ARE BLACK IMMIGRANTS A MODEL MINORITY?
Race, Ethnicity and Sociopolitical Mobility in the United States

By Mosi Adesina Ifatunji

> "West Indians in the United States are significant not only because of their overrepresentation among prominent or successful blacks, but also because their very different background makes them a test case of the explanatory importance of color, as such, in analyzing socioeconomic progress in the American economy and society, as compared to the importance of the cultural traditions of the American Negro." 1978, Thomas Sowell, *Three Black Histories*, p. 42

The study of social inequality in general and racial inequality in particular has been a staple question for American sociology since it's founding at the close of the nineteenth century (Dubois 1899, Dubois 1903). However, after a century of debate, there is still very little if any consensus on the reasons for social, political and economic inequality between blacks and whites in the United States. That is, despite the political and judicial gains of the modern civil rights period, 'black folk'[1] continue to struggle for parity with their white peers and there is still much debate concerning the reasons for such persistent inequality. Broadly speaking, there are two primary explanations for this relatively asymmetric social positioning: the somewhat changed, but nonetheless unforgiving presence of an *anti-black racial animus* that is endemic to social thought and public policy in American society (e.g., Bonilla-Silva 2001, Feagin 2000) *or* the presence of a deeply ingrained and seemingly cancerous *cultural pathology*, coursing through the 'veins' of black social networks (e.g., Cosby and Puissant 2007, Lewis 1965, Moynihan 1965, Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997).

According to Thomas Sowell (as quoted above, 1978: 42) the comparative study of African Americans and black Immigrants from the West Indies is representative of a naturally occurring scientific experiment whereby the investigator can isolate the degree to which anti-black animus and/or cultural pathology are responsible for racial inequality. Indeed, Sowell has argued that since both ethnic groups are black, the greater success of black immigrants implicates African American culture as the key factor in the production of black-white racial inequality.[2]

While there is much to learn about the relative roles of color and culture in the production of black-white racial inequality vis-à-vis such a black ethnic comparative, there are systematic limitations associated with presenting such a comparative as a 'naturally occurring scientific experiment' whereby levels of anti-black animus are controlled. That is, we might ask: does perceived nativity alter the ways in which black people experience anti-black racial animus in the United States? Posed another way, "Are Black Immigrants a Model Minority?"

The chief contribution of this project will therefore be to revise and push forward thinking on the role that race plays in the production and maintenance of *black ethnic inequality*[3] in the United States. More specifically, I offer the concept of *differential racialization* in order to argue that much of the black ethnic inequality we observe is the result of a social process whereby the same attitudes and behaviors receive divergent socioeconomic and political consequence – in both kind and degree – based on whether or not the actor in question is perceived to be an African American or a black immigrant. Differential racialization is therefore in service to white supremacy in that it maintains the position of whites at the top and most blacks – native and foreign-born – at the bottom of our racial hierarchy. In short, my thinking on differential racialization is different from the existent explanations for black ethnic inequality because it is deeply informed by those who have worked to theorize the ways in which race structures or organizes societies (e.g., Bobo et al. 1997, Bonilla-Silva 1997, Kim 1999, Omi and Winant 1994, Feagin 2000, Mills 1997) as opposed to queries that are more immediately inspired by the literature on immigration and migration (e.g., Portes and Zhou 1993), identity politics (e.g., Kasinitz 1992, Waters 1999, Vickerman 1998) or labor economics (Butcher 1994, Chiswick 1978, Model 2008, Sowell 1978).

In terms of theoretical background, differential racialization begins with the contention that the most recent shift in U.S. racial discourse has been away from the biogenic racial logic of Jim Crow and toward

[1] Using the parlance of W.E.B Du Bois (Du Bois 1903).
[2] Several scholars have used a different comparative to tease out the degree to which phenotypical blackness is responsible for racial inequality by comparing the labor market outcomes of white and black Hispanics – i.e., holding culture or 'Hispanicness' constant (Cotton 1993, Woodbury 1993).
[3] When I refer to the literature on 'black ethnic inequality' I am referring to literature that documents and/or attempts to explain differences in socioeconomic mobility between African Americans and black immigrants (from any country).

a more colorblind racial ideology of the post civil rights period, where discussions of innate cultural predispositions are often invoked – i.e., the "biologization of culture" (Bonilla-Silva 2003: 39-43, Bobo et. al 1997, Moynihan 1965). This shift from biology to culture has been paralleled by a more general increase in the number of social characteristics that have been assigned certain kinds of racial meaning – i.e., an increase in the number of characteristics that are being used in the racialization process (Blaut 1992, Bonilla-Silva 2004, Gold 2004, Omi and Winant 1994). According to the most recent theorization on racialization, two such social characteristics that have been factored into this process are *national origin* and *perceived foreignness* (Kim 1999, Tuan 1998, Ngai 2005).[4] As a result, stable notions of blackness are assigned as a result of perceived nativity (Benson 2006, Kasinitz 1992, Pierre 2004, Waters 1999).[5] In the end, differential racialization functions to maintain the more general position of *all* blacks at the bottom of a "triangulated" racial hierarchy (Kim 1999). That is, in comparison to African Africans, black immigrants gain higher levels of socioeconomic attainment yet suffer political disenfranchisement vis-à-vis relative valorization and civic ostracism, respectively (Kim 1999, Pierre 2004, Waters 1999, Rodgers 2006).[6]

