Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing <u>scholarworks-group@umbc.edu</u> and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.



	Introductio	n	
 Research on minority c constrain children's scl 	hildren's educational outcomes often h hool readiness (Reardon & Galindo, 200	nas focused)9).	l on ris
• The proposed study for approaches to learning instruction that engage (Crosnoe, Morison et a	cuses on <i>promotive</i> factors that can f , home stimulation, parental education es children and fosters higher level th l. 2010).	oster math 1al expecta ⁻ inking, amo	develo tions, n unt of
 This study has three a Aim 1: Document differ on profici 	ims: t math learning trajectories for Africe ency in math skills at start of kinderge	an America arten.	n and L
 Aim 2: Analyze k expectations), ar mathematical ski 	now child (approaches to learning), hom nd classroom (math instruction) promo Ils for African American and Latino ch	ne (stimulat tive factors nildren.	ring env s impac
• Aim 3: Describe	differences in promotive factors betw	veen groups	s of chi
	Mathad		
Data: Farly Childhood La	naitudinal Study - Kindergarten Cohor	rt (FCLS-K)	
Participants: African Am	erican (N=2 828) and Latino children ((LOLO K)	,. Refere
American children (N=10	,306).	(14-0,000).	
position of an object, us ProficientRe Not Proficient-	ing nonstandard units of length to con ceive proficient probability scores of -Receive proficient probability scores Nath Proficiency at Kindergarten Ent	ipare objec 1.0 or highe 5 of 0.75 or 7 ry by Race	ts. r. lower. 2/ Ethr
		Proficient	Not
	African Amonican	25%	profic
	Latino	22%	78%
	European American	52%	48%
• Math Scores: Concept size, ordinality and seque measurement, fractions,	rual and procedural knowledge, problem ence, addition and subtraction, multipli area and volume. IRT scores from Kir	n solving in cation and dergarten,	numbe divisior 1st,3r
 Promotive Factors: as Child: 	sessed in kindergarten		
 Approaches to attentiveness, (Gresham & El 	eagerness to learn, learning independent liott, 1990))	ings on chil ence, flexib	dren's pility, a
 Home: Home Stimula Parents' rating 	tion: Composite of home-based activit s of frequency of read books, do arts	ies to prom & crafts, h	ote chi Ielp par
games, • Parents' Expe	ctations: Expectations that child will	complete ca	ollege o
Classroom:			
 Math Instruct higher-order t manipulatives, 	hinking. Teachers' ratings of frequence playing math-related games, using mus	to engage y of workin sic, creative	childre 1g with 2 mover
understand con solve math pro	ncepts, explain how math problem is so blems with partners, work on math pro	olved, do ma oblems in re	ith pro zal-life

tutoring. Amount of Math Instruction: O-more than 90 minutes per day

Promoting Minority Young Children's Mathematical Development Susan Sonnenschein & Claudia Galindo University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Email: sonnensc@umbc.edu, galindo@umbc.edu

Results sk factors that . Estimated math achievement gaps for African American and Latino children, by math Aim 1 proficiency (reference group= European American children) pment: children's || Fall K Spring K Fall 1st Spring 1st Spring 3rd Spring 5th nathematical 0.8 math instruction 0.5 0.38 0.35 0.38 0.34 0.30 0.3 0.19 Latino children who 0.0 0.02 -0.3 vironment, parental -0.33 t the development of -0.5 -0.8 -0.82 -0.86 -0.91 ildren. -1.02 -1.0 -1.11 -1.16 -1.14 -1.3 -1.17 -1.21 -1.15 -1.5 ent group: European Latino non-proficient —African A. proficient —African A. non-proficient —Latino proficient Note. In standard deviation units. Reference group=all European Americans, regardless of proficiency level. All gaps are ize" proficiency level. statistically significant (p<0.05) except for the following: European American-African American proficient in Fall and ence, identifying ordinal Spring of First Grade Aim 2: Estimates of Promotive Factors on Spring of Kindergarten Math Scores, by Race/Ethnicity and Math Proficiency nicity (%) African American Proficient: Approaches to Learning Child: ient Home: Home Stimulation Parental Expectations **Classroom:** Higher Order Math Instruction Amount of Math Instruction er and shape, relative African American Non-Proficient: , place value, rate and Child: Approaches to Learning d, and 5th grades. Home Stimulation Home: Parental Expectations Classroom: Higher Order Math Instruction task persistence, Amount of Math Instruction and organization Latino Proficient: Child: Approaches to Learning ildren's learning: e.g., Home Stimulation Home rents with chores, play Parental Expectations Classroom: Higher Order Math Instruction or more. Amount of Math Instruction en's interest and foster Latino Non-Proficient: geometric Approaches to Learning Child: ment/drama to oblems from textbook, Home Stimulation Home e situations, peer Parental Expectations Higher Order Math Instructio Classroo

