I'm not a robot



```
Economic and social measure of a person's affluence and/or influence An 1880 painting by Jean-Eugène Buland showing a stark contrast in socioeconomic status (SES) is a measurement used by economics and sociologsts. The measurement combines a person's work experience and their or their family's access to economic
resources and social position in relation to others.[1][2] In common parlance, "socioeconomic status, using the former to one's relatively stable cultural background and the latter to refer to one's current social and economic situation
which is consequently more changeable over time.[4] When analyzing a family's SES, the household income and the education and occupations of its members are examined, whereas for an individual's SES only their own attributes are assessed. Recently, research has revealed a lesser-recognized attribute of SES as perceived financial stress, as it
defines the "balance between income and necessary expenses".[5][6][2] Perceived financial stress can be tested by deciphering whether a person at the end of each month has more than enough, just enough, or not enough money or resources.[2][7] However, SES is more commonly used to depict an economic difference in society as a whole.[8]
Socioeconomic status is typically broken into three levels (high, middle, and low) to describe the three places a family or an individual into one of these categories, any or all of the three variables (income, education, and occupation) can be assessed. Education in higher socioeconomic families is
typically stressed as much more important, both within the household as well as the local community. In poorer areas, where food, shelter and safety are a priority, education is typically regarded as less important. Youth in poorer households are particularly at risk for many health and social problems in the United States, such as unwanted
pregnancies, addiction, drug abuse, diabetes and obesity.[9] Additionally, low income and education have been shown to be strong predictors of a range of physical and mental health problems, including, meningitis, respiratory viruses, arthritis, coronary disease, and psychosis, schizophrenia. These problems may result from environmental conditions
at home or in the workplaces, or using the social causation model where disability or mental illness, may be the precursor leading to a person's social status including freedoms and liberties. [10][11][12][13] Income refers to wages, salaries, profits, rents, and any flow of earnings received. Income can also come in the form of unemployment or
worker's compensation, social security, pensions, interests or dividends, royalties, trusts, alimony, or other governmental, public, or family financial assistance. It can also come from monetary winnings, like lotteries and other games or contests where money is awarded as a prize. Income can be looked at in two terms: relative and absolute. John
Maynard Keynes's absolute income hypothesis predicts that as income in relation to others. Income is a commonly used measure of SES because it is relatively easy to figure for most
individuals. Income inequality is most commonly measured around the world by the Gini coefficient, where 0 corresponds to perfect equality and 1 means perfect inequality. Low-income families focus on meeting immediate needs and do not accumulate wealth that could be passed on to future generations, thus increasing inequality. Families with
higher and expendable income can accumulate wealth and focus on meeting immediate needs while being able to consume and enjoy luxuries and weather crises. [14] Education are associated with better economic and
psychological outcomes (i.e.: more income, more control, and greater social support and networking).[13] Education plays a pivotal role in skillsets and cultivating specific qualities that stratify people with higher SES from lower SES. Parents from lower SES households have been observed as being more likely to give orders to their children in their
interactions while parents with a higher SES are more likely to encourage questioning in their children in the interest of fostering critical thinking. Research has shown how children who are born in lower SES households have weaker language skills compared to children raised in higher SES households. These language skills affect their abilities to
learn and thus exacerbate the problem of education disparity between low and high SES neighborhoods.[15] Research shows that lower SES students of higher SES.[16] This may be attributed to the abundance of resources available to the upper and upper middle class school
districts and parents, while the equivalent in areas which are predominantly lower-middle/working class do not have the resources (for staffing quality teachers, updating textbooks, providing free tutoring or counseling for students who need it in order to succeed at school, etc.). This section is an excerpt from Socioeconomic impact of female
education.[edit] The socioeconomic impact of female education constitutes a significant area of research within international development. Some of the effects are related to economic development. Women's education increases the income of
women and leads to growth in GDP. Other effects are related to social development. Educating girls leads to a number of social benefits, including many related to women's empowerment. Occupational status reflects the educational
attainment required to obtain the job and income levels that vary with different jobs and within ranks of occupations. Additionally, it shows achievement in skills required for the job. Occupational status measures social position by describing job characteristics, decision-making ability and control, and psychological demands on the job.[citation
needed] Occupations are ranked by the Census (among other organizations) and opinion polls from the general population are surveyed. Some of the most prestigious occupations are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical engineers, university professors, and communications are physicians are physicians are physicians and surgeons.
