD study was to utilize the US school system (Garavan et al., 2018). Eligibility criteria for the current analysis were not being a twin, not being Hispanic, and having valid data on race, demographic factors, and cognitive performance. Only non-Hispanic Black or non-Hispanic White individuals could enter our analysis.

2.3 Study Variables
The study variables included race/ethnicity (moderator), age, sex, parental education, parental employment, parental marital status, and household size (covariates), subjective economic status
(independent variable), and children’s matrix reasoning (dependent variable).

2.4 Demographic and Socioeconomic Confounders
Age, sex, household size, parental education, parental employment, and parental marital status were the confounders. Parents were asked to report the age of their children. Age was a dichotomous variable 1 for 10 and 0 for 9 years old. Sex was also dichotomized as 1 for males and 0 for females. Household size was a continuous measure self-reported by the parent. Parental marital status was equal to 1 for married and equal to 0 for unmarried. Parental education was a continuous measure from 1 to 21. Parental employment was self-reported by the interviewed parent and was coded 1 for the presence of any employed parent in the household and 0 for no employed parent in the household.

2.5 Primary Outcome
Matrix reasoning (cognitive performance). The ABCD study used the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children -V (WISC-V) to measure the cognitive performance of the children (Raiford et al., 2016). WISC is one of the most commonly used measures to capture children’s IQ and cognitive performance (Baron, 2005). In this analysis, we used the WISC-V matrix reasoning total score data (pea_wiscv_tss) as our outcome (Raiford et al., 2016). This variable is pre-calculated and was already available in the ABCD study. Our measure of WISC-V matrix reasoning had a normal distribution. For this continuous measure, a higher score indicates higher cognitive performance (Covin & Hatch, 1977; Salthouse, 1993; Soulieres et al., 2009).

2.6 Independent Variable
Subjective economic status. This study measured subjective economic status using seven items. Participants were asked “In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following:” 1) “Needed food but couldn’t afford to buy it or couldn’t afford to go out to get it?”, 2) “Were without telephone service because you could not afford it?” 3) “ Didn’t pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage because you could not afford it?”, 4) “Were evicted from your home for not paying the rent or mortgage?”, 5) “Had services turned off by the gas or electric company, or the oil company wouldn’t deliver oil because payments were not made?”, 6) “Had someone who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but didn’t go because you could not afford it?” and 7) “Had someone who needed a dentist but couldn’t go because you could not afford it?” Responses were 0 or 1. A mean score (a continuous measure) was calculated, with a range varying between 0 and 1, where higher scores were indicative of higher subjective economic status (Assari, Preiser, Lankarani, et al., 2018; Assari, Smith, Mistry, et al., 2019; Boe, Petrie, Sivertsen, & Hysing, 2019; Chen & Paterson, 2006; Moon, 1987; Wright & Steptoe, 2005; Ye, Wen, Wang, & Lin, 2020). Subjective economic status shows strong effects on behavioral, developmental, and health outcomes (Assari, Preiser, Lankarani et al., 2018; Assari, Smith, Mistry et al., 2019; Manuck et al., 2010; Moon, 1987; Senn et al., 2014; Ursache et al., 2015).
2.7 Moderator

Race. Race/ethnicity was identified by the parents. Race/ethnicity was a categorical variable and coded 1 for non-Hispanic Black and 0 for non-Hispanic White.

2.8 Data Analysis

SPSS 23.0 (IBM, New York, NY, USA) was applied for data analysis. Mean, standard deviation (SD), frequency, and relative frequency (%) were reported to describe the sample. We described our sample overall and by race/ethnicity. We performed a Pearson bivariate test to rule out multicollinearity before performing our linear regression model. For our multivariable models, we applied multiple linear regression models. Our first two models were performed in the overall sample. Our last two models were performed in each race. Model 1 did not have any interaction terms. Model 2, however, did add an interaction term between race/ethnicity and subjective economic status. Model 3 was performed in non-Hispanic White children. Model 4 was performed in non-Hispanic Black children. We reported b, SE, 95% CI, and p value.

2.9 Ethical Aspect

This analysis was exempt from a full Institutional Review Board (IRB) review by Charles R. Drew University of Medicine. The mother study (ABCD), however, was approved by the IRB at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD). Assent and consent were received from children and their parents, respectively (Auchter et al., 2018).

3. Results

3.1 Descriptives

As shown in Table 1, 7898, 9-10 years old children were included in our analysis. From this number, most were non-Hispanic Whites (n = 5839; 73.9%) and the rest were non-Hispanic Blacks (n = 2959; 26.1%).

Table 1. Socio-demographic Data Overall (n = 7898)

|                              | All  |               |               |
|------------------------------|------|---------------|---------------|
|                              | n    | %             | n             | %             |
| Child Race/Ethnicity         |      |               |               |
| Non-Hispanic White           | 5839 | 73.9          | 5839          | 100           | 0    | 0    |
| Non-Hispanic Black           | 2059 | 26.1          | 0             | 0             | 2059 | 100  |
| Child Sex                    |      |               |               |
| Female                       | 3738 | 47.3          | 2734          | 46.8          | 1004 | 48.8 |
| Male                         | 4160 | 52.7          | 3105          | 53.2          | 1055 | 51.2 |
| Child Age (Year)             |      |               |               |
| 9                            | 4218 | 53.4          | 3115          | 53.3          | 1103 | 53.6 |
| 10                           | 3659 | 46.3          | 2708          | 46.4          | 951  | 46.2 |
Parents’ Marital Status*

|            | Not Married |         |         |         |         |         |
|------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|            |             | Mean    | SD      | Mean    | SD      | Mean    |
| Not Married| 2442        | 30.9    | 1037    | 17.8    | 1405    | 68.2    |
| Married    | 5456        | 69.1    | 4802    | 82.2    | 654     | 31.8    |

Parents’ Employment Status*

|            | Not Employed |         |         |         |         |         |
|------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|            |              | Mean    | SD      | Mean    | SD      | Mean    |
| Not Employed| 2410        | 30.5    | 1684    | 28.8    | 726     | 35.3    |
| Employed   | 5488        | 69.5    | 4155    | 71.2    | 1333    | 64.7    |

|            | Mean | SD |
|------------|------|----|
| Household Size | 4.66 | 1.53 |
| Parental Education (1-21, High) | 16.96 | 2.00 |
| Subjective Economic Status (0-1, High) | 0.93 | 0.16 |
| Matrix Reasoning | 9.98 | 3.01 |

*p < 0.05 for comparison of non-Hispanic Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites

Table 2 presents the bivariate correlation between various study variables in the overall sample. Subjective economic status was positively correlated with cognitive performance. Other factors that were correlated with the cognitive score were race/ethnicity, sex, parental employment, parental marital status, and parental education.