In addition to offering a more robust theorization for the role of race in the production of black ethnic inequality, I will also be contributing to the current debate with new data and novel uses of statistical methods. Although those arguing for the selective nature of immigrants have offered fairly adequate data and modeling in support of their thesis, others have been unable to fully address challenges ranging from a heavy reliance on data from the U.S. Census[7] to an overwhelming focus on blacks living in the north and southeast. That is, although the U.S. Census is one of the few datasets with large numbers of black immigrants from the West Indies, it is not well suited to investigation the role of race and culture in the production of black ethnic inequality (e.g., Sowell 1978). To the extent that these factors have been considered, it has been in ethnographic studies that have been conducted in the north- and southeast (e.g., Waters 1999, Kasinitz 1992). Therefore, in this study I will conduct a secondary analysis of survey data, using a national multi-stage area probability survey that includes whites, African Americans and black immigrants from the British West Indies. In order to better understand the ways in which the racial and ethnic composition of the metropolitan context might be at play, this survey will be supplemented with data from the U.S. Census (i.e., tokenism and queuing theory, Blalock 1956, Blalock 1957, Kanter 1993). When complete, this single dataset should provide for a more nuanced assessment of the various explanations for black ethnic inequality.

Finally, findings from this study will contribute to debates being held at the intersection of race and public policy. The case of the "Negro immigrant" *does* offer the potential to bring sobering evidence to the ongoing dispute concerning reasons for an enduring racial inequality. However, if we continue to celebrate black immigrants as a 'model minority' vis-à-vis their African American peers without inserting a more robust conceptualization of race and racism, we will continue to incite intra-racial jealousy and in-fighting (e.g., Raphael 1964) to the exclusion of a more forthright conversation intended to lead to policy formation that has as its goal the amelioration of racial inequality in the United States (Pierre 2004). As such, I will ultimately be using findings from this study to comment on the viability of the two major explanations for black-white racial inequality in the United States – i.e., anti-black racial animus and black sociocultural pathology.

EXPLINATIONS FOR BLACK ETHNIC INEQUALITY

[4] Although in discussions regarding immigrants in general and black immigrants in particular, national origin and foreignness are often conflated. I maintain that these two concepts are interrelated but distinct. For example, being a black immigrant from Jamaica is different than being a black immigrant from Guyana; and being a black immigrant from the West Indies is different from being a black immigrant from Africa.

[5] The core differences between white esteem and differential racialization is that those who have offered the notion of white esteem focus on the perspective of white employers and justify the preference that white employers have for black immigrants. In contrast, my argument for differential racialization is not only predicated on the thoughts and opinions of white employers but includes all social actors and I problematize the notion that there are major differences in the thoughts and behaviors of the two black ethnic groups.

[6] The argument for differential racialization and its theoretical foundations are elaborated in the section, "Explanations for Black Ethnic Inequality."

[7] Although the U.S. Census has decent indicators of human capital it has poor indicators on cultural characteristics and no indicators that allow for an assessment of racial attitudes.

Generally speaking the finding that black immigrants from the British West Indies "do better" than African Americans has been explained in three different ways.[8] First, those who have argued for different *cultural predispositions* have asserted that black people from the West Indies possess cultural characteristics that are more in line with the Protestant work ethic than are descendents of American slavery (e.g., Sowell 1978, Ogbu and Simons 1998). This argument has been most vigorously countered by the *immigrant self-selection thesis* which argues that to compare native-born blacks to foreign-born black immigrants[9] is not to compare 'African American culture' to 'Afro-Caribbean culture', but to compare the human capital differences of 'movers' and 'non-movers' (e.g., Butcher 1994, Model 2008, Winston 2002). These scholars have shown that people who migrate – between states or countries – are positively selected on both observable and unobservable characteristics that matter in determining social mobility – e.g., ambition and willingness to succeed. Lastly, some have offered that because black immigrants work harder and are less concerned with racial politics[10], white employers hire and promote them at higher rates than they do African Americans (e.g., Waters 1999, Kasinitz 1992). Next I review the literature on sociocultural difference and the various arguments for the selectivity of migrant populations. Then, instead of reviewing work on white employer esteem and comfort, I problematize and incorporate this literature into the section on differential racialization.

CULTURE AND HUMAN CAPITAL

While there is much debate between those who argue for culture (i.e., sociocultural difference) and those who argue for differences in human capital (i.e., migrant selectivity) what will be made clear is that although the mechanisms may be different (i.e., nativity verses migration, respectively) the working explanation that undergirds much, if not all of this thinking, is that black immigrants do better because they are more deeply invested in human capital and simply work harder than African Americans. After reviewing the two main streams of thought in this tradition I will offer a novel explanation for black ethnic inequality that implicates the concept and politic of race as a key factor in the production of black ethnic inequality.

