



# **RESPONSE TO REVIEWER**

## SAMPLE RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS (2)

Here is a real response to a paper I reviewed somewhat ago. In this case, the author took the comments of the reviewers, scanned them in, and then inserted her/his responses in between. Very cool!

I have included it here so you can see the amount of detail/discussion I expect for your letter.

### Response to Reviewers "TITLE OF PAPER" (XXX-XXX)

I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for the careful criticism and advice. As you can see, I have taken this advice very seriously. I am quite confident that the revised manuscript is much improved. Below, I respond to each reviewer in turn. For purposes of clarity, I will use 12/4/5 to mean page 12, paragraph 4, line 5 of the revised manuscript. Additionally, I have provided my responses to each comment immediately under the original reviewer comment in italics. I have tried to include as many of the revisions made to the manuscript as possible in this document

#### EDITORS COMMENTS:

1. It is very important to look at what percentage of the black population is black immigrants, as opposed to African Americans. If immigrants account for a large proportion of the black population, you will need to consider the differences between African Americans and immigrants.

*I agree that it is important to make a distinction between "Black" and "African American." While neither Ogbu nor other scholars who study the resistance model make this distinction to the degree you are making it, this is not an insignificant distinction within Ogbu's framework. I address this more fully in comment #14 from reviewer 2.*

2. It is dangerous to reject the views of others you do not agree with and provide no evidence of the evidence that accounts for the gap. I would be careful in completely rejecting Ogbu's work for all of the reasons stated by Reviewer 2. Things are rarely all or nothing. You must conclude that you have found no support for Ogbu's interpretation in your data, but this finding does not tell us what accounts for the gap.

*In reflecting on the reviews, I realize I overstated the results. I have been more careful with the discussions of Ogbu in the discussion section. I elaborate on these in comments #7, 10, 11, and 12 from reviewer 2.*



3. As an aside, you might want to rethink your comments about Coleman on page 30. You state that his research has "dangerous policy implications." Well, the first question is if he is correct, and there is plenty of evidence that family background indicates the level of student success in school. Do you think that differences in family backgrounds of white and black children have nothing to do with differences in academic success? What is considered good policy matters too, but that is another question.

*I acknowledge that my comments about Coleman were strong (and perhaps unfair). They are no longer part of the manuscript because the conclusion has been rewritten in keeping with the comments from the reviewers.*

## COMMENTS FROM REVIEWER 1

This paper tests out some of the key aspects of oppositional culture theory empirically. It uses a helpful dataset (though a bit dated) and allows us to test out some aspects of oppositional culture theory that are so widely accepted they are basically "common sense" conclusions. I think it is a nicely written and organized paper and should be published with some revisions. I have two broad concerns and some other suggestions, which I will list below.

1. Because the analyses were broad and covered several hypotheses, some of the findings did not receive enough discussion. The paper turns into a long list of findings and then goes out with a rather spartan discussion.

*I have rewritten the discussion and conclusion sections of the paper, however, I think it should be noted that I discuss every finding in the results section, after I test every hypothesis. While I compare them a bit in the discussion/conclusion sections, I tried to provide more of a global discussion of the topic at the end of the paper.*

2. There are some deafening gaps concerning the role of schools in educational outcomes. The conclusion of the paper includes very wishy-washy and vague exclamations about moving away from Ogbu. Okay, if Ogbu is wrong, then what else do we need to consider? For instance, there is a lot of recent research about how school practices matter (e.g., Anne Ferguson, Karolyn Tyson, both on her own and in her work, William Darity, Amanda Lewis, Carla O'Connor, Pedro Noguera, Prudence Carter, Roslyn Mickelson, Annette Lareau, Erin Horvat, etc.). The absence of this literature was also felt in other sections in the paper (e.g., see point below about "in trouble")

*See comment "b" from Reviewer 1 (about school practices) below, then see comments #7, 10, 11, and 12 from Reviewer 2 (about moving away from Ogbu).*

### **Some additional comments**

- a) The manuscript claims on page 7 that it is inappropriate to apply the resistance model to elementary-aged children. Although probably, the nature of the way elementary-aged children view their relation to schooling differs from that of high-school-age students, it seems unwarranted and misguided to simply assert that 10-year-olds are unlikely to think about the future returns to schooling. Quite the opposite, children in at least 4th-6th grade can have deep ambivalence about their school relations. Also, in this section, Karolyn Tyson has done some work on the developmental features of Ogbu's theory that should be cited.