high SES classification, provide more challenging work and greater control over working conditions but require more ability. The jobs with lower rankings include food preparation workers, counter attendants, bartenders and helpers, dishwashers, janitors, maids and housekeepers, vehicle cleaners, and parking lot attendants. The jobs that are less
valued also offer significantly lower wages, and often are more laborious, very hazardous, and provide less autonomy.[13][17] Occupation is the most difficult factor to measure because so many exist, and there are so many competing scales. Many scales rank occupations based on the level of skill involved, from unskilled to skilled manual labour to
professional, or use a combined measure using the education level needed and income involved. In sum, the majority of researchers agree that income, education and occupation together best represent SES, while some others feel that changes in family structure should also be considered.[18] SES affects students' cognitive abilities and academic
success.[18] Several researchers have found that SES affects students' abilities.[18] Wealth distribution in the United States by net worth (2007).[19] The net wealth of many people in the lowest 20% is negative because of debt.[19] By 2014 the wealth gap deepened. Top 1% (34.6%) Next 4% (27.3%) Next 5% (11.2%) Next 10% (12%) Upper Middle
20% (10.9%) Middle 20% (4%) Bottom 40% (0.2%) Wealth, a set of economic reserves or assets, presents a source of security providing a measure of a household's ability to meet emergencies, absorb economic shocks, or provide the means to live comfortably. Wealth reflects intergenerational transitions as well as accumulation of income and savings
[13][20] Income, age, marital status, family size, religion, occupation, and education are all predictors of wealth gap due in part to income disparities and differences in achievement resulting from institutional discrimination. According to
Thomas Shapiro, differences in savings (due to different rates of incomes), inheritance factors, and discrimination in the housing market lead to the racial wealth gap. Shapiro claims that savings increase with increasing income, but African Americans cannot participate in this, because they make significantly less than Americans of European descent
(whites). Additionally, rates of inheritance dramatically differ between African Americans and Americans and Americans and Americans and European descent. The amount a person inherits, either during a lifetime or after death, can create different starting points between two different starting points also factor into housing, education, and
employment discrimination. A third reason Shapiro offers for the racial wealth gap are the various discriminations African Americans must face, like redlining and higher interest rates in the housing market. These types of discrimination feed into the other reasons why African Americans end up having different starting points and therefore fewer
assets.[21] This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources in this section. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. (April 2016) (Learn how and when to remove this message) Recently, there has been increasing interest from epidemiologists on the subject of
economic inequality and its relation to the health of populations. Socioeconomic status has long been related to health, those higher in the social hierarchy typically enjoy better health inequity, as there is a very robust positive correlation between socioeconomic status and
health. This correlation suggests that it is not only the poor who tend to be sick when everyone else is healthy, but that there is a continual gradient, from the top to the bottom of the health care resources which is the reason that their
children may have a more advanced illness because of the lack of treatment. [23] This phenomenon is often called the "SES Gradient" or according to the World Health Organisation the "Social Gradient". Lower socioeconomic status has been linked to chronic stress, heart disease, ulcers, type 2 diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, certain types of cancer,
and premature aging. There is debate regarding the cause of the SES Gradient. Researchers see a definite link between economic resources of the wealthy, but they find little correlation due to social status differences. [24] Other researchers such as Richard G. Wilkinson, J. Lynch, and G.A. Kaplan
have found that socioeconomic status strongly affects health even when controlling for economic resources and access to health care. [25] Most famous for linking social status with health are the Whitehall studies—a series of studies conducted on civil servants in London. The studies found that although all civil servants in England have the same
access to health care, there was a strong correlation between social status and health. The studies found that this relationship remained strong even when controlling for health-affecting habits such as exercise, smoking and drinking. Furthermore, it has been noted that no amount of medical attention will help decrease the likelihood of someone
getting type 2 diabetes or rheumatoid arthritis—yet both are more common among populations with lower socioeconomic status. This section needs expansion. You can help by adding to it. (January 2014) Political scientists have established a consistent relationship between SES and political participation. For example, in 2004, the American Political
Science Task Force on Inequality and American Democracy has found that those with higher socioeconomic status participate at higher rates than those with lower status (usually measured using the three variables income or wealth,