Nativity and Cultural Behaviors

Although Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan (1963) foreshadow him by at least a decade,[11] Thomas Sowell is heralded as chief among those who have made the argument that black immigrants 'do better' than African Americans because of differences in sociocultural predisposition (1975, 1978, 1981, 1983). Sowell begins his contribution in 1975 in his now widely cited monograph, *Race and Economics*. Early in the book he states the position of much of his research in the decade to come, "Black immigrants to the United States have succeeded economically, educationally and in other ways much more than native black Americans, under the existing level of racial discrimination, which is largely the same for both. It is not merely that Black Americans are denied some current opportunities but that they were denied the more basic opportunities to more fully develop their abilities themselves" (Sowell 1975: 33). That is, the fact that black immigrants are doing better than African Americans points to differences in cultural practice and human capital investment that exist between the two groups. In his words,

> "… West Indian Negros emphasized such traits as work, thrift and education – more generally achievements involving planning and working for the future, implying the emotional control for self-denial in the present and emphasizing the logical and mundane over the emotional, the imaginative, and the heroic. The opposite characteristics can be scene among the … Negros, where advancement can be achieved in emotional and imaginative areas, such as oratory, lyric literature, and music, and which have produced many dramatic 'leaders' and heroes" (Sowell 1975: 130-131).

Focusing on the role of education in general and public education in particular, he states

[8] Although the literature has been framed in this way (Model 2008), I argue later that sociocultural and selectivity arguments are actually part of the same orientation to explaining black ethnic inequality.

[9] Unless otherwise stated, when I use the term 'black immigrant' I am referring to black people that have immigrated to the United States from the British West Indies.

[10] This point will be elaborated below where I argue that being caste as a 'model minority' is to be caste as working hard and not complaining about racial discrimination and inequality.

[11] In their widely cited book *Beyond the Melting Pot* Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan (1963) observe that, "The West Indians' most striking difference from the Southern Negroes was their greater applicability to business, education, buying homes and in general advancing themselves… The ethos of the West Indian, in contrast to that of the Southern Negro, emphasized saving, hard work, investment, education" (p. 35).

> "Minority children from ethnic groups which greatly stress the value of education – Jews, Orientals, West Indians – survive and develop despite the inadequacies of the school or its personnel. Those groups without such a tradition – American Negroes, Italian Americans, Puerto Ricans or Mexican Americans – do not tend to develop in a hostile setting" (Sowell 1975: 192).

When taken together, Sowell asserts that the differences in mobility that exist between African Americans and black immigrants from the West Indies *must* be due to cultural practices, not biological factors. He supports this claim with the 'observation' that black immigrants exercise more forethought and exhibit a greater ability to delay gratification. In order to drive his point home, he 'observes' that West Indians make better use of the same resources accorded many African Americans.

Sowell would not provide systematic data for these claims until the publication of his essay "Three Black Histories" in 1978. In this book chapter he analyzed data from the 1970 U.S. Census, in order to document earnings gaps between Afro-Caribbean immigrant populations and African Americans. He found that, "West Indian families earn substantially higher incomes than [African American] families, and only slightly less than the national average" (Sowell 1978: 43). Indeed, he shows that Afro-Caribbean immigrants made approximately 52 percent more than African Americans, nationally in 1969. In order to control for regional differences in population distribution he shows that in New York City Afro-Caribbeans made 28 percent more than African Americans. He then compares Afro-Caribbeans and African Americans with comparable levels of education and shows that Afro-Caribbeans with four years of college make 17 percent more than African Americans with the same level of education and that those with two years of postgraduate study make 27 percent more than their African American peers.

Sowell attributes these sociocultural differences between Afro-Caribbeans and African Americans to the fact that racial slavery took different forms in the West Indies and North America and blacks have always outnumbered whites in the West Indies. With respect to the former, Sowell states, "Thus, even under slavery, West Indian Negroes had direct personal responsibility for an important part of their own well being, and also acquired experience in economic activity on their own, since they cultivated their individual plots without supervision and were usually allowed to sell any surplus in the market" (Sowell 1975: 98). As such, blacks in the West Indies were more likely to be independent because the slave masters were more likely to allow them to grow their own crops and even trade surpluses among slaves. This is then contrasted with the higher levels of slave master dependence among black slaves in North America. Inasmuch as multigenerational experience with proprietorship can prepare a people, Sowell argues, black West Indians were better prepared for participation in a capitalist economy. Higher levels of dependence are then speculated to be associated with less thrift and hard work among African Americans.

Sowell also argues that since blacks were in the racial majority in the West Indies they were more likely to revolt and escape. He states, "The chance that an escaped slave would encounter even isolated white men… was very small, as compared to the chance that an escaped plantation slave would run into white patrols, white workmen, or white rural settlements in the South" (Sowell 1975: 99). Sowell also highlights how being in the racial majority has implications for how black West Indians think about race today. He states, "The absence of a white working class meant that 'free persons of color,' and later the whole free black population could not be restricted to the most menial occupations or the more skilled and more responsible positions would have gone unfilled" (Sowell 1978: 46). In effect, Sowell draws a line through history – from slave revolts and escapes to more blacks in high-ranking positions in the contemporary West Indies – in order to connect racial demographics in the West Indies to the notion that blacks in the West Indies are less concerned with the role of race in their social mobility.