*I concur with this comment. Hence, I have revised the part of the paper to add Tyson's work. It is now in the 2nd paragraph of the LIMITATIONS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH section, which follows a paragraph that addresses the maturation component to the resistance model and how Ogbu claims that school resistance is exacerbated during adolescence (see page 6 or read below):*

*Prior research provides an incomplete evaluation of the maturation aspect of the theory. Quantitative studies that examine Black students' school resistance compared to White students in different age groups (e.g., Farkas, Lleras, and Maczuga 2002; Downey and Ainsworth-Darnell 2002) are, in fact, just cohorts of different sets of children; they are cross-sectional analyses of different cohorts of children and only measure one element of the resistance model: the "acting White" premise. In a qualitative study examining school resistance of Black students in elementary school, Tyson (2002, 2003) examines opposing schooling stances, generally finding that Black children start their schooling experience very engaged and achievement-oriented and does not find that the larger Black culture rejects schooling.*



*However, when children show a negative attitude towards schooling, she attributed a central role to schooling culture in shaping those negative attitudes. Particularly, and in addition to achievement outcomes, school officials work at changing many aspects of Black children's culture which suggests, by default, the existence of a lack connected to "Blackness." She pointed out that children's negative comments seemed to represent a desire to avoid failing in school, suggesting that schooling attitudes are not the result of culture but are nonsocial developmental. Unfortunately, and apart from only observing one year's worth of data, she did not intend to compare the relative changes in school resistance between Blacks and Whites in adolescence, which is believed to be the time when oppositional culture emerges* 5

*I also added this extra footnote (5) to restore my original point about the theory that was developed using high schoolers:*

*The model of resistance was developed concerning students at the secondary education level. A major aspect of the resistance model that explains the resistance of children attending school is that they are projecting out the disparities in opportunity structure that they will face as adults relative to Whites. These linkages among contextual societal conditions (e.g., structures of opportunity and systems of social mobility) to individual-level characteristics (e.g., race) are being developed more in adolescence. That being said, Tyson (2002) provides us with insight into the fact that younger children can also have deep ambivalence about their school relationships.*

- b) In the discussion of students resisting school, the authors later treat survey questions regarding skipping school and being "in trouble" as things that mean the same thing or are equivalent forms of resistance to school on page 19. There is quite an extensive body of literature on blacks being disciplined at different rates, which indicates that schooling practices (e.g., various forms of institutional racism) are in some part responsible. That is, your measure of "in trouble" may be more accurately interpreted as a marker for the much different treatment that African American children received when compared to white children in schools. Thus, the causal ordering is, I would argue, confused. Is being "in trouble" a marker of resistance, or is resistance an outcome of being targeted by school personnel? For more on this, see Anne Ferguson's *Bad Boys*, William Ayers' edited volume on zero tolerance policies, and some of the work of Pedro Noguera.

*I have incorporated this comment in several places in the paper. It is included in the We must be attentive to the fact that "in trouble" (and skipping school) It is not necessarily the same thing as school resistance. Several studies of potentially differential disciplinary rates for Blacks suggest that school practices partially account for a relative decline in compliance (e.g., Delpit 1995; Lewis*



2003; Ferguson 2000; Tyson 2002, 2003; Morris 2005). These studies show that the cultural discontinuity between Black families and the institutionalized organization of schools which prioritized the cultural norms and standards of "mainstream" White middle-class society made Black children more likely to be the focus of school personnel's attention concerning behavior. For example, Ferguson (2000) notes that school personnel view Black males' dress and behavior as recalcitrant and oppositional; thus, school personnel often take strict control over them.

She observes that black males are in a culturally imagined world which imposes continual regulation of their (dress, behavior and speech). Morris (2005) shows that while White and Asian American children are perceived as "non-threatening," Black (and Latino/a) children are recognized as dangerous (p. 28), and therefore require surveillance and are disproportionately disciplined for behavioral infractions. Taken together, these studies suggest that "schools respond to students according to perceptions of race and gender and use these concepts as the basis for specific forms of regulation (Morris 2005:28). This means that being "in trouble" may be related to unique disadvantages faced by African American children in schools. While the studies do provide the impression, they suggest problems related to ordering, the truth is that being in "trouble" may be a function of being treated differentially by school personnel.