occupational level, and years of education) correlates negatively with criminality, except for self-reported illegal drug use. Higher parental socioeconomic status probably has an inverse relationship with criminality, except for self-reported illegal drug use. Higher parental socioeconomic status is thought
to be positively correlated with higher levels of stress, and therefore the mental and psychological ill-effects of stress. [29] Indeed, higher stress levels have been positively associated with a propensity to commit crime. [30] Somewhat inconsistent evidence indicates a positive relationship between low income levels, the percentage of population under
the poverty line, low education levels, and high income inequality in an area with more crime in said area. [27] A 2013 study from Sweden argued that there was little effect of neighbourhood deprivation on criminality per se and rather that the higher rates of crime were due to observed family and individual level factors, indicating
that high-risk individuals were being selected into economically deprived areas.[31] A World Bank study said, "Crime rates and inequality are positively correlated within countries, and this correlation reflects causation from inequality to crime rates, even after controlling for other crime determinants."[32]
Researchers in criminology have argued the effect of poverty upon crime is contextual: [33][34][35] As Levi (1997: 860) noted, macrolevel accounts 'seldom generate anything close to a causal account which makes sense of nonviolence as well as of violence'. Put another way, the vast majority of individuals who live in conditions of poverty or
disadvantage do not resort to violence at any time. Hence, in order to understand the patterns of violence that actually occur, it is imperative to study the social experiences of those who engage in it (Athens 1992). This section needs expansion. You can help by adding to it. (February 2016) The environment of low SES children is characterized by less
dialogue from parents, minimal amounts of book reading, and few instances of joint attention, the shared focus of the child and adult on the same object or event, when compared to the environment of high SES children. In contrast, infants from high SES families experience more child-directed speech. At 10 months, children of high SES hear on
average 400 more words than their low SES peers. [36] Language ability differs sharply as a function of SES, for example, the average vocabulary size of 3-year-old children from professional families was more than twice as large as for those on welfare. [37] Children from lower income households had greater media access in their bedrooms but lower
access to portable play equipment compared to higher income children.[38] This eventually leads children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds to be at a disadvantage when comparing them with their counterparts in terms of access to physical activities. In addition to the amount of language input from parents, SES heavily influences the type of
parenting style a family chooses to practice. These different parenting styles shape the tone and purpose of verbal interactions between parent and child. For example, parents of high SES tend toward more authoritative or permissive parents pose more open-ended questions to their children to encourage the latter's
speech growth.[40] In contrast, parents of low SES tend toward more authoritarian styles of address. Their conversations with their respective groups
more accommodating and compliant personality. Therefore, low-SES parents see the family as more hierarchical, with the parents at the top of the working class world, where individuals are ranked and discouraged from questioning
authority. Conversely, high-SES individuals occupy high-power positions that call for greater expressivity. High-SES parents encourage their children to questions, these parents push their children to questions of their own.[39] In contrast with low-SES parents
these individuals often view the power disparity between parent and child as detrimental to the family. Opting instead to treat children as equals, high-SES conversations are characterized by a give and take between parent and child.[42] These interactions help prepare these children for occupations that require greater expressivity. The linguistic
environment of low and high SES children differs substantially, which affects many aspects of language and literacy development such as semantics, syntax, morphology, and phonology. Semantics is the study of the meaning of words and phrases. Semantics covers vocabulary, which is affected by SES. Children of high SES have larger expressive
vocabularies by the age of 24 months due to more efficient processing of familiar words. By age 3, there are significant differences in the amount of dialogue and vocabulary extend from childhood to adolescence and even into early adulthood according to a large
socioeconomically diverse study. [44] A lack of joint attention in children contributes to poor vocabulary growth when compared to their high SES peers. Joint attention, a child and adult can focus on the same object, allowing the child to map out
words. For example, a child sees an animal running outside and the mom points to it and says, "Look, a dog." The child will focus its attention thus facilitates word learning for children. Syntax refers to the arrangement of words and phrases to form sentences
SES affects the production of sentence structures. Although 22- to 44-month-old children's production of simple sentence structures does not vary by SES, low SES does contribute to difficulty with complex sentence include sentence structures.