Table 2. Correlations between Study Variables (n = 7898)

|        | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 Race (Non-Hispanic Black) | 1     | -0.02 | -0.06*| -0.48*| -0.03*| -0.00 | -0.42*| -0.30*| -0.29*|
| 2 Sex (Male)      | 1     | -0.01 | 0.01  | 0.02* | 0.02* | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.07*|
| 3 Employed Parents| 1     | 0.05**| -0.17*| 0.01  | 0.25* | 0.12* | 0.08* |       |       |
| 4 Married Parents | 1     | 0.25**| 0.01  | 0.40* | 0.30* | 0.24* |       |       |       |
| 5 Household size  | 1     | -0.00 | -0.08*| -0.02 | 0.02  |       |       |       |       |
| 6 Age             | 1     | 0.00  | 0.01  | 0.00  |       |       |       |       |       |
| 7 Parental Education| 1     | 0.31* | 0.30* |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 8 Subjective economic status | 1     | 0.16* |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 9 Cognitive performance |       |       | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |

*p < 0.05

3.2 Pooled Sample Multivariate Analysis

In Table 3, two linear regression models have estimated our association of interest in the overall (pooled) sample. Model 1 (Main Effect Model) showed the boosting effect of high subjective economic status on children’s matrix reasoning. Model 2 (Interaction Model) showed an interaction between the effects of race/ethnicity and subjective economic status on the outcome, suggesting that the boosting effect of high
subjective economic status on matrix reasoning is weaker for non-Hispanic Black children relative to their non-Hispanic White counterparts (Table 3).

### Table 3. Overall Linear Regressions ($n = 7898$)

|                                | Model 1 (Main Effects) | Model 2 (Interaction Effects) |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                                | b                      | SE   | 95% CI        | b                | SE   | 95% CI        |
| Race (Non-Hispanic Blacks)     | -1.15*                 | 0.09 | -1.32 -0.98   | -0.21            | 0.39 | -0.97 0.56    |
| Sex (Male)                     | -0.39*                 | 0.06 | -0.51 -0.26   | -0.39*           | 0.06 | -0.51 -0.26   |
| Age                            | 0.03                   | 0.06 | -0.09 0.16    | 0.03             | 0.06 | -0.09 0.16    |
| Household size                 | -0.05*                 | 0.02 | -0.09 0.00    | -0.05*           | 0.02 | -0.09 0.00    |
| Parents employed               | 0.02                   | 0.07 | -0.12 0.16    | 0.02             | 0.07 | -0.12 0.16    |
| Married household              | 0.48*                  | 0.09 | 0.31 0.65     | 0.47*            | 0.09 | 0.30 0.64     |
| Parent education (years)       | 0.24*                  | 0.02 | 0.21 0.27     | 0.24*            | 0.02 | 0.20 0.27     |
| Subjective economic status     | 0.55*                  | 0.22 | 0.12 0.98     | 1.10*            | 0.31 | 0.49 1.72     |
| Subjective economic status × Race | -1.05*             | 0.42 | -1.88 -0.22   |

CI= Confidence Interval; SE= Standard Error; *p < 0.05

3.3 Race-specific Multivariate Models

Table 4 shows the results of linear regression models specific to each race/ethnic group. Model 3 showed the protective effects of high subjective economic status on the children’s matrix reasoning of non-Hispanic White children. Model 4, however, did not show any effect of high economic status on children’s matrix reasoning for non-Hispanic Black children. The difference between the regression coefficients (b) in non-Hispanic White children and non-Hispanic Black children was statistically significant, according to the interaction term tested in Model 2.

### Table 4. Race-specific Linear Regressions ($n = 7898$)

|                                | Model 3 (Non-Hispanic White) | Model 4 (Non-Hispanic Black) |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                                | b                            | SE   | 95% CI        | b                | SE   | 95% CI        |
| Sex (Male)                     | -0.34*                       | 0.07 | -0.48 -0.20   | -0.51*           | 0.13 | -0.76 -0.25   |
| Age                            | 0.06                         | 0.07 | -0.08 0.21    | -0.08            | 0.13 | -0.34 0.18    |
| Household size                 | -0.03                        | 0.03 | -0.09 0.02    | -0.08*           | 0.04 | -0.15 0.00    |
| Parents employed               | -0.13                        | 0.08 | -0.29 0.03    | 0.46*            | 0.15 | 0.17 0.75     |
| Married household              | 0.38*                        | 0.10 | 0.17 0.58     | 0.66*            | 0.16 | 0.36 0.97     |
| Parent education (years)       | 0.25*                        | 0.02 | 0.21 0.29     | 0.20*            | 0.03 | 0.14 0.25     |
| Subjective economic status     | 1.17*                        | 0.31 | 0.55 1.78     | -0.09            | 0.31 | -0.70 0.52    |

CI= Confidence Interval; SE= Standard Error; *p < 0.05
4. Discussion

Overall, high subjective economic status was associated with higher children’s matrix reasoning. However, the boosting effect of subjective economic status on children’s matrix reasoning was diminished for non-Hispanic Blacks when compared to non-Hispanic Whites.