Additionally, in the last part of the discussion section, I wrote the following paragraph, which was part of my discussion on how future research can enrich resistance model literature (page 31, 2nd paragraph):

Fourth, more research should investigate how schools cultivate a culture of resentment/resistance around some African Americans and further enhance the racial achievement gap. There is a lot of recent evidence that indicates school leaders unintentionally damage the school achievement of many African Americans (Ferguson 2000, Tyson 2003; Lewis 2003, Noguera 2003; Lareau and Horvat 1999). Lareau and Horvat (1999) identify that the possession and activation of capital, both social and cultural, are racially and socially differentiated in educational settings, which impacts how groups vary based on their students' inclusion (i.e., their behaviors are acknowledged and legitimated) and exclusion (i.e., their behaviors are marginalized and rejected) from the institutional academic setting.

*Nonetheless, while many qualitative studies show the existence and impact of cultural discontinuity between school personnel and African American children (e.g., Delpit 1995; Lewis 2003; Ferguson 2000; Tyson 2002, 2003; Morris 2005), few quantitative studies document these. Quantitative studies would be useful in determining the relative effect of specific aspects of the culture that African American children bring from their home on the responses of school personnel, and the impact their responses have on the African Americans' resentment/resistance to the dominant group.*

3. I found the discussion and conclusions to be very disappointing. Although the critique of Obgu's theory is insightful, there seems to be a significant lack of other possible explanations for the outcomes of schools. For example, on page 28 the authors say, "Findings from this and other studies suggest that the success of these schools could be related to other factors". Okay, what kind of factors?

*These sections have been rewritten. Also see comments 7, 11 and 12 from Reviewer 2.*

4. Is there a missing word on page 27, which you suggest that the achievement gap can logically be attributed to Black students' lack of desire? This seems to be at odds with much of what was mentioned before.

*This was referring to the view/argument made by proponents of the theory. However, it has been removed from the text since the discussion/conclusion has been rewritten.*

## **COMMENTS FROM REVIEWER 2:**

### **Background/Literature Review**

1. The first time NAEP is mentioned (2/1/7), I'd first spell it out and then use the abbreviation. Further, I'd, in a sentence or two at most, briefly describe the dataset.

*I wrote out the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) the first time it is mentioned and added a sentence briefly describing the dataset (see first paragraph of the manuscript).*



2. In the purpose of the study (page 5), the author mentions comparing Whites and Blacks, however, s/he offers no justification for this comparison as compared to, say, Whites to Blacks and Hispanics.

*(NOTE: Because some of Reviewer 2's later comments correspond to earlier portions of the manuscript, my response to this comment makes more sense if read after comment #14 from Reviewer 2). In the "purpose of the study," I added the following sentence (see page 8/1/9-11): "Since my goal is to determine the degree to which an oppositional culture exists among involuntary minorities relative to Whites, I will exclude immigrant Blacks and Latinos from my study".*

*This is a follow-up to a previous footnote (3/2/11) that reads: "Although the resistance theory has been expanded by Ogbu (1978) to include Latino/as, Latino/as are omitted from this study. According to Ogbu, Mexican Americans or Chicanas/os—who constitute almost two-thirds of the Hispanics in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau 2000)—believe they are also alienated from American society due, in part, to the experience of having been incorporated into the United States through American imperialistic expansion in the 1840s and the bitter memories it represents. Nevertheless, approximately 50,000 Mexicans stayed or lived as citizens of the newly acquired territory of the United States, a small fraction of the more than 20 million persons of Mexican Ancestry who live in the United States today; and most Mexican Americans are immigrants or descendants of immigrants who immigrated after the Mexican revolution of 1910 (cf. Jaffe, Cullen and Boswell 1980). Therefore, despite being often cast as the largest oppressed minority group, other than African Americans (from within the United States), overwhelmingly Latino/a children are products of voluntary immigration; thus, it is highly improbable for Ogbu to label this group "involuntary minorities" (Thernstrom and Thernstrom 2003).*

### **Data & Analytics Plan**

3. In describing the methods section, the author should remember two things: specify and justify. The author should specify exactly what s/he is doing and what s/he is using/doing it on. And in doing so, justify exactly why that sample is the sample, and the methodology was simple. In short, this needs to be done better throughout this section (particularly see #4 below).