In sum, Sowell argues that the reason why black immigrants do better than African Americans is because they work harder and suffer from lower levels of "racial paranoia" (Jackson 2008). Sowell attributes differences in work ethic and racial attitudes to differences in the nature of slavery and racial demographics between the British West Indies and the United States.

Immigrant Selectivity and Human Capital

Barry Chiswick (1978) widely noted for the core ideas of the *immigrant self-selection thesis*. However, his

thoughts were largely inspired by Marcus Lee Hanson, in the book *The Immigrant in American History*, when he observed that, "Countries of origin were dismayed by their loss when they saw their ports thronged with the sturdiest of their peasantry. Efforts to stem the movement were attempted" (Hanson 1940: 212). As a result, Chiswick would offer:

> "Economic theory suggests that migration in response to economic incentives is generally more profitable for the more able and more highly motivated. This self-selection in migration implies that for the same schooling, age, and other demographic characteristics immigrants to the United States have more innate ability or motivation relevant to the labor market than native-born persons." (Chiswick 1978: 901).

The evidence for this claim was that although immigrants did not make as much as their native peers on arrival, after a certain amount of years they would overtake the earnings of the native-born. The implication is that although immigrants would have to adjust to the new society, after they were adjusted their higher levels of largely unobservable 'innate ability' allowed them to outpace their native-born peers. That is, although immigrants had more human capital there would be a lag effect in their returns to human capital that are the result of adjustment. Susan Model presents the most current and comprehensive estimates of this catch-up time or lag effect (2008: 75). She finds that in 1980 the catch-up time was about 12 years, about 9 years in 1990 and approximately 15 years in 2000.

While keeping with the argument that immigrants have more human capital than African Americans, some came to disagree with this particular conception of immigrant self-selection. George Borjas (1985) has argued that immigrant human capital should vary by immigrant cohort and the changing nature of immigration policy. Moreover, immigrants from countries – like those in the West Indies – with higher levels of income inequality than the United States would provide for a relatively low quality of immigrant stock. When taken together, Borjas showed that during periods of relatively open immigration polices, immigrants from the Caribbean did not have the same levels of 'innate ability' as their predecessors. Again, Susan Model presents the most recent and comprehensive findings concerning immigrant cohort (2008: 78-9). She concludes, "of the eight comparisons that test this expectation, only four display the expected decline" (Model 2008: 76). Although Model finds modest support at best, it is worth mentioning that this could be associated with her operationalization of immigrant cohort and that a different operationalization might show different findings.

The best evidence for the role of self-selection in the literature on black ethnicity and racial inequality comes in the work of Kristin Butcher in her 1994 paper "Black Immigrants in the United States." In this paper Butcher not only compares African Americans to black immigrants from the West Indies but she also compares both of these two groups to "black movers." That is, Butcher created a category of African Americans that had moved from one state to another by comparing their current state of residence to their state of birth (i.e., black migrants). The theory was that if immigrant – or migrant in this case – self-selection was at play, black movers would show similar levels of socioeconomic attainment as those black immigrants who were from the West Indies.[12] Her findings show that, at least in the year 1979,

> "Native movers earn 35 percent higher wages than native non-movers, lending some credence to the self-selection argument. Even black immigrants in the highest earnings group earn less than the native black movers" (p. 267, 269).

Moreover, both native- and foreign-born whites made approximately 40 to 50 percent more than native-born black movers and black immigrants (p. 269). From these findings and findings like this, several scholars have concluded that the immigrant self-selection is an aspect of explaining black ethnic inequality (e.g., Model 2008).

While those arguing for the role of immigrant selectivity in the production of human capital differences have presented compelling evidence (e.g., Butcher 1994, Model 2008: 84-88) for the idea that movers are special, it is important to consider one of the more constant findings associated with those arguing for the immigrant self-selection thesis, "the declining advantage of those more recently arrived" (Model 2008: 81). Indeed as Model reports, "some scholars might anticipate a diminution in white favoritism on the grounds that the larger a minority group, the more discrimination against it" (Model

[12] I use the term *black migrant* to refer to African Americans that move from state to state and the term *black immigrant* to refer to foreign-born blacks that have immigrated to the United States. In this particular project, all black immigrants are from the British West Indies.

2008: 81, Blalock 1956). That is, racial dynamics – variously considered – may be present within the immigrant self-selection thesis such that it is not that race matters less than culture, but that race matters differently and that culture is in effect, racialized.

Summarizing Culture and Human Capital

In short, while Thomas Sowell has argued that the reason why black immigrants do better than African Americans is because of widespread, concrete and stable cultural differences between those who descend from slavery in the British West Indies and those whose ancestors hail from slavery in America, Kristin Butcher and Susan Model (most notably) have argued that any differences that exist between black immigrants and African Americans are due to human capital differences that are associated with the selectivity of migrant populations. Although these two schools of thought often present themselves as very different from one another, they both provide evidence for the same working assumption: black immigrants do better because they work harder (i.e., sociocultural differences, Sowell 1978) and have more human capital (i.e., positively selected, Butcher 1994, Model 2008) than African Americans. That is, all are deeply inspired by the basic assumptions present in the literature on labor economics and neither approach gives serious attention to the idea that observed socioeconomic differences might be the result of racial factors. In order to consider the potential role of the concept and politic of race in the production of black ethnic inequality I first show the ways in which black immigrants have been framed as a model minority.