The observed diminished returns (MDRs) of economic status on matrix reasoning for non-Hispanic Black children compared to non-Hispanic White children are similar to what the previous research has suggested (Assari, 2018a, 2018c; Assari, 2019a; Assari, Farokhnia et al., 2019). MDRs are repeatedly established by research both within and between individuals and families. These MDRs are robust and reliable as they are found to hold across all economic levels, developmental phases, types of outcomes, and visible and non-visible sources of marginalizing identities (Assari, 2017b; Assari, 2018a). MDRs are shown for income (Assari, Caldwell, & Mincy, 2018a), education (Assari, Farokhnia, et al., 2019), employment (Assari, 2018d), and marital status (Assari, Caldwell, & Zimmerman, 2018). Economic status results in more gain for non-Hispanic White children than non-Hispanic Black children (Assari, Caldwell, & Mincy, 2018a; Assari, Caldwell, & Mincy, 2018b; Assari, Thomas et al., 2018), adults (Assari, 2018a), and older adults (Assari & Lankarani, 2016). Also, MDRs not only apply to non-Hispanic Blacks (Assari, Thomas et al., 2018), or Hispanic Whites (HWs) (Assari, 2018g; Assari, 2019; Assari, Farokhnia et al., 2019; Shervin & Ritesh, 2019) as they also hold for Asian Americans (Assari, Boyce, Bazargan, & Caldwell, 2020), Native Americans (Shervin Assari & Mohsen Bazargan, 2019a), and LGBTQ individuals (Assari, 2019a). For example, some studies have documented racial differences in family structure effects on health (Cross, 2020). That means, racial differences exist in the effects of parental marital status (an indicator of economic status) on children’s health; the return on living in a two-biological-parent family is weaker for Black children than White children (Cross, 2020).

A wide range of societal mechanisms is likely to be involved in causing MDRs of economic status in non-Hispanic Black families. Non-Hispanic Black communities, families, and individuals face a wide range of stressors that are not due to economic resources, but rather social stratification and racism. These non-economic adversities are environmental, structural, and are related to race, racialization, and marginalization, adversities that are seen across all economic levels (Bowden, Bartkowski, Xu, & Lewis Jr, 2017). The marginal returns of economic mobility may be limited when upward social mobility is more difficult for a specific group (Chetty, Hendren, Kline, & Saez, 2014). Increased exposure to stress is believed to reduce children’s ability to gain from their available economic status resources such as parental education and income. It is shown that for non-Hispanic Black families, an increase in economic status means an increase in experience (Assari, 2018b; Assari, F. X. Gibbons, & R. Simons, 2018a; Assari, F. X. Gibbons, & R. L. Simons, 2018b; Assari, Lankarani, & Caldwell, 2018; Assari & Moghani Lankarani, 2018) and vulnerability (Assari, Preiser, Lankarani et al., 2018) to discrimination. This might be because non-Hispanic Black families who have economic resources are more likely to be surrounded by non-Hispanic White families, which increases their exposure to discriminatory events (Assari, Gibbons, et al., 2018a; Assari, Gibbons, et al., 2018b). Needless to say, high levels of race-related and
general discrimination, which operate as a risk factor for many poor health outcomes such as cognitive decline, reduce the expected gains from economic resources (Assari & Caldwell, 2018; Assari, Lankarani, et al., 2018; Assari, Preiser, Lankarani et al., 2018).

Residential segregation may be a reason why we observe differences between non-Hispanic Black and non-Hispanic White contextual exposures. It might be a result of residential and school segregation that school options are limited for non-Hispanic Black children, across all economic levels. As a result, Black children are sent to poor schools that are located in highly segregated areas, and this is even true for families that have economic resources (Assari, 2019b; Assari S, 2019; Assari & Caldwell, 2019). This results in the differential effects of Socioeconomic Status (SES) on education and schooling of non-Hispanic White children and non-Hispanic Black children. While high SES non-Hispanic White children attend sufficiently resourced schools that are located in suburban areas with available funding and highly prepared teachers, non-Hispanic Black children are sent to schools that have a lower level of resources and less prepared teachers (Jefferson et al., 2011).

In this study, we did not argue that race has a fixed and unmodifiable effect on cognitive performance. We are not making a statement in the politically and morally charged debate on the effect of race on IQ. We conceptualize race as a proxy of racialization, and we exclusively focused on the effect of race as a social factor, on bounding the health effects of economic status. The argument here is that in a race aware society that has historically used racism to hold non-Hispanic Blacks behind, family level and individual level factors are not enough to secure desired outcomes. This is in part because non-Hispanic Black families who have high economic resources still report high levels of stress as they face a wide range of societal barriers (Assari, 2018b; Assari & Moghani Lankarani, 2018). Non-Hispanic White families with similar economic status are not required to deal with such stressors in their daily lives (Assari & Mohsen Bazargan, 2019b; Assari, Preiser, & Kelly, 2018; Assari, Preiser, Lankarani, et al., 2018).

Although the lack of economic resources imposes one type of risk to non-Hispanic Black communities and families, this is not the only disadvantage that Black families experience in the US. MDRs are reflective of another set of disadvantages in the life of Black families (Assari, 2017b; Assari, 2018a). While the solution to a lack of resources is to equalize access to resources, the solution to the second type requires equalization of the returns of economic resources. The MDRs-related inequalities are resistant to closing the racial gap in economic resources. Resolving MDRs requires addressing the structural barriers that are root causes of MDRs-related inequalities, even in families that have high SES.

It is essential to dissolve inequalities that are due to a lack of economic resources from those that are due to their diminishing returns. Researchers and policymakers should be able to recognize the difference between the two classes of adversities and provide and suggest specific solutions to each. Policymakers should also be aware that non-Hispanic Blacks are experiencing double disadvantage and jeopardy, one for low economic resources, and one for lower return of such resources when they become available to them. A real solution should make economic resources available to the communities of color and at the
same time ensure that those resources are utilized by individuals and families (Assari, 2018a; Assari, 2018h).

To explain causes of MDRs, scholars have studied the daily experiences of middle-class Black families (Chiteji & Hamilton, 2002; Weitzman, Byrd, & Auinger, 1999). Reviewing the work of the above-mentioned research on Black middle class suggests that middle-class non-Hispanic Black families experience their class and social status differently when compared to middle-class non-Hispanic White families (Hudson, Sacks, Irani, & Asher, 2020). It is shown that high subjective economic status may even operate as a source of vulnerability for non-Hispanic Black families, as it both increases exposure (Assari, 2018b; Assari, Gibbons, et al., 2018a; Assari, Gibbons, et al., 2018b; Assari, Lankarani, et al., 2018) and sensitivity (Assari, Preiser, Lankarani, et al., 2018) to discrimination.