*Refer to Reviewer 2/comment #5 below.*



4. Maryland's data is utilized for this analysis -- why this state? To what extent is it generalizable to other states? Would we obtain the same results if other states or federal data were used? Furthermore, we know this sample is drawn from a county on the Eastern seaboard (8/3/1). Again, why that location? Would the findings differ if a different country were chosen? If the location was chosen due to convenience (this is true for most research undertaken), the author needs to justify why that specific location is the best (or at least appropriate) location given the population residing there and the research question being analyzed in this paper/research. Simply telling the reader \*that\* it was chosen is not enough; readers need to know \*why\* it was chosen. As such, the author needs to be able to answer these questions before a reader can trust generalizability/validity/reliability of this data is useful to their wider argument.

*Please see Reviewer 2/comment #5 below.*

5. That's why it doesn't matter doesn't hold strongly for me. The author may want to think that through a little more.

*I address comments #3-5 from Reviewer 2 in the "METHODS: Data" section. After explaining the dataset/sample selection/attrition issue, I positioned the following paragraphs as part of the regular text (Page 9-10): While MADICS is largely populated by psychologists and collected to understand the processes behind the psychological determinants of behavioral choices and developmental pathways during adolescence, it provides ample opportunity to achieve the goals of the current study.*

*The MADICS has the richness of measures and a longitudinal design that makes it a great opportunity to assess whether development from middle school to high school creates greater opposition to schooling among African American youth than among White youth across a variety of measures. So, in addition to having degrees of quality, the MADICS has a breadth that extends far beyond the datasets used previously to assess the resistance model.*

## **Discussion/Conclusions**

6. The author suggests that they have examined oppositional cultural theory in "many more ways than others have been able to look at" (26/2/4-5). While I would agree that they have looked at theory in many more ways, it's clear that others have looked at ... they even cite some appropriate studies doing so. I would suggest that they change the language to be unable to \*simultaneously\* look "in the same population" or something to that effect.

*See Reviewer 2/comment #7 below.*

7. The author concludes that "the oppositional culture theory does not seem to be a viable explanation of racial differences in achievement" (27/1/1). Here, the researcher needs to err on the side of caution. I don't think the theory was ever meant to explain ALL racial differences in achievement. However, to the extent that it is useful in examining the experiences of even a small number of students (note, even the author found this phenomenon with 17% of his/her sample), then the theory has some value. For full disclosure, I am not a full advocate for the theory. However, one must admit that it has at least *\*some\** explanatory power.

*I respond to comments #6-7 from Reviewer 2 in the first paragraph of the "Discussion" section, which I have rewritten. I now communicate these points differently. Now, on 27/2nd paragraph (first paragraph of the discussion section), the following sentences were written as follows:*

*Second, the richness of the MADICS dataset permitted the opposition culture theory to be tested in several ways that other researchers have not been able to assess (to address comment 6).*

*And*

*As such, the oppositional culture theory does not seem to be plausible Explanation of racial differences in achievement (to address ongoing comment).*

*To*

## **DISCUSSION**

This study was conducted to provide a thorough quantitative assessment of Ogbu's conceptualization of oppositional culture. I used a comprehensive longitudinal dataset that is particularly useful for evaluating several aspects of the theory concurrently in the same sample. This study has revealed two major findings that contribute to literature involving the racial achievement gap. First, the core aspects of the oppositional culture explanation were not supported. Second, the patterns in attitudes of African Americans and Whites exhibit consistency over time. That is, following grade 7, maturation appears to have little influence on the relative differences in schooling attitudes between African Americans and Whites. Ogbu's theory may be true for other segments of the population, but these results suggest the degree to which oppositional culture theory explains racial differences in achievement is limited.



8. In addressing the literature about cultural change, the author may want to include Shelby Steele's *The Content of Our Character*. While somewhat outdated, that book made a considerable splash in this area.