Amount of Math Instruction



	β	SE	p
-	1.62	.49	.001
	1.96	.90	.03
	0.49	.27	.07
1	0.01	.38	.97
	0.30	.42	.47
	β	SE	p
1	2.62	.25	.000
	0.38	.44	.38
	0.48	.13	.000
1	-0.02	.29	.93
	0.13	.23	.58
	β	SE	p
	β 2.09	SE .47	<i>م</i> .000
	β 2.09 1.83	SE .47 .77	р .000 .017
	β 2.09 1.83 0.27	SE .47 .77 .25	<i>p</i> .000 .017 .286
1	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22	SE .47 .77 .25 .35	<i>p</i> .000 .017 .286 .526
1	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .43	.000 .017 .017 .286 .526 .015
1	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05 B	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .43 SE	p .000 .017 .286 .526 .015 p
1	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05 B 2.57	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .35 .43 SE .24	p .000 .017 .286 .526 .015 p .000
1	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05 B 2.57 1.16	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .35 .43 SE .24 .24 .44	p.000.017.286.526.015p.000.009
	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05 B 2.57 1.16 0.24	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .35 .43 SE .24 .24 .44 .44	p.000.017.286.526.015p.000.009.048
n n	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05 B 2.57 1.16 0.24 0.38	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .35 .43 SE .24 .24 .44 .12 .12 .18	p.000.017.286.526.015p.000.009.048.038
1	β 2.09 1.83 0.27 -0.22 1.05 B 2.57 1.16 0.24 0.38	SE .47 .77 .25 .35 .43 SE .24 .24 .24 .44 .12 .12	.000 .017 .286 .526 .015 .000 .0015 .000 .000 .0038



Note. In standard deviation units. Reference group=all European Americans, regardless of proficiency level. All differences are statistically significant (p<0.05) except amount of math instruction for European American - African American proficient, and for European American-Latino proficient.

- proficient children.

SRCD2012 PMYD, Tampa, Florida

Conclusions

There were significant differences in math development trajectories by math proficiency in kindergarten and by race/ethnicity.

Proficient children, regardless of race/ethnicity, showed smaller gaps over time than non-

• African American and Latino non-proficient children's began kindergarten with a substantial math disadvantage compared to European American children. However, African American non-proficient children's achievement gap remain substantial and stable by 5th grade but the Latino non-proficient children's achievement gap was reduced by half.

• African American and Latino proficient children started kindergarten with a half standard deviation advantage over European children. However, African American children's initial advantage was reduced steadily but Latino children's initial advantage remained stable.

There were similarities and differences in the association between protective factors and math achievement across the four groups. Children's approaches to learning had a significant influence on math scores for the four groups of children. There were significant differences across the four groups of children in what home and classroom factors promoted end-ofkindergarten math scores. Parents' expectations had a significant influence on African American children and amount of math instruction was important for Latino children.

There were significant differences relative to European American children in the incidence of promotive factors across all four groups.

These results support contextual theories of development for understanding children's math development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, Garcia Coll et al., 1996).