5. Study Limitation
The current study had a few non-fatal limitations. With a cross-sectional design, we do not read our findings as causal associations between SES and children’s cognitive performance. We only tested MDRs of subjective economic status, and MDRs of other SES indicators were not investigated. While we controlled for parental education, employment, and marital status, other indicators such as family income, family wealth, and neighborhood economic status may also show differential effects on Black and White children’s cognitive performance. This study also did not test contextual variables that cause the associations between economic resources and developmental outcomes to differ across racial groups.

6. Conclusion
When compared to non-Hispanic White children, non-Hispanic Black children show weaker effects of subjective SES on their matrix reasoning. It is still unknown why high-SES non-Hispanic Black children show worse-than-expected outcomes.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author Funding: SA is supported by the following National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants: CA201415 02, DA035811-05, U54MD007598, U54MD008149, D084526-03, and U54CA229974.

ABCD Funding: Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (https://abcdstudy.org), held in the NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than 10,000 youth age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The ABCD Study is supported by the National Institutes of Health Grants [U01DA041022, U01DA041028, U01DA041048, U01DA041089, U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041120, U01DA041134, U01DA041148, U01DA041156, U01DA041174, U24DA041123, U24DA041147]. A full list of supporters is available at https://abcdstudy.org/nih-collaborators. A listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at https://abcdstudy.org/principal-investigators.html. ABCD consortium
investigators designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators. The ABCD data repository grows and changes over time. The ABCD data used in this report came from [NIMH Data Archive Digital Object Identifier (http://dx.doi.org/10.15154/1504041)].

Acknowledgment: The authors wish to thank John Gavin Wells for his excellent edits to this paper.

References

Ahmad, A., Zulaily, N., Shahril, M. R., Syed Abdullah, E. F. H., & Ahmed, A. (2018). Association between socioeconomic status and obesity among 12-year-old Malaysian adolescents. *PLoS One, 13*(7), e0200577. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200577

Alcohol Research: Current Reviews Editorial, S. (2018). NIH’s Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. *Alcohol Res, 39*(1), 97. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30557152

Allen, M. D., & Fong, A. K. (2008). Clinical application of standardized cognitive assessment using fMRI. I. Matrix reasoning. *Behav Neurol, 20*(3), 127-140. http://doi.org/10.3233/BEN-2008-0223

Alvarado, S. E. (2018). The impact of childhood neighborhood disadvantage on adult joblessness and income. *Soc Sci Res, 70*, 1-17. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.10.004

Assari, S. (2016). Distal, intermediate, and proximal mediators of racial disparities in renal disease mortality in the United States. *J Nephropathol, 5*(1), 51-59. http://doi.org/10.15171/jnp.2016.09

Assari, S. (2017a). Number of Chronic Medical Conditions Fully Mediates the Effects of Race on Mortality: 25-Year Follow-Up of a Nationally Representative Sample of Americans. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities, 4*(4), 623-631. http://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-016-0266-4

Assari, S. (2017b). Unequal Gain of Equal Resources across Racial Groups. *Int J Health Policy Manag, 7*(1), 1-9. http://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.90

Assari, S. (2018a). Blacks’ Diminished Return of Education Attainment on Subjective Health; Mediating Effect of Income. *Brain Sci, 8*(9). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8090176

Assari, S. (2018b). Does School Racial Composition Explain Why High Income Black Youth Perceive More Discrimination? A Gender Analysis. *Brain Sci, 8*(8). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8080140

Assari, S. (2018c). Family Income Reduces Risk of Obesity for White but Not Black Children. *Children (Basel), 5*(6). http://doi.org/10.3390/children5060073

Assari, S. (2018a). Health Disparities due to Diminished Return among Black Americans: Public Policy Solutions. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 12*(1), 112-145. http://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12042

Assari, S. (2018d). Life Expectancy Gain Due to Employment Status Depends on Race, Gender, Education, and Their Intersections. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities, 5*(2), 375-386. http://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-017-0381-x

Published by SCHOLINK INC.
Assari, S. (2018e). Parental Education Attainment and Educational Upward Mobility; Role of Race and Gender. *Behav Sci (Basel),* 8(11). http://doi.org/10.3390/bs8110107

Assari, S. (2018b). Parental Education Better Helps White than Black Families Escape Poverty: National Survey of Children’s Health. *Economies,* 6(2), 30. Retrieved from http://www.mdpi.com/2227-7099/6/2/30

Assari, S. (2018f). Parental Educational Attainment and Mental Well-Being of College Students; Diminished Returns of Blacks. *Brain Sci,* 8(11). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8110193

Assari, S. (2018g). Socioeconomic Status and Self-Rated Oral Health; Diminished Return among Hispanic Whites. *Dent J (Basel),* 6(2). http://doi.org/10.3390/dj6020011

Assari, S. (2018h). Unequal Gain of Equal Resources across Racial Groups. *Int J Health Policy Manag,* 7(1), 1-9. http://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.90

Assari, S. (2019a). Education Attainment and ObesityDifferential Returns Based on Sexual Orientation. *Behav Sci (Basel),* 9(2). http://doi.org/10.3390/bs9020016

Assari, S. (2019b). Parental Educational Attainment and Academic Performance of American College Students; Blacks’ Diminished Returns. *J Health Econ Dev,* 1(1), 21-31. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31372601

Assari, S. (2019). Socioeconomic Determinants of Systolic Blood Pressure; Minorities’ Diminished Returns. *Journal of Health Economics and Development,* 1(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.hedjournal.com/article_88938_d0f03c9e2607bdaee1aa93938267b33.pdf

Assari S. (2019). Parental Educational Attainment and Academic Performance of American College Students; Blacks’ Diminished Returns. *Journal of Health Economics and Development,* 1(1), 21-31. Retrieved from http://www.hedjournal.com/article_88998_0ea5f9591eeaa2aee5c592ea962a7541.pdf

Assari, S., & Bazargan, M. (2019). Being Married Increases Life Expectancy of White but Not Black Americans. *J Family Reprod Health,* 13(3), 132-140. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32201487

Assari, S., & Bazargan, M. (2019a). Protective Effects of Educational Attainment Against Cigarette Smoking; Diminished Returns of American Indians and Alaska Natives in the National Health Interview Survey. *International Journal of Travel Medicine and Global Health.*