*I include Shelby Steele in the second paragraph under conclusion on pp. 32-33 (see comment 12 below for the exact wording).*

9. When discussing the Black community's educational efforts as a cultural practice (28/1/4), the author may want to include the work of Valerie Lee. I think she coined the term academic press in her work on Catholic schools.

*In rewriting the discussion and conclusion sections, the text of this comment refers to no longer appearing in the paper.*

10. The writer provides an argument and then concludes that "Clearly then, Black students did not overestimate their educational expectations" (28/last/last). Is s/he comfortable stating that for all 3,200 students in her/his sample? That is, that statement is certainly broad and not necessarily supported by her/his data. Again,

*I would be cautious. I agree with the reviewer that the sentences in this part of the paper were too strong. These are no longer part of the manuscript.*

11. In the end, the authors appear to conclude it is poverty and not oppositional culture. However, he/she opted not to test this hypothesis. Doing so would have strengthened the paper. Miscellaneous

*While I agree with this comment, addressing the degree to which poverty accounts for the racial differences in school performance instead of oppositional culture is beyond the scope of this paper. After consideration of the reviews, it became clear to me that I was not fully interpreting the findings and overstating the current findings by suggesting the issue is a function of poverty. Therefore, now in the last paragraph of the manuscript (in the CONCLUSION section on page 33), the following has been changed from:*

*"The present findings should encourage researchers and policymakers to reconsider their reliance on explanations for African Americans' lower school achievement that cite lower levels of effort and desire for success. This reliance leads to a perception that the racial achievement gap is stubbornly intractable. Perhaps Cook and Ludwig's (1998:392) candid suggestion that "policymakers should refrain from permitting concern about the so-called oppositional culture to deflect attention from the more basic issues, such as once again effectively managing schools, or offering sufficient motivation, support, and guidance to*



*students under the weight of poverty" bears more serious consideration.*

To

*"The current study's failure to support the majority of the central tenets of the theory suggests that African Americans' lower school achievement should be considered more open to alternative explanations. With the current findings (plus those reported by O'Connor 1997; Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey 1998; Cook and Ludwig 1998; Akom 2003; Tyson 2002; Tyson, Darity, and Castellino 2005; and Carter 1999, 2005), investigators and policy makers should reconsider a reliance on explanations of African Americans' lower school achievement that emphasize lower levels of effort and desire for success. There is evidence to suggest that African American youths want to learn; they simply are not learning the skills requisite for success."*

12. Are there policy implications derived from this research? If so, what are they?  
The author may want to raise a question for the readers.

*Since this research study did not directly test the impact of oppositional culture on the racial achievement gap, the findings are unlikely to generate specific policy recommendations for the convergence of the gap.*

*Nevertheless, to the extent that the purpose of the study was to evaluate racial differences in school resistance (often used to explain the gap), this study has some implications for how people think about the problem, which is inextricably entwined with the breadth/scope which the causes of the problem are thought about, and the breadth/scope of the solutions to address the issue.*

*Consequently, the final section of the article (Conclusion on pages 32-3) has been revised to reflect this issue and is included below:*

## **CONCLUSION**

*Theories offer answers to "why" or "how" this happens and influence the social science literature and policy implications. The way we look at problems and their causes is just as important (if not more than) the policy. The consequences of policy based on theories that have no empirical support can be incredible. For example, in the late 1960's and 70's Jensen provides a set of proposals for increasing Black achievement that directly stemmed from the theory of Black genetic inferiority. He insisted that the basis for the gap was genetic and therefore resolution could not happen here; Black children needed to be taught using special varieties of the classroom instructional approach that used associative learning (for example, memorization or rote learning, trial and error learning). A current example of theory with dangerous policy implications is Hanushek (1989, 1999) who claims that "the common surrogates for teacher*



and school quality (class size, teachers' education and experience, among the most important) are not systematically related to performance" (1989: 49) which can lead policymakers, to think that school resources were not that important. Although many researchers have examined the extent to which there is an oppositional culture amongst African Americans compared to Whites. (cf. O'Connor 1997; Ainsworth-Darnell & Downey 1998; Cook & Ludwig 1998; Akom 2003; Tyson 2002; Tyson, Darity, & Castellino 2005; Carter 1999, 2005), The theory continues to be well-known and accepted in research, popular writing, and, indeed, among the general public. Every so often, bestselling authors make theory a key part of their scholarly work in popular books. For example, in his 1990 book, *The Content of our Character*, Shelby Steele writes, "... when you get right down to it, there are even in the worst schools, a cadre of accredited teachers who teach the basics and are committed to enriching the lives of students. But too often the students they teach seem to shun at least those among them who do well, who see studying as a sucker's game, and who see school itself as a waste of time. One sees in many of these children an almost recalcitrance not to learn, a suppression of the natural impulse to understand, which poverty's determinism cannot entirely explain."