UNDERMINING NOTIONS OF THE BLACK IMMIGRANT AS MODEL MINORITY

In stark contrast to those who argue that black immigrants do better than African Americans because they work harder and have/acquire more human capital than African Americans, I assert that much of the black ethnic inequality that has been documented is the result of a social process whereby the same attitudes and behaviors receive substantially divergent socioeconomic and political consequence based on the perceived nativity of the black body in question. In order to build this argument I will first show the ways in which black immigrants have been framed as having very different attitudes and behaviors despite having attitudes and behaviors that are very similar to – if not the same as – African Americans. That is, the ways in which black immigrants having been caste as a model minority. I also show that indeed there is ample reason to question this framing.

Starting just after the civil rights movement and immigration reform of the late 1960s, black immigrants have been systematically framed as a model minority. As I will show, the notion that black immigrants are indeed a model minority is largely a myth. I define a *model minority* as a specific group of color who is understood to have achieved more success than African Americans (or the decedents of American slavery) because of their Protestant work ethic and lack of a preoccupation with race and racism (Prashad 2000, Lee 1996). I define the *model minority myth* as a lay theory and social discourse that assigns model minority status to particular racialized minorities so as to maintain white supremacy – e.g., whites at the top of the social structure.[13] In short, such racial logic goes: if one minority group can do well, others can do just as well or better; and to the extent that other groups do not succeed, this shows that their lack of mobility is not do to discrimination but instead do to a lack of effort and too much time spent worrying about race – i.e., other racialized minority groups are not sufficiently "model." Therefore the model minority frame employs notions of hard work and acquiesces to the racial status quo as key factors in the social mobility of 'colored folk.'

Although Sowell is often interpreted as offering a fairly straightforward cultural argument, a careful reading of his work that is inspired by the literature on race and racism in general, and the model minority (myth) in particular, implicates Sowell as the primary source for thinking of the black immigrant as a model minority. That is, Sowell speaks to both the protestant work ethic and – if you will – "racial acquiescence" in the production of black ethnic and black-white racial inequality. He begins with framing the problem,

> "West Indians in the United States are significant not only because of their overrepresentation among prominent or successful blacks, but also because their very different background makes them a test case of the explanatory importance of

[13] The explanatory logic goes of the model minority myth goes: if one minority group can do well, others can do just as well or better; and to the extent that other groups do not succeed, this shows that their lack of mobility is not do to discrimination but instead that it is the result of a lack of effort and too much time spent worrying about race – i.e., that these groups are not sufficiently "model."

> color, as such, in analyzing socioeconomic progress in the American economy and society, as compared to the importance of the cultural traditions of the American Negro." 1978, Thomas Sowell, *Three Black Histories*, p. 42

The implication in this particular passage is that if black immigrants are doing better than African Americans it must be because African Americans practice a culture that inhibits them from experiencing greater social mobility. Later in the same paragraph, he tells us why this finding is so important. He states that because black immigrants do better than African Americans,

> "…racism alone, is clearly not a sufficient explanation of income disparities within the black population or between the black and white populations." 1978, Thomas Sowell, *Three Black Histories*, p. 43

Sowell also has moments where he discusses work ethic and racial factors simultaneously. He states,

> "… West Indian Negros emphasized such traits as work, thrift and education – more generally achievements involving planning and working for the future, implying the emotional control for self-denial in the present and emphasizing the logical and mundane over the emotional, the imaginative, and the heroic. The opposite characteristics can be scene among the … Negros, where advancement can be achieved in emotional and imaginative areas, such as oratory, lyric literature, and music, and which have produced many dramatic 'leaders' and heroes" (Sowell 1975: 130-131).

Here, Sowell talks about "work, thrift and education' in reference to the cultural dimension of the model minority concept while more tacitly implicating the racial dimension when he refers to African American civil rights leaders as emotional and dramatic heroes. The inference here is that African American "dramatic 'leaders' and heroes" are unduly concerned with race, using less logic and more "emotional and imaginative" strategies to confront whatever racial dynamics that might exist. The framing of immigrants as model minorities would persist and can be found in various academic disciplines, including anthropology where John Ogbu (1992) has focused on the ways in which immigrant selectivity results in model behavior among voluntary immigrant minority groups. He sums up two decades of ethnographic research with the following statement,

> "Voluntary [minority immigrants] have cultural models that lead them to accept uncritically mainstream folk theory uncritically mainstream folk theory and strategies of getting ahead in the United States and to interpret their economic hardships as temporary problems they can and will overcome through education and hard work. Additionally they tend to acquiesce in their relationship with school personnel and White authorities controlling other social institutions" (Ogbu 1992: 291).