Assari, S., & Bazargan, M. (2019b). Unequal Associations between Educational Attainment and Occupational Stress across Racial and Ethnic Groups. *International journal of environmental research and public health,* 16(19), 3539. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/16/19/3539

Assari, S., Boyce, S., & Bazargan, M. (2020). Subjective Family Socioeconomic Status and Adolescents’ Attention: Blacks’ Diminished Returns. *Children,* 7(8), 80. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9067/7/8/80
Assari, S., Boyce, S., Bazargan, M., & Caldwell, C. H. (2020). Mathematical Performance of American Youth: Diminished Returns of Educational Attainment of Asian-American Parents. *Education Sciences, 10*(2), 32. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/10/2/32

Assari, S., & Caldwell, C. H. (2018). Social Determinants of Perceived Discrimination among Black Youth: Intersection of Ethnicity and Gender. *Children (Basel), 5*(2). http://doi.org/10.3390/children5020024

Assari, S., & Caldwell, C. H. (2019). Parental Educational Attainment Differentially Boosts School Performance of American Adolescents: Minorities’ Diminished Returns. *J Family Reprod Health, 13*(1), 7-13. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31850092

Assari, S., Caldwell, C. H., & Bazargan, M. (2019). Association Between Parental Educational Attainment and Youth Outcomes and Role of Race/Ethnicity. *JAMA Netw Open, 2*(11), e1916018. http://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.16018

Assari, S., Caldwell, C. H., & Mincy, R. (2018a). Family Socioeconomic Status at Birth and Youth Impulsivity at Age 15; Blacks’ Diminished Return. *Children (Basel), 5*(5). http://doi.org/10.3390/children5050058

Assari, S., Caldwell, C. H., & Mincy, R. B. (2018b). Maternal Educational Attainment at Birth Promotes Future Self-Rated Health of White but Not Black Youth: A 15-Year Cohort of a National Sample. *J Clin Med, 7*(5). http://doi.org/10.3390/jcm7050093

Assari, S., Caldwell, C. H., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2018). Family Structure and Subsequent Anxiety Symptoms; Minorities’ Diminished Return. *Brain Sci, 8*(6). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8060097

Assari, S., Farokhnia, M., & Mistry, R. (2019). Education Attainment and Alcohol Binge Drinking: Diminished Returns of Hispanics in Los Angeles. *Behav Sci (Basel), 9*(1). http://doi.org/10.3390/bs9010009

Assari, S., Gibbons, F. X., & Simons, R. (2018a). Depression among Black Youth; Interaction of Class and Place. *Brain Sci, 8*(6). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8060108

Assari, S., Gibbons, F. X., & Simons, R. L. (2018b). Perceived Discrimination among Black Youth: An 18-Year Longitudinal Study. *Behav Sci (Basel), 8*(5). http://doi.org/10.3390/bs8050044

Assari, S., & Hani, N. (2018). Household Income and Children’s Unmet Dental Care Need; Blacks’ Diminished Return. *Dent J (Basel), 6*(2). http://doi.org/10.3390/dj6020017

Assari, S., Khoshpouri, P., & Chalian, H. (2019). Combined Effects of Race and Socioeconomic Status on Cancer Beliefs, Cognitions, and Emotions. *Healthcare (Basel), 7*(1). http://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare7010017

Assari, S., & Lankarani, M. M. (2016). Education and Alcohol Consumption among Older Americans; Black-White Differences. *Front Public Health, 4*, 67. http://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2016.00067

Assari, S., Lankarani, M. M., & Caldwell, C. H. (2018). Does Discrimination Explain High Risk of Depression among High-Income African American Men? *Behav Sci (Basel), 8*(4).
Assari, S., & Moghani Lankarani, M. (2018). Workplace Racial Composition Explains High Perceived Discrimination of High Socioeconomic Status African American Men. *Brain Sci, 8*(8). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8080139

Assari, S., Preiser, B., & Kelly, M. (2018). Education and Income Predict Future Emotional Well-Being of Whites but Not Blacks: A Ten-Year Cohort. *Brain Sci, 8*(7). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8070122

Assari, S., Preiser, B., Lankarani, M. M., & Caldwell, C. H. (2018). Subjective Socioeconomic Status Moderates the Association between Discrimination and Depression in African American Youth. *Brain Sci, 8*(4). http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8040071

Assari, S., Smith, J., Mistry, R., Farokhnia, M., & Bazargan, M. (2019). Substance Use among Economically Disadvantaged African American Older Adults; Objective and Subjective Socioeconomic Status. *Int J Environ Res Public Health, 16*(10). http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16101826

Assari, S., Smith, J. L., Saqib, M., & Bazargan, M. (2019). Binge Drinking among Economically Disadvantaged African American Older Adults with Diabetes. *Behav Sci (Basel), 9*(9). http://doi.org/10.3390/bs9090097

Assari, S., Thomas, A., Caldwell, C. H., & Mincy, R. B. (2018). Blacks’ Diminished Health Return of Family Structure and Socioeconomic Status; 15 Years of Follow-up of a National Urban Sample of Youth. *J Urban Health, 95*(1), 21-35. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-017-0217-3

Auchter, A. M., Hernandez Mejia, M., Heyser, C. J., Shilling, P. D., Jernigan, T. L., Brown, S. A., . . . Dowling, G. J. (2018). A description of the ABCD organizational structure and communication framework. *Dev Cogn Neurosci, 32*, 8-15. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.04.003

Baron, I. S. (2005). Test review: Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition (WISC-IV). *Child Neuropsychol, 11*(5), 471-475. http://doi.org/10.1080/09297040590951587

Barreto, S. M., de Figueiredo, R. C., & Giatti, L. (2013). Socioeconomic inequalities in youth smoking in Brazil. *BMJ Open, 3*(12), e003538. http://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003538

Bell, C. N., Sacks, T. K., Thomas Tobin, C. S., & Thorpe, R. J., Jr. (2020). Racial Non-equivalence of Socioeconomic Status and Self-rated Health among African Americans and Whites. *SSM Popul Health, 10*, 100561. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2020.100561

Boe, T., Petrie, K. J., Sivertsen, B., & Hysing, M. (2019). Interplay of subjective and objective economic well-being on the mental health of Norwegian adolescents. *SSM Popul Health, 9*, 100471. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2019.100471

Bouthoorn, S. H., Wijtzes, A. I., Jaddoe, V. W., Hofman, A., Raat, H., & van Lenthe, F. J. (2014). Development of socioeconomic inequalities in obesity among Dutch pre-school and school-aged children. *Obesity (Silver Spring), 22*(10), 2230-2237. http://doi.org/10.1002/oby.20843
Bowden, M., Bartkowski, J., Xu, X., & Lewis Jr, R. (2017). Parental occupation and the gender math gap: Examining the social reproduction of academic advantage among elementary and middle school students. *Social Sciences, 7*(1), 6.