Berkeley linguist John McWhorter (2000:28) claims that African Americans are a culture of "self-sabotage," which "condones weakness and failure." Accepting the theory as a dominant explanation for racial differences in achievement might cause policymakers to narrowly define the causes of the gap and to conclude that gap convergence is improbable because African Americans do not want to learn. The current study's disconformity evidence for many of the theory's principal tenets indicates that African Americans' lower performance in school deserves alternative consideration. In light of present evidence (and evidence found by O'Connor 1997; Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey 1998; Cook and Ludwig 1998; Akom 2003; Tyson 2002; Tyson, Darity, and Castellino 2005; Carter 1999, 2005), and perhaps most importantly, the researchers and policy makers need to retreat from employing explanations that rely on the assumption that African Americans' lower school achievement is a result of their lower levels of effort and desire to be successful. Several studies lend evidence that African American youths do want to learn; it is just that they are not developing skills that will yield success.



13. While I'm not recommending this as a way to end the paper, the authors need a section, a paragraph or two that discusses the limitations of the study.

Otherwise, the reader can reasonably assume the authors think the article cannot be built upon... that it achieved some type of perfection. I might suggest that they put in a couple of paragraphs about the limitations of the study, then a paragraph that discusses suggestions for future research or policy suggestions, and then a conclusion with some reminder as to what the significance of the findings is from this study.

*The discussion now includes a discussion of how future research could contribute to the resistance model literature. Each of the factors that were discussed are things that were not able to be examined in this study. Also, look at comment 16 below (Look at comment 12 above for discussion of policy implications).*

14. As stated previously, I would use racial and ethnic terminology with much more intent in this paper. This may be best highlighted through the consideration of the terms African American and Black. There are times when it seems that the author is using these terms synonymously, yet at other times, he intentionally uses one or the other. This latter point is germane to the consideration of generalizability. For example, in a place like New York City, approximately 55% of the Black population is immigrant and first or second-generation immigrant and may not identify as African American; yet they do identify as Black. The same is true very near the author's case study in Maryland's Eastern Shore, which has a large population of African immigrants. Therefore, would the author want to use language that is all-inclusive of all these populations or language that excludes some? Regardless of how either term is used, I would suggest a criterion (as a footnote) for the beginning of the paper and use it throughout. Think of a footnote like the following:

"In this document, we will use the term Black to refer to persons of African Diaspora, and specifically those individuals who reside in the United States. African Americans have been identified as a subgroup within the larger Black community. Because our discussion intentionally includes individuals who may be first-generation immigrants or, for any number of reasons, do not identify as African American, we utilize the term "Black." We also capitalize it to identify the racial category and related racial identity, as well as to differentiate it from color. Likewise, for the category of race, we also capitalize White."

Once the author has processed this thought process, a similar strategy will need to be utilized for any of the other racial groups mentioned in the paper. (Also addressing comment #1 from an editor). In the MADICS, 936 of the 938 Blacks identified as non-immigrant Blacks, they characterize themselves as African Americans.



Two responded "other" and noted that their identity was Caribbean immigrant.

I put the following footnote after the first use of "Black" in the first paragraph of the manuscript:

"I use the term Black to refer to people of the African Diaspora; to such populations that are living within the United States. When the term "Black" is used, it is with a capital B to distinguish the racial category and related identity from the color.

In this way, I use capital W when referring to race, too."