The thoughts of Thomas Sowell and John Ogbu found many sympathetic ears and would eventually find there way into the mainstream discursive concerning explanations for racial inequality in general and black immigrant success in particular. For instance, in 1996 the conservative *Economist* news magazine published a short piece entitled, "Race in America: Black Like Me." The article began by asking, "Why do black immigrants do so much better than blacks who are born in America?" The answer. "Attitude makes part of the difference . . . black immigrants are more entrepreneurial than native-born blacks." The article continues to highlight cultural factors like, "high motivation . . . and a strong will to succeed." After referencing differences in household incomes, the *Economist* suggests that, "figures like these suggest that racism does not account for all, or even most, of the difficulties encountered by native-born blacks" (1996: 27). Again emphasizing both hard work and a disinterest in race and racism as the best policy for doing away with racial inequality. Indeed stories like this found their way into not only the conservative periodicals but also in papers like the *Boston Globe*, *Baltimore Sun* and *Tampa Tribune* (Pierre 2004).

The point of this brief exercise has been to show that indeed the black immigrant has been framed as a model minority and that this framing has become part of the mainstream explanatory discourse on racial inequality in the United States. Next I will show how more recent research has lent credence to this logic, despite somewhat contradictory findings. That is, I will show that both white employers and black immigrants believe that black immigrants work harder and complain less about race and that these are the primary reasons for their greater success. I will also show that despite these perceptions and claims, there is evidence to the contrary (i.e., the notion that black immigrants are a model minority is more myth than reality).

Protestant Work Ethic

I first focus on the Protestant work ethic dimension of the model minority myth as applied to the black immigrant. In doing so I conduct a critical analyses of findings presented in the book *Black Identities* by Mary Waters (1999) because she conducts interviews with white employers, black immigrants and African Americans and reports findings concerning some of the contradictions at play around the perception of black immigrant Protestant work ethic. That is, I use her text *Black Identities* as a means by which to make my argument that, not only are black immigrants caste as model "on the ground", but that this characterization is largely a *myth*. There are three important highlights to consider here: First, white employers considered black immigrants to be model. Second, black immigrants adopted this view. And third, whites, black immigrants and Waters present countervailing evidence to the notion that black immigrants are a model minority and yet this narrative remains in tact throughout. Waters starts with white managers that she interviewed,

> A: If I had one position open and if it was a West Indian versus an American black, I'd go with the West Indian.
> Q: And that's because of your experience working with people?
> A: Yes. Their reliability, their willingness to do the job or what has to be done.
> Q: Are there concrete statistics on this?
> A: I don't have them. I just – it's just experience that they have a different drive than American blacks.
>
> (White male manager, age 42) 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 116

Clearly this manager believes that black immigrants are harder workers than African Americans. This view was based on his own personal experiences, which are often less than objective – especially considering the readily available discourse concerning black immigrants. Black immigrants were also aware of the ways in which they benefited from their model minority status and adopted a particular narrative about the African American work ethic,

> A: My ex-boss he was white and he would rather have a staff like this with a lot of West Indians because of the problems [he had] when he would hire Americans. He would say, 'it's a waste.' On a Monday morning when he looking for his job to be done, they're not here. And he always say he liked West Indian people. And I think I benefit from that. I think this is why I'm in this position right now through him, you know? And probably because I'm black, maybe wouldn't appreciate me that much. If you're working for a place and there's openings for a job, them big firms, they like to take West Indians faster than a black American.
> Q: Why do you think that is?
> A: Because as I was saying, most people know most Americans is lazy. Black Americans.
>
> (Trinidadian female manager, age 38, in United States twenty-two years) 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 124

Although Waters presents several quotes of this nature, what is somewhat unique about this quote is that in addition to the respondent appearing cognoscenti of the fact that she is seen as a hard worker vis-à-vis African Americans, but that there may be a larger racial politic at steak (i.e., when she eludes, "And probably because I'm black, maybe wouldn't appreciate me that much"). Despite this "slip" she felt comfortable saying, "…most Americans is lazy." Indeed several black immigrants reported their view that African Americans were lazy,

> "The majority of the black Americans – what I say, is either that they're lazy or they don't like to work. I might be wrong, but by judging from places where you work along with them, if they need something, they work for it. When they get it, that's it. They don't – the majority of them, like, they don't have a plan about what they need with their life. I think this welfare system encourages it. 'Cause in my country, there is no such thing. You gotta work for a living. There is no special security and welfare, nothing like that." (Guyanese male worker, age 39, in the United States six years) 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 127

This quote shows that some of the black immigrant respondents tried to base their analysis on their personal experiences with African Americans and were willing to admit that African Americans do indeed work hard when they need something. But despite these qualifications, the conclusion remained in tact, that African Americans "are lazy or don't work hard" and that the "welfare system encourages it." In explaining the reason why black immigrants employed this narrative – despite the presence of contradictions in their own experiences – Waters concludes,

> "To explain these behaviors and attitudes, most of the immigrants use their own limited experiences with inner-city black Americans and the ready made cultural stereotypes that are prevalent in the mass media and that role off the tongues of white managers. Thus the immigrants compared their own hard-working, planning, friendly, upwardly-

> striving selves with the lazy, welfare-dependent, unfriendly, bitter black Americans." 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 138

That is, black immigrants were aware of their own framing as model and the framing of African Americans as lazy and undeserving that is present in the media and employed these narratives even when their experiences did not support them. White employers also made mention of contradictions. In particular a few described the ways in which their conception of black immigrants as model did not always support their experiences. Interestingly, these behaviors were not explained in terms of sociocultural pathology, but in terms of a benign ignorance. Waters observes,

> "… where American blacks are blamed for their lack of a work ethic and for not showing up to work on Mondays, the immigrants are often granted cultural or ethnic explanations for why they behave in a particular way. One manager explained that when new immigrants were late 'on island time' or did not show up for work when it rained, he understood that they just did not understand the 'American way of work,' and then cut them some slack." 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 121

Despite making this observation, Waters does not discuss how such an inconsistency might be implicated in the maintenance of racial inequality. That is, she does not stop to question the ways in which a less accurate construction of black immigrants as consistently hard working might work to undue support the argument that African American pathology is the main reason for black-white racial inequality.