you to sit there".[46] The emergence of simple sentence structures is seen as a structure that is obligatory in everyday speech. Complex sentence formation abilities of low SES children may be caused by less frequent exposure to
complex syntax through parental speech. Low SES parents ask fewer response-coaxing questions of their children which limits the opportunities of these children which limits the opportunities of the opportunities 
noun and verb phrases.[40] In contrast, high SES households ask their children's vocabulary growth and complex noun phrase constructions.[40] Children's grasp of morphology, the study of how words are formed, is affected by SES
Children of high SES have advantages in applying grammatical rules, such as the pluralization of nouns are regular and -s denotes more than one, but also understanding how to apply different rules to irregular nouns. Learning and
understanding how to use plural rules is an important tool in conversation and writing. In order to communicate successfully that there is more than one dog running down the street, an -s must be added to dog. Research also finds that the gap in ability to pluralize nouns and adjectives does not diminish by age or schooling because low SES
children's reaction times to pluralize nouns and adjectives do not decrease.[47] Phonological awareness, the ability to recognize that words are made up of different sound units, is also affected by SES. Children of low SES between the second and sixth grades are found to have low phonological awareness. The gap in phonological awareness
increases by grade level.[48] This gap is even more problematic if children of low SES are already born with low levels of phonological awareness from an early age are not affected by SES.[49] Given the large amount of research on the setbacks
children of low SES face, there is a push by child developmental researchers to steer research to a more positive direction regarding low SES. The goal is to highlight the strengths and assets low income families possess in raising children. For example, African American preschoolers of low SES exhibit strengths in oral narrative, or storytelling, that
families.[51] A gap in reading growth exists between low SES and high SES children, which widens as children move on to higher grades. Reading assessments that test reading growth include measures on basic reading skills (i.e., print familiarity, letter recognition, beginning and ending sounds, rhyming sounds, word recognition), vocabulary
(receptive vocabulary), and reading growth and less on their parents. Initially, high SES children begin as better
readers than their low SES counterparts. As children get older, high SES children progress more rapidly in reading growth rates than low SES children fall behind, the more difficult it is to catch up and the more likely they will continue to fall behind. By the time
students enter high school in the United States, low SES children are considerably behind their high SES peers in reading growth.[53] Home environment is one of the leading factors of a child's well-being. Children living in a poor home with inadequate living conditions are more likely to be susceptible to illness and injuries.[23] The disparities in
experiences in the home environment between children of low SES affect reading outcomes. [53] Children of low SES status are read to less often and have fewer books in the home environment is considered the main contributor to SES reading outcomes.
SES status have lower initial reading scores than their high SES counterparts upon entering kindergarten. [53][54] Low SES parents are also less involved in their high SES counterparts upon entering kindergarten.
plays a role in shaping emotional, physical and mental health, all things that are extremely important to educational success in the classroom. This is a crucial factor that must be acknowledged by educators because boundaries such as constant parenting stress and approach to learning, for example, have a major impact on the students' literacy
development. [55] The home environment makes the largest contribution to the prediction of initial kindergarten reading disparities. Characteristics of the home environment is characterized by the frequency with which parents engage in joint book
reading with the child, the frequency with which children read books outside of school, and the frequency with which household members visited the library with the child. Parental involvement in school is characterized by attending a parent-teacher conference, attending a parent-teacher association (PTA) meeting, attending an open house,
volunteering, participating in fundraising, and attending associated with reading level may be due to children experiencing little
schooling before kindergarten—they mainly have their families to rely on for their reading growth.[53] Socioeconomic status plays a role in the involvement of certain parents over others. It affects parenting practices and as a result proves to be a strong predictor of child achievement when comparing households.[56] A parent's involvement in their
child's reading literacy performance progress is often overcome by demographic factors such as poverty, racial and ethnic identity, family and parenting stress, and the parent's educational level.[55] Studies show that when parents become involved in reading-related activities with their children outside of school, reading performance, literacy, love
for reading and language skills are more likely to improve.[57] Parent involvement in students' education is a large factor in their literacy achievement, but the way they parent has a large impact on the overall development of the child. These kinds of involvements are often determined by privilege and the level of stress that a parent must endure,