I am referring to the total Black population within the U.S. yet comment #14 from Reviewer 2 highlights an important distinction with African Americans and immigrant Blacks having competing minority status, according to one of Ogbu's frameworks. As such, and as noted by Reviewer 2, I use racial and ethnic terms more deliberately. I offer the following footnote on page 3/2nd paragraph, when African Americans are first described:

It's essential to understand the distinction between "Black" and "African American." For some people, African Americans represent a subgroup within a larger Black community that also includes those who may be first-generation immigrants or others who, for whatever reasons, may not identify as African American. Some previous research has used the term "Black" to refer to their research when making racial comparisons to account for academic outcomes based on their U.S. population (e.g., Black-White achievement gap). However, not all Blacks have the same status as minorities within Ogbu's classification of minorities (Ogbu and Simons 1998). For example, Ogbu delineated involuntary minorities and voluntary minorities, where an involuntary minority (African Americans) was not by choice but by the actions of others. Voluntary minorities (immigrant Blacks, e.g., Caribbean Americans) migrants or immigrant groups voluntarily move from their country of origin to the United States because they perceive greater opportunities (e.g., employment opportunities, greater political or religious freedoms). Voluntary minorities have not had the history or experience of oppression by White Americans; they are generally more trusting of Whites and their institutions to provide upward mobility. Through education is the dominant mechanism for attaining the opportunities they came to the United States to experience.

Consequently, they do not cultivate identities in response to the dominant group or develop counterproductive schooling behaviors/attitudes, and often progress academically despite experiences of discrimination and several challenges in school. Thus, the different minority status of these groups results from different histories and remembrances with the dominant group (i.e., White Americans) that carry different dispositions about the barriers they face.



All Blacks in this study identified their ethnicity and race as the label African American (the dataset used in this study contained only two Black immigrants). Considering this, I use the label "African American" when referring to Blacks in this study (I suspend this rule when quoting texts produced by others, which I leave intact, or when discussing work conducted by other researchers who use the label Black). For Bak's immigrant characteristics, references may be found in the work of Waters (1999), which outlines the differences between Black Americans (i.e., African Americans) and immigrant Blacks from the West Indies.

15. You may want to try to avoid using the word "I" in the paper. Most, if not all, research or hypotheses are presented or considered in a manner that makes it possible to prove wrong. If not, it raises the question of whether researchers are trying to research the topic or merely confirm their position. For me, this distinction validates the difference between research and investigative journalism. In journalism, the purpose is to confirm a preconception. Journalists tend to disregard information that contradicts their theory; researchers try to avoid doing the same. So, writing the paper/article in a manner that the information/research stands alone elevates legitimacy beyond the lived-course experience of the authors, or researchers.

*Point taken.*

16. My last point, I think, is perhaps the most vital. Ogbu's work often utilized qualitative methods. One of the many advantages of qualitative work is that it can touch on subtlety and intricacies that quantitative work does not always allow. Is it then conceivable that Ogbu (and his various colleagues over time) can elicit experiences and processes that quantitative data cannot? In other words, just because this paper does not (necessarily) find quantitative support for Ogbu's theory, could the theory still be valid/validity; and if validity can only be found through qualitative methods or more nuanced quantitative measures? The authors appear dismissive or at least do not entertain this possibility.

*In my discussion on how future research can build existing literature of the resistance model, about the need to improve cultural measures in quantitative studies (page 30):*

*"Second, future data collection efforts should strive to broaden the scope of cultural measures while improving data quality in national datasets. While this study quantitatively measures some features of the oppositional culture theory, it should be seen as only a first step. Ogbu used qualitative methods, which may have allowed him to gather experiential and process data that current quantitative datasets cannot.*



*The weak support for Ogbu's theory in this study suggests that maybe more active quantitative methods will produce greater explanatory power from this theory. Maybe quantitative researchers can grab on to the way adolescents interpret their ordinary daily experiences by following more open-ended questions or asking participants to explore their feelings and thoughts after giving them some examples of the sorts of scenarios they may encounter. While the insights drawn from participant-observer research cannot be replicated, lessening information like this into quantitative codes may be like collecting qualitative interview data. Increasing opportunities for collaboration between quantitative and qualitative researchers grow in importance."*

Even with all my comments (which in this forum may seem unduly harsh), I liked this paper and feel the information presented is valuable and deserves to be disseminated to a broader audience. With that in mind, my comments are as extensive as they are. I wish the researcher well in undertaking the revisions suggested in my comments and encouraging him/her to follow this project through to publication.