Racial Paranoia and Protest

The model minority myth is also about a certain divestment in the notion that race and racism are important factors in social mobility. That is, part of the rationale for black immigrant success is that they are less concerned with race and racial discrimination than are African Americans – i.e., African Americans are 'racially paranoid' (Johnson 2008). John Johnson (2008: 3) offers the notion of *racial paranoia* as "distrustful conjecture about purposeful race-based maliciousness and the 'benign neglect' of racial indifference." He continues in saying that, "racial paranoia is constituted by extremist thinking, general social distrust, the nonfalsifiable embrace of intuition and the unflinching commitment to contradictory thinking" (Johnson 2008: 7). Later in the same chapter, Johnson (2008: 10) sets the intellectual agenda of his book, "*Racial Paranoia* takes a broad look at African Americans in the twenty-first century as they attempt to see something that can't always be seen, to touch something that may not be there, and to make sense of a small voice inside their heads that whispers and whispers and whispers."

Waters talks about the lack of "racial paranoia" among black immigrants as an important part of the reason why whites favor black immigrants. She argues that lower levels of racial paranoia among black immigrants produce a comfort factor that results in immigrant favorability. According to Waters the comfort factor exists, at least in part, because,

> "West Indian blacks provide a black face for whites to look into without seeing the sorry history of American race relations mirrored back. This puts whites at ease and a cycle of expectations is created. West Indians do not expect strained expectations with whites, and whites don't expect strained relations with West Indians." 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 171

Waters then provides an example of white employer favorability. According to one of the white female managers she interviewed,

> "Sometimes I feel that people who come from the islands are more appreciative of their jobs. They consider themselves fortunate. And sometimes I feel that the assistants that come from the South feel that you owe it to them to keep them on when you have some problems. The island people are a little more open to white people than the southern blacks who question authority more. And I don't know how to say it – the West Indians kind of accept the fact that even though you are white, it is not *because* you are white that you are dictating to them, but because you are the person in authority" (White female manager, age 32) 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 171

So here we see some support for the notion that whites are more comfortable with the racial politics of black immigrants than with those of African Americans. According to Waters, black immigrants echo the perception that African Americans are too concerned with race and therefore do not move forward as quickly as they do,

> "I can't help them [African Americans] because they're so wrapped up in racism, and they act it out so often, they interpret it as such so often that sometimes they are not even approachable…

> Sometimes I feel sorry for them, but you find out that you just can't change their attitude because they just tell you that you don't understand. You weren't there to feel the way they felt." (Jamaican female teacher, age 41, in United States seven years) 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 171

Moreover, according to the black immigrants, it was this type of racial paranoia that is also responsible for a lack of African American mobility,

> "We're not saying that there is not racism, we're not saying that there's not prejudice. We're not saying that there are not certain jobs where they put a token black man. We're not saying that. But you don't have to be negative all the time. I just cannot understand because I came here, I didn't have a high school diploma from this country. You understand? But – I mean, I love my job, I'm doing what I like to do… my next step after this will be to have my own catering business. And that is what I'm working towards now. You know? So, don't tell me I can't do it. [I say to African Americans] why you can't do it and you're right here?" (Trinidadian female supervisor, age 36, in the United States nineteen years) 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 171

In some ways Waters herself can also be read as tacitly implicating black immigrant racial attitudes as part of their reason for success in the United States. She states,

> "Thus the cultural beliefs and practices West Indian immigrants bring to the United States reflect… hard work and ambition to conquer discrimination… which lead them to expect racial discrimination but to see it as a relatively contained part of life, not one that suffuses every encounter between black and white." 1999, Mary Waters, *Black Identities*, p. 153

Her working assumption here is that African Americans do suffuse race into every encounter and therefore pay the penalty associated with racial paranoia. However, despite the conception that whites and black immigrants have of black immigrants as holding a more neutral set of racial politics, Waters eludes to the fact that this may not be the empirical reality but, I would argue, because of the power of the model minority myth, black immigrants are allowed to pass. She states,

> "At the same time, a significant number of the white managers describe the foreign-born as being very outspoken, very aware of race, and very likely to be blunt about what they want. Yet this did not seem to dampen relations between whites and West Indians in the same way that it dampened relations between African Americans and whites" (Waters 1999: 175).