especially when of low socioeconomic status. The reading literacy gap has been further exposed by the enhancement of these already existing inequalities. Studies have found a direct link between Family Processes (including approaches to learning and self control), and
Reading Literacy.[55] Although seeming unrelated, the way that a parent interacts with their child and their c
practice remote learning of the 2020 pandemic.[58] Limited access to the correct school resources affects a child's literacy level dramatically, even more so during the switch to online learning, given the combination of decreased parent involvement and access to outdoor play. Low to lower-middle class households had the highest rate of employment
change during the pandemic, which includes loss of employment, reduced hours and/or reduced pay.[58] Large historical events like this one have only extenuated and exposed already existing inequities and in turn have negatively affected students of these demographics. The US Department of Labor revealed that layoffs that occurred during the
COVID-19 pandemic had the biggest impact on historically minorities groups, which include Black, Latino, low income workers, and women. [58] This means that children of these same working adults experienced disparities as well. In a 2013 report by the US Department of Commerce, it was found that only 55% of African American and 58% of rural
households had any internet access in their home. [59] This can be compared to the 74% of white and 81% of Asian American homes that the demographic students still experience this "digital gap" and disproportionate lack in
access to the internet and/or technological equipment necessary. [58] Without access to the correct materials at home, including books and digital tools, students cannot perform as well in reading achievement growth during the summer. Students from high SES
families continue to grow in their ability to read after kindergarten and students from low SES families fall behind in their reading growth at a comparable amount. [60] Additionally, the summer setback disproportionately affects African American and Hispanic students because they are more likely than White students to come from low SES families
Also, low SES families typically lack the appropriate resources to continue reading growth when school is not in session. After the long summer break, it is found that the reading literacy gap between middle and lower class students is about 3 months long. [60] This is a substantial amount of skills lost over a period of break from classes that, if not
addressed, can grow extremely worse over time. It is especially important to address this issue and create solutions for young students of low SES in order to address the cycle of disadvantages faced by these communities. Studies show that by providing books to disadvantaged students over the summer, the reading achievement dramatically
improves for elementary school students.[60] Specifically, providing access to self-selected books consistently over the months of summers is successful in limiting reading setbacks.[60] Many of these students continue to feel discouraged, have less motivation and therefore fall more behind. By providing encouragement through opportunity, there is
more chance of future success in literacy development. The neighborhood gualities include but are not limited to garbage or litter in the street, individuals selling or using drugs in the street, burglary or robbery in the area,
violent crime in the area, vacant homes in the area, vacant homes in the area, and how safe it is to play in the neighborhood. Low SES children are more likely to grow up in such neighborhood conditions than their high SES peers. Community support for the school and poor physical conditions surrounding the school are also associated with children's reading. Neighborhood
factors help explain the variation in reading scores in school entry, and especially as children move on to higher grades. As low SES children in poor neighborhood environments get older, they fall further behind their high SES peers in reading growth and thus have a more difficult time developing reading skills at grade level.[53] In a study by M.
Keels, it was determined that when low-income families are moved from poor neighborhoods to suburban neighborhoods, there are reductions in delinquency in children. [61] When comparing different social statuses of families, the environment of a neighborhood turns out to be a major factor in contributing to the growth of a child. School
characteristics, including characteristics of peers and teachers, contribute to reading disparities between low and high SES children. For instance, peers play a role in influencing early reading proficiency. In low SES schools, there are higher concentrations of less skilled, lower SES, and minority peers who have lower gains in reading. The number of
children reading below grade and the presence of low-income peers were consistently associated with initial achievement and growth rates. Low SES peers tend to have limited skills and fewer economic resources than high SES children, which makes it difficult for children to grow in their reading ability. The most rapid growth of reading ability
happens between the spring of kindergarten and the spring of first grade. Teacher experience (number of years teaching a particular school and the number of courses taken on early education, elementary education, and child development), the highest
degree earned, and the number of courses taken on teaching reading all determine whether or not a reading growth rates being significantly lower than the growth rates of their high SES counterparts.[53] Children of parents
with a high SES tended to express more disengagement behaviors than their peers of low SES.[62] This study by Michael Kraus and Dacher Keltner was published in the December 2008 issue of Psychological Science. In this context, disengagement behaviors included self-grooming, fidgeting with nearby objects, and doodling while being addressed.