Bumpus, J. P., Umeh, Z., & Harris, A. L. Social Class and Educational Attainment: Do Blacks Benefit Less from Increases in Parents’ Social Class Status? *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 0*(0), 2332649219854465. http://doi.org/10.1177/2332649219854465

Burchinal, M., McCartney, K., Steinberg, L., Crosnoe, R., Friedman, S. L., McLoyd, V., . . . Network, N. E. C. C. R. (2011). Examining the Black-White achievement gap among low-income children using the NICHD study of early child care and youth development. *Child Dev, 82*(5), 1404-1420. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01620.x

Casey, B. J., Cannonier, T., Conley, M. I., Cohen, A. O., Barch, D. M., Heitzeg, M. M., . . . Workgroup, A. I. A. (2018). The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Dev Cogn Neurosci, 32*, 43-54. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.001

Chen, E., & Paterson, L. Q. (2006). Neighborhood, family, and subjective socioeconomic status: How do they relate to adolescent health? *Health Psychol, 25*(6), 704-714. http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.25.6.704

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Kline, P., & Saez, E. (2014). Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129*(4), 1553-1623.

Chierchia, G., Fuhrmann, D., Knoll, L. J., Pi-Sunyer, B. P., Sakhardande, A. L., & Blakemore, S. J. (2019). The matrix reasoning item bank (MaRs-IB): Novel, open-access abstract reasoning items for adolescents and adults. *R Soc Open Sci, 6*(10), 190232. http://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.190232

Chiteji, N. S., & Hamilton, D. (2002). Family connections and the black-white wealth gap among middle-class families. *The Review of Black Political Economy, 30*(1), 9-28.

Christensen, D. L., Schieve, L. A., Devine, O., & Drews-Botsch, C. (2014). Socioeconomic status, child enrichment factors, and cognitive performance among preschool-age children: Results from the Follow-Up of Growth and Development Experiences study. *Res Dev Disabil, 35*(7), 1789-1801. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.02.003

Cohen, G. L., & Sherman, D. K. (2005). Stereotype threat and the social and scientific contexts of the race achievement gap. *Am Psychol, 60*(3), 270-271; discussion 271-272. http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.3.270

Covin, T. M., & Hatch, G. L. (1977). WISC-R full scale mean IQS for both black and white children, aged 6 through 15 and having difficulty in school. *Psychol Rep, 41*(3 pt. 2), 1201-1202. http://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1977.41.3f.1201

Cross, C. J. (2020). Racial/Ethnic Differences in the Association Between Family Structure and Children’s Education. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 82*(2), 691-712.
Cummings, J. R. (2014). Contextual socioeconomic status and mental health counseling use among US adolescents with depression. *J Youth Adolesc.*, **43**(7), 1151-1162. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0021-7

DeSantis, A. S., Adam, E. K., Doane, L. D., Mineka, S., Zinbarg, R. E., & Craske, M. G. (2007). Racial/ethnic differences in cortisol diurnal rhythms in a community sample of adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*, **41**(1), 3-13. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.03.006

Dismukes, A., Shirtcliff, E., Jones, C. W., Zeana, C., Theall, K., & Drury, S. (2018). The development of the cortisol response to dyadic stressors in Black and White infants. *Dev Psychopathol.*, **30**(5), 1995-2008. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579418001232

Dombrowski, S. C., Canivez, G. L., & Watkins, M. W. (2018). Factor structure of the 10 WISC-V primary subtests across four standardization age groups. *Contemporary School Psychology*, **22**(1), 90-104.

Feldman, P. J., & Steptoe, A. (2004). How neighborhoods and physical functioning are related: the roles of neighborhood socioeconomic status, perceived neighborhood strain, and individual health risk factors. *Ann Behav Med.*, **27**(2), 91-99. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2702_3

Fuentes, M., Hart-Johnson, T., & Green, C. R. (2007). The association among neighborhood socioeconomic status, race and chronic pain in black and white older adults. *J Natl Med Assoc.*, **99**(10), 1160-1169. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17987920

Garavan, H., Bartsch, H., Conway, K., Decastro, A., Goldstein, R. Z., Heeringa, S., . . . Zahn, S. (2018). Recruiting the ABCD sample: Design considerations and procedures. *Dev Cogn Neurosci.*, **32**, 16-22. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.04.004

Gerra, G., Benedetti, E., Resce, G., Potente, R., Cutilli, A., & Molinaro, S. (2020). Socioeconomic Status, Parental Education, School Connectedness and Individual Socio-Cultural Resources in Vulnerability for Drug Use among Students. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, **17**(4). http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041306

Gorey, K. M. (2009). Comprehensive School Reform: Meta-Analytic Evidence of Black-White Achievement Gap Narrowing. *Educ Policy Anal Arch*, **17**(25), 1-17. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27453681

Gottfredson, L. S. (1998). The general intelligence factor. In: *Scientific American, Incorporated.*

Hair, N. L., Hanson, J. L., Wolfe, B. L., & Pollak, S. D. (2015). Association of Child Poverty, Brain Development, and Academic Achievement. *JAMA Pediatr.*, **169**(9), 822-829. http://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1475

Hanson, J. L., Nacewicz, B. M., Sutterer, M. J., Cayo, A. A., Schaefer, S. M., Rudolph, K. D., . . . Davidson, R. J. (2015). Behavioral problems after early life stress: contributions of the hippocampus and amygdala. *Biol Psychiatry*, **77**(4), 314-323. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.04.020
Harnett, N. G., Wheelock, M. D., Wood, K. H., Goodman, A. M., Mrug, S., Elliott, M. N., . . . Knight, D. C. (2019). Negative life experiences contribute to racial differences in the neural response to threat. *Neuroimage, 202*, 116086. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116086