In contrast, engagement behaviors included head nods, eyebrow raises, laughter and gazes at one's partner and the desire to deepen and enhance the relationship. Participants of low SES tended to express more engagement behaviors toward their conversational partners, while their high SES
counterparts displayed more disengagement behaviors. Authors hypothesized that, as SES rises, the capacity to fulfill one's needs also increases. This may lead to greater feelings of independence, making individuals of high SES less inclined to gain rapport with conversational partners because they are less likely to need their assistance in the future
[62] Society portal Economic mobility Intelligence and socio-economic status Identity performance NRS social grade Social comparison theory Social status Status attainment of SES in health research: Current practice and steps toward a new approach" (PDF)
Social Science & Medicine. 56 (4): 769-784. doi:10.1016/s0277-9536(02)00073-4. PMID 12560010. ^ a b c Palta, Priya; Szanton, Sarah L.; Semba, Richard D.; Thorpe, Roland J.; Varadhan, Ravi; Fried, Linda P. (2015). "Financial strain is associated with increased oxidative stress levels: The Women's Health and Aging Studies". Geriatric Nursing. 36
(2): S33 - S37. doi:10.1016/j.gerinurse.2015.02.020. PMC 6053071. PMID 25784083. ^ Princeton University. "Social class" Archived 3 December 2013 at the Wayback Machine. WordNet Search 3.1. Retrieved on: 2012-01-25. ^ Rubin, M.; Elipatrick, S.; Matthews, K.E.; Stehlik, T.; Zyngier, D. (2014). ""I am working-class": Subjective self-
definition as a missing measure of social class and socioeconomic status in higher education research. Education Researcher. 43 (4): 196-200. doi:10.3102/0013189X14528373. hdl:1959.13/1043609. S2CID 145576929. Szanton, S. L.; Allen, J. K.; Thorpe, R. J.; Seeman, T.; Bandeen-Roche, K.; Fried, L. P. (2008). "Effect of Financial Strain on
psychological distress in Alzheimer's caregivers". Psychology and Aging. 24 (1): 177-183. doi:10.1037/a0014760. PMC 2814818. PMID 19290749. Szanton, S. L.; Thorpe, R. J.; Whitfield, K. (2010). "Life-course financial strain and health in African-Americans". Social Science & Medicine. 71 (2): 259-265. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.04.001
 PMC 2885496. PMID 20452712. A National Center for Educational Statistics. 31 March 2008. Archived. Hunt, J. McV (1972). "Early childhood education and social class". Canadian Psychologist. 13 (4): 305-328. doi:10.1037/h0082195. Goode, Erica (1 June 1999). "For Good Health, It Helps To Be Rich and Important". The New York Times
ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved 16 September 2022. ^ Marmot, Michael (1 April 2007). The Status Syndrome: How Social Standing Affects Our Health and Longevity. Macmillan. ISBN 978-1-4299-0066-9. ^ Werner, Shirli; Malaspina, Dolores; Rabinowitz, Jonathan (27 October 2006). "Socioeconomic Status at Birth Is Associated With Risk of
Schizophrenia: Population-Based Multilevel Study". Schizophrenia Bulletin. 33 (6): 1373-1378. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbm032. ISSN 0586-7614. PMC 2779876. PMID 17443013. ^ a b c d "Disability & Socioeconomic Status". American Psychological Association. ^ Boushey, Heather and Weller, Christian. (2005). Inequality Matters: The Growing
Economic Divide in America and its Poisonous Consequences.. "What the Numbers Tell Us." Pp 27-40. Demos. ^ Lareau, Annette. (2011). Unequal Childhoods: Race, Class, and Family Life. University of California Press ^ Staff (2012) "Education & Socioeconomic Status" American Psychological Association ^ Leonhardt, David (14 May 2005). "A
Edward N. Wolff, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, March 2010 ^ MacArthur Research Network on SES and Health. 31 March 2008. Retrieved 16 April 2008. April 2008. Shapiro, Thomas. (2004). The Hidden Cost of Being African American: How Wealth
Perpetuates Inequality, Oxford University Press. ^ Adler, Nancy E.; Boyce, Thomas; Chesney, Margaret A.; Cohen, Sheldon; Folkman, Susan; Kahn, Robert L.; Syme, S. Leonard (1994). "Socioeconomic status and health: The challenge of the gradient". American Psychologist. 49 (1): 15-24. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.336.6204. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.49.1.15
PMID 8122813. ^ a b Bradley, Robert (2002). "Socioeconomic Status and Child Development". Annual Review of Psychology. 53: 371-399. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135233. PMID 11752490. S2CID 43766257. ^ Leigh, A.; Jencks, C.; Smeeding, T.M. (2009). Nolan, B.; Salverda, W.; Smeeding, T.M. (eds.). The Oxford Handbook of
Economic Inequality. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199606061.013.0016. ISBN 9780199606061. S2CID 152404453. Wilkinson, Richard; Pickett, Kate (2009). The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better. Allen Lane. p. 352. ISBN 978-1-84614-039-6. "American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality". Perspectives on
 Politics. 2 (4): 651-666. December 2004. doi:10.1017/S1537592704040404. ISSN 1537-5927. S2CID 233314371. ^ a b Ellis, Beaver & Wright 2009. ^ Morgan (22 May 2010). "Why do Celebrities get away with Crimes?". www.knowswhy.com. Retrieved 6 March 2017. ^ Baum, Andrew; Garofalo, J. P.; Yali, Ann Marie (December 1999). "Socioeconomic
Status and Chronic Stress: Does Stress Account for SES Effects on Health?". Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 896 (1): 131-144. Bibcode:1999NYASA.896..131B. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb08111.x. PMID 10681894. ^{\circ} Felson, Richard B.; Osgood, D. Wayne; Horney, Julie; Wiernik, Craig (1 June 2012). "Having a
Bad Month: General Versus Specific Effects of Stress on Crime". Journal of Quantitative Criminology. 28 (2): 347-363. doi:10.1007/s10940-011-9138-6. ISSN 1573-7799. Sariaslan, Amir; Långström, Niklas; D'Onofrio, Brian; Hallqvist, Johan; Franck, Johan; Franck, Johan; Franck, Johan; Lichtenstein, Paul (1 August 2013). "The impact of neighbourhood deprivation on adolescent
violent criminality and substance misuse: A longitudinal, quasi-experimental study of the total Swedish population". International Journal of Epidemiology. 42 (4): 1057-1066. doi:10.1093/ije/dyt066. PMC 3780994. PMID 24062294. ^ Fajnzylber, Pablo; Lederman, Daniel; Loayza, Norman (April 2002). "Inequality and Violent Crime". The Journal of Lawrence misuse: A longitudinal, quasi-experimental study of the total Swedish population". International Journal of Epidemiology. 42 (4): 1057-1066. doi:10.1093/ije/dyt066. PMC 3780994. PMID 24062294. ^ Fajnzylber, Pablo; Lederman, Daniel; Loayza, Norman (April 2002). "Inequality and Violent Crime".
and Economics. 45 (1): 1-39. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.559.483. doi:10.1086/338347. S2CID 11378886. Srookman, Fiona; Robinson, Amanda (12 April 2012). "Violent Crime". In Morgan, Rod; Maguire, Mike; Reiner, Robert (eds.). The Oxford Handbook of Criminology. OUP Oxford. pp. 563-594. ISBN 978-0-19-959027-8. Wright, Bradley R. Entner; Caspi,
Avshalom; Moffitt, Terrie E.; Miech, Richard A.; Silva, Phil A. (February 1999). "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, P., Larsson, H.; Larsson, H.; Larsson, H.; Larsson, H.; Larsson, H.; Larsson, H.; Larsson, Phil A. (February 1999). "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999). "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation, Phil A. (February 1999)." "Reconsidering the relation but not correlation but not 
Children. P.H. Brookes. ISBN 9781557661975. Adoi: 10.1016/j.tics.2008.11.003. PMC 3575682. PMID 19135405. Tandon, Pooja S.; Zhou, Chuan; Sallis, James F.; Cain, Kelli L.; Frank, Lawrence D.; Saelens, Brian E. (1
January 2012). "Home environment relationships with children's physical activity, sedentary time, and screen time by socioeconomic status". International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical activity, sedentary time, and screen time by socioeconomic status". International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 9: 88. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-9-88. ISSN 1479-5868. PMC 3413573. PMID 22835155. ^ a b c Hoff, E.; Laursen, B.; Tardif, T (2002). M.
make us who we are. New York, NY: Hudson Street Press. pp. 89-112. ISBN 978-1101623602. ^ a b Kusserow, A (1999). "De-Homogenizing American Individualism: Socializing Hard and Soft Individualism: Socializing Hard and Soft Individualism: Socializing Hard and Soft Individualism in Manhattan and Queens". Ethos. 27 (2): 210-234. doi:10.1525/eth.1999.27.2.210. ^ Hart, Beety (1995). Meaningful Differences in the Everyday
Experience of Young American Children. ^ Decker, Alexandra L.; Duncan, Katherine; Finn, Amy S.; Mabbott, Donald J. (12 August 2020). "Children's family income is associated with cognitive function and volume of anterior not posterior hippocampus". Nature Communications. 11 (1): 4040. Bibcode: 2020NatCo...11.4040D. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-
17854-6. ISSN 2041-1723. PMC 7423938. PMID 32788583. ^ Farrant, Brad; Stephen Zubrick (2012). "Early vocabulary development: The importance of joint attention and parent-child book reading". First Language. 32 (3): 343-364. doi:10.1177/0142723711422626. S2CID 145006189. ^ a b Vasilyeva, Marina; Heidi Waterfall; Janellen Huttenlocher
(2008). "Emergence of syntax: Commonalities and differences across children". Developmental Science. 11 (1): 84-97. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00656.x. PMID 18171371. Across children and differences across children. Developmental Science. 11 (1): 45-63.