Harrison, T. L., Shipstead, Z., & Engle, R. W. (2015). Why is working memory capacity related to matrix reasoning tasks? *Mem Cognit, 43*(3), 389-396. http://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-014-0473-3

Hemovich, V., Lac, A., & Crano, W. D. (2011). Understanding early-onset drug and alcohol outcomes among youth: the role of family structure, social factors, and interpersonal perceptions of use. *Psychol Health Med, 16*(3), 249-267. http://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2010.532560

Hudson, D., Sacks, T., Irani, K., & Asher, A. (2020). The Price of the Ticket: Health Costs of Upward Mobility among African Americans. *Int J Environ Res Public Health, 17*(4). http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041179

Jacques, T., & Seitz, A. R. (2020). Moderating effects of visual attention and action video game play on perceptual learning with the texture discrimination task. *Vision Res.* http://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2020.02.003

Jefferson, A. L., Gibbons, L. E., Rentz, D. M., Carvalho, J. O., Manly, J., Bennett, D. A., & Jones, R. N. (2011). A life course model of cognitive activities, socioeconomic status, education, reading ability, and cognition. *J Am Geriatr Soc, 59*(8), 1403-1411. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03499.x

Karcher, N. R., O’Brien, K. J., Kandala, S., & Barch, D. M. (2019). Resting-State Functional Connectivity and Psychotic-like Experiences in Childhood: Results From the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. *Biol Psychiatry, 86*(1), 7-15. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2019.01.013

Karlsson, O., De Neve, J. W., & Subramanian, S. V. (2018). Weakening association of parental education: Analysis of child health outcomes in 43 low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Epidemiol.* http://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyy158

Kaufman, J. S., Cooper, R. S., & McGee, D. L. (1997). Socioeconomic status and health in blacks and whites: the problem of residual confounding and the resiliency of race. *Epidemiology, 621*-628.

Kelishadi, R., Jari, M., Qorbani, M., Motlagh, M. E., Ardalan, G., Bahreynian, M., . . . Heshmat, R. (2017). Does the socioeconomic status affect the prevalence of psychiatric distress and violent behaviors in children and adolescents? The CASPIAN-IV study. *Minerva Pediatr, 69*(4), 264-273. http://doi.org/10.23736/S0026-4946.16.04266-3

King, J., & Markant, J. (2020). Individual differences in selective attention and scanning dynamics influence children’s learning from relevant non-targets in a visual search task. *J Exp Child Psychol, 193*, 104797. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2019.104797

Knight, T. A. (2003). Wais-III matrix reasoning: instruction effects on task perception and performance. *Psychol Rep, 93*(1), 66-68. http://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2003.93.1.66
Larson, K., Russ, S. A., Nelson, B. B., Olson, L. M., & Halfon, N. (2015). Cognitive ability at kindergarten entry and socioeconomic status. *Pediatrics, 135*(2), e440-e448. http://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2014-0434

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. (1995). Social conditions as fundamental causes of disease. *J Health Soc Behav, Spec No*, 80-94. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7560851

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. (2009). The social shaping of health and smoking. *Drug Alcohol Depend, 104 Suppl 1*, S6-10. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.03.002

Lisdahl, K. M., Sher, K. J., Conway, K. P., Gonzalez, R., Feldstein Ewing, S. W., Nixon, S. J., . . . Heitzeg, M. (2018). Adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) study: Overview of substance use assessment methods. *Dev Cogn Neurosci, 32*, 80-96. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.007

Luciana, M., Bjork, J. M., Nagel, B. J., Barch, D. M., Gonzalez, R., Nixon, S. J., & Banich, M. T. (2018). Adolescent neurocognitive development and impacts of substance use: Overview of the adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) baseline neurocognition battery. *Dev Cogn Neurosci, 32*, 67-79. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.006

Madhushanthi, H. J., Wimalasekera, S. W., Goonewardena, C. S. E., Amarasekara, A., & Lenora, J. (2018). Socioeconomic status is a predictor of neurocognitive performance of early female adolescents. *Int J Adolesc Med Health*. http://doi.org/10.1515/ijamh-2018-0024

Manly, J. J., Jacobs, D. M., Touradji, P., Small, S. A., & Stern, Y. (2002). Reading level attenuates differences in neuropsychological test performance between African American and White elders. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc, 8*(3), 341-348. http://doi.org/10.1017/s1355617702813157

Manuck, S. B., Phillips, J. E., Gianaros, P. J., Flory, J. D., & Muldoon, M. F. (2010). Subjective socioeconomic status and presence of the metabolic syndrome in midlife community volunteers. *Psychosom Med, 72*(1), 35-45. http://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181c484dc

Marmot, M. (2004). *The Status Syndrome: How Social Standing Affects Our Health and Longevity*. London: Bloomsbury Press.

Mayes, S. D., & Calhoun, S. L. (2008). WISC-IV and WIAT-II profiles in children with high-functioning autism. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders, 38*(3), 428-439.

Merz, E. C., Tottenham, N., & Noble, K. G. (2018). Socioeconomic Status, Amygdala Volume, and Internalizing Symptoms in Children and Adolescents. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol, 47*(2), 312-323. http://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2017.1326122

Miller, B., & Taylor, J. (2012). Racial and socioeconomic status differences in depressive symptoms among black and white youth: An examination of the mediating effects of family structure, stress and support. *J Youth Adolesc, 41*(4), 426-437. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9672-4

Moon, C. (1987). Subjective economic status, sex role attitudes, fertility, and mother’s work. *Ingu Pogon Nonjip, 7*(1), 177-196. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12280803
Nogueira, G. J., Castro, A., Naveira, L., Nogueira-Antunano, F., Natinzon, A., Gigli, S. L., . . . Marchesi, M. (2005). [Evaluation of the higher brain functions in 1st and 7th grade schoolchildren belonging to two different socioeconomic groups]. *Rev Neurol, 40*(7), 397-406. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15849672

Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., Diez-Roux, A., Kawachi, I., & Levin, B. (2004). “Fundamental causes” of social inequalities in mortality: A test of the theory. *J Health Soc Behav, 45*(3), 265-285. http://doi.org/10.1177/002214650404500303

Poh, B. K., Lee, S. T., Yeo, G. S., Tang, K. C., Noor Afifah, A. R., Siti Hanisa, A., . . . Group, S. S. (2019). Low socioeconomic status and severe obesity are linked to poor cognitive performance in Malaysian children. *BMC Public Health, 19*(Suppl 4), 541. http://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6856-4

Raiford, S., Zhang, O., Drozdick, L., Getz, K., Wahlstrom, D., Gabel, A., . . . Daniel, M. (2016). WISC–V Coding and Symbol Search in digital format: Reliability, validity, special group studies, and interpretation (Q-interactive Technical Report 12). Bloomington, MN. *Bloomington, MN: Pearson.*

Richards, M., James, S. N., Sizer, A., Sharma, N., Rawle, M., Davis, D. H. J., & Kuh, D. (2019). Identifying the lifetime cognitive and socioeconomic antecedents of cognitive state: Seven decades of follow-up in a British birth cohort study. *BMJ Open, 9*(4), e024404. http://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024404

Rodriguez, J. M., Karlamangla, A. S., Gruenewald, T. L., Miller-Martinez, D., Merkin, S. S., & Seeman, T. E. (2019). Social stratification and allostatic load: Shapes of health differences in the MIDUS study in the United States. *J Biosoc Sci, 1*-18. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0021932018000378

Salthouse, T. A. (1993). Influence of working memory on adult age differences in matrix reasoning. *Br J Psychol, 84*(Pt 2), 171-199. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1993.tb02472.x

Samuel, L. J., Roth, D. L., Schwartz, B. S., Thorpe, R. J., & Glass, T. A. (2018). Socioeconomic Status, Race/Ethnicity, and Diurnal Cortisol Trajectories in Middle-Aged and Older Adults. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci, 73*(3), 468-476. http://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbw080

Schibli, K., Wong, K., Hedayati, N., & D’Angiulli, A. (2017). Attending, learning, and socioeconomic disadvantage: Developmental cognitive and social neuroscience of resilience and vulnerability. *Ann N Y Acad Sci, 1396*(1), 19-38. http://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13369

Schreier, H. M., & Chen, E. (2013). Socioeconomic status and the health of youth: A multilevel, multidomain approach to conceptualizing pathways. *Psychol Bull, 139*(3), 606-654. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0029416

Schulz, A. J., Mentz, G., Lachance, L., Johnson, J., Gaines, C., & Israel, B. A. (2012). Associations between socioeconomic status and allostatic load: Effects of neighborhood poverty and tests of mediating pathways. *Am J Public Health, 102*(9), 1706-1714.
Senn, T. E., Walsh, J. L., & Carey, M. P. (2014). The mediating roles of perceived stress and health behaviors in the relation between objective, subjective, and neighborhood socioeconomic status and perceived health. *Ann Behav Med, 48*(2), 215-224. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-014-9591-1

Shervin, A., & Ritesh, M. (2019). Diminished Return of Employment on Ever Smoking Among Hispanic Whites in Los Angeles. *Health Equity, 3*(1), 138-144. http://doi.org/10.1089/heq.2018.0070

Soulieres, I., Dawson, M., Samson, F., Barbeau, E. B., Sahyoun, C. P., Strangman, G. E., . . . Mottron, L. (2009). Enhanced visual processing contributes to matrix reasoning in autism. *Hum Brain Mapp, 30*(12), 4082-4107. http://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20831

Takada, M., Kondo, N., Hashimoto, H., & Committee, J. S. D. M. (2014). Japanese study on stratification, health, income, and neighborhood: Study protocol and profiles of participants. *J Epidemiol, 24*(4), 334-344. http://doi.org/10.2188/jea.je20130084

Ursache, A., Noble, K. G., & Blair, C. (2015). Socioeconomic Status, Subjective Social Status, and Perceived Stress: Associations with Stress Physiology and Executive Functioning. *Behav Med, 41*(3), 145-154. http://doi.org/10.1080/08964289.2015.1024604

Valencia, M. L. C., Tran, B. T., Lim, M. K., Choi, K. S., & Oh, J. K. (2019). Association Between Socioeconomic Status and Early Initiation of Smoking, Alcohol Drinking, and Sexual Behavior Among Korean Adolescents. *Asia Pac J Public Health, 31*(5), 443-453. http://doi.org/10.1177/1010539519860732

Vargas, T., Rakshshan Rouhakhtar, P. J., Schiffman, J., Zou, D. S., Rydland, K. J., & Mittal, V. A. (2020). Neighborhood crime, socioeconomic status, and suspiciousness in adolescents and young adults at Clinical High Risk (CHR) for psychosis. *Schizophr Res, 215*, 74-80. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.11.024

Weitzman, M., Byrd, R. S., & Auinger, P. (1999). Black and white middle class children who have private health insurance in the United States. *Pediatrics, 104*(1 Pt 2), 151-157. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10390282

Williams, D. R. (1999). *Race, socioeconomic status, and health the added effects of racism and discrimination.*

Williams, D. R., Costa, M. V., Odunlami, A. O., & Mohammed, S. A. (2008). Moving upstream: how interventions that address the social determinants of health can improve health and reduce disparities. *J Public Health Manag Pract, 14* Suppl, S8-17. http://doi.org/10.1097/01.PHH.0000338382.36695.42

Wright, C. E., & Steptoe, A. (2005). Subjective socioeconomic position, gender and cortisol responses to waking in an elderly population. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 30*(6), 582-590. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2005.01.007
Ye, Z., Wen, M., Wang, W., & Lin, D. (2020). Subjective family socio-economic status, school social capital, and positive youth development among young adolescents in China: A multiple mediation model. *Int J Psychol, 55*(2), 173-181. http://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12583

Yelin, E., Trupin, L., Bunde, J., & Yazdany, J. (2019). Poverty, Neighborhoods, Persistent Stress, and Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Outcomes: A Qualitative Study of the Patients’ Perspective. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken), 71*(3), 398-405. http://doi.org/10.1002/acr.23599