doi:10.1515/LING.2009.002. S2CID 144231550. ^ Schiff, Rachel; Einav Lotem (2012). "Schiff, R., & Lotem, E. (2011). Effects of phonological and morphological and morphological
Kimberley; Michael Wolmetz; Lisa Ochs; Martha Farah; Bruce McCandliss (2006). "Brain-behavior relationships in reading acquisition are modulated by socioeconomic factors". Developmental Science. 9 (6): 642-654. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2006.00542.x. PMID 17059461. S2CID 2917133. ^ Gardner-Neblett, Nicole; Elisabeth Pungello; Iheoma
Iruka (2012). "Oral narrative skills: Implications for the reading development of African American children". Child Development Perspectives. 6 (3): 218-224. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00225.x. ^ Chen, Edith; Miller, Gregory E. (March 2012). "Shift-and-Persist" Strategies: Why Low Socioeconomic Status Isn't Always Bad for Health"
Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7 (2): 135-158. doi:10.1177/1745691612436694. ISSN 1745-6916. PMC 3491986. PMID 23144651. Benson, J., Borman, G. (2010). "Family, Neighborhood, and School Settings Across Seasons: When Do Socioeconomic Context and Racial Composition Matter for the Reading Achievement Growth of Young
Children?". Teachers College Record. 112 (5): 1338-1390. doi:10.1177/016146811011200505. S2CID 140373474. {{cite journal}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link) ^ a b c d e f Aikens, N., Barbarin, O. (2010). "Socioeconomic Differences in Reading Trajectories: The Contribution of Family, Neighborhood, and School Contexts". Journal of
Educational Psychology. 100 (2): 235-251. doi:10.1037/0002-0663.100.2.235. {{cite journal}}. CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link) a b Evans, G. (2004). "The Environment of Childhood Poverty". American Psychologist. 59 (2): 77-92. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.77. PMID 14992634. a b c Smith-Adcock, Sondra; Leite, Walter; Kaya,
Yasmine; Amatea, Ellen (5 June 2019). "A Model of Parenting Risk and Resilience, Social-Emotional Readiness, and Readiness, an
Christopher J. (February 2020). "Process and context: Longitudinal effects of the interactions between parental involvement, parental involvement, and SES on academic achievement". Journal of School Psychology. 78: 96-114. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2019.11.004. ISSN 0022-4405. PMID 32178814. S2CID 212741587. ^ "Homework in the Foundation Phase:
Perceptions of principals of eight public primary schools in Johannesburg". South African Journal of Education. 38 (2). 31 May 2018. doi:10.15700/saje.v38n2a1461. ISSN 0256-0100. ^ a b c d Chen, Cliff Yung-Chi; Byrne, Elena; Vélez, Tanya (12 March 2021). "Impact of the 2020 pandemic of COVID-19 on Families with School-aged Children in the
United States: Roles of Income Level and Race". Journal of Family Issues. 43 (3): 719-740. doi:10.1177/0192513x21994153. ISSN 0192-513X. PMC 7957335. ^ a b Chen, J. C.-Y.; Kraiger, Judy J. Kurt (2019). "Engaging Parents Involvement in K - 12 Online Learning Settings: Are
We Meeting the Needs of Underserved Students?". Journal of e-Learning & Knowledge Society. 15 (2): 113-20 - via Ebscohost. ^ a b c d Allington, R. L.; McGill-Franzen, A.; Camilli, G.; Williams, L.; Graff, J.; Zeig, J. (2010). "WWC Quick Review of the Report "Addressing Summer Reading Setback Among Economically Disadvantaged Elementary
Students"". PsycEXTRA Dataset. doi:10.1037/e596832011-001. Retrieved 7 May 2021. ^ Santiago, Catherine DeCarlo; Wadsworth, Martha E.; Stump, Jessica (1 March 2011). "Socioeconomic status, neighborhood disadvantage, and poverty-related stress: Prospective effects on psychological syndromes among diverse low-income families". Journal of
Economic Psychology. Special Issue on The Psychology and Behavioural Economics of Poverty. 32 (2): 218–230. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2009.10.008. ^ a b Kraus, M.W.; Keltner, D. (2008), "Signs of Socioeconomic Status: A Thin-Slicing Approach", Psychological Science, 20 (1): 99–106, doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02251.x, PMID 19076316,
S2CID 9308617 [dead link] Ellis, Lee; Beaver, Kevin M.; Wright, John (1 April 2009). Handbook of Crime Correlates. Academic Press. ISBN 9780123736123. US Census Bureau report on educational attainment in the United States, 2003. June 2004 American Psychological Association's Socioeconomic Status Office Retrieved from 's Socioeconomic Status O
```