In sum, the model minority frame has been applied to the black immigrant in both the academy and in working class settings. However, a close read of this depiction results in contradictory evidence. This evidence suggests that the notion of the black immigrant as model minority may be more imagined than real. Next, I review the theoretical foundations and race-related implications underlying this inconsistency.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR DIFFERENTIAL RACIALIZATION

As noted at the outset, differential racialization is a social process with politico-economic implications. That is, it involves the imagining of differences in work ethic and racial skepticism where they do not exist and the differential treatment of the same or very similar behaviors and attitudes. This different treatment for the same characteristics then results in the assignment of black immigrants and African Americans to slightly different locations at the bottom of the American racial hierarchy. In what follows I review the five theoretical foundations that undergird my thinking on differential racialization.

I then review state-of-the-art theorizing on race and racism in the United States in order to develop the notion of differential racialization. This review brings together notions of the "biologization of culture", the role of perceived national origin and foreignness in the assignment of racial meanings, and the ways in which these meanings are employed to assign African Americans and black immigrants at slightly different positions at the bottom of a "triangulated" racial hierarchy. I conclude the section with the primary hypotheses that follow from a theory of differential racialization.

First, I start with the assumption that race is an *independent social force* that is endemic to the American project – i.e., the expansion of the West from Europe to the Americans starting in the middle of the sixteenth century and continuing to the present (Feagin 2000, Mills 1997, Omi and Winant 1994, Bonilla-Silva 1997). As Omi and Winant assert (1994: 48), "race [is] an autonomous field of social conflict, political organization and cultural/ideological meaning." Accordingly I understand race to be neither

an essential human characteristic nor a product of false consciousness. Instead race is a product of the human imagination; a social construct that not only shapes the social structures of everyday life but also invites our imagination to see things that may in fact not be there (Berger and Luckman 1967, Fields 1990, Hall 1986). That is, race occupies the liminal space between the real and the imagined in such a way that – *despite its imagined nature* – it continues to have real consequences. Given the ideological and material consequences that are associated with race, the phenotypical differences we often associate with different races are then understood as markers of political conflict over social and economic resources (Omi and Winant 1994, Bonilla-Silva 1997). That is, since race often determines who gets what, various efforts are made in order to intervene in order to redistribute resources along particular racial lines (Omi and Winant 1994, Bonilla-Silva 1997). Given this theorization, my argument for differential racialization considers the various ways in which black immigrants might be incorporated into such a racialized society. Also, given the socially constructed nature of race, it becomes possible to think about the ways in which similar phenotypes might be assigned different racial meanings.

Second, the social determinants of race have been known to change over time. Therefore, I agree with others who contend that the most recent shift has been a *shift away from the biogenic determination of Jim Crow toward discussions of innate cultural predispositions in the post civil rights period* – i.e., approx. 1965 to the present (Bonilla-Silva 2003: 39-43, Bobo et. al 1997, Lewis 1965). In the current historical period, racism is much less overt and "involves persistent negative stereotyping of African Americans, a tendency to blame blacks themselves for the black-white gap in socioeconomic standing, and resistance to meaningful policy efforts to ameliorate U.S. racist social conditions and institutions" (Bobo et. al 1997: 16). This new trend in "blaming the victim" is undergirded by the working presupposition that the cultural practices of blacks are not only the reason for their condition but that certain cultural characteristics are somehow "fixed" to the black body politic – i.e., the "biologization of culture" (Bonilla-Silva 2003: 40). Therefore, instead of defining racial groups in terms of religion or biogenetic disposition, cultural predispositions are increasingly being attached to variation in the human phenotype in ways that are both preset and permanent. This is very different from the anthropological notion of culture as both socially constructed and fluid.

Third, the shift from biology to culture has been paralleled by a more general *increase in the number of 'social characteristics' employed in the process of assigning racial meaning* (Blant 1992, Bonilla-Silva 2004, Gold 2004). Two such social characteristics that have been factored into the increasingly complex process of racialization are *national origin* and *perceived foreignness* (Kim 1999, Tuan 1998, Ngai 2005). In the book *Impossible Subjects*, Mai Ngai (2005) argues that "the national origins quota system [of U.S. immigration law] created categories of difference that turned on both national origins and race, reclassifying Americans as racialized subjects simultaneously along both lines" (p. 36). That is, the position of people within the racial hierarchy of the United States is at least partly determined by perceived national origin. In addition to national origin, Mia Tuan (1998) argues that although Asian Americans have been a central part of the American project for generations they continue to be perceived as foreigners and therefore excluded from the social and political imagination of the United States.

Claire Kim attempts to capture much of this thinking in her theorization on "racial triangulation" (Kim 1999). In doing so she offers a conception of racial inequality that has more than one axis. That is, in addition to the classic axis of inferior-superior, Kim adds the axis foreign-insider to help us better understand the roles of national origin and foreignness in the production of racial inequality in the United States. In short she argues that racialization is a process of triangulating folks between whites and blacks via relative valorization and civic ostracism. She contends that while Asian Americans are seen as a more capable stock of people than African Americans (i.e., higher on the superior-inferior axis) they are civically ostracized because they are perceived as foreign relative to African Americans (i.e., they do not do as well along the foreigner-insider axis). The implication is that, a certain type of perpetual – even multigenerational – "cultural predisposition" is then affixed to the body vis-à-vis an interaction between national origin and phenotype.

I argue that the perception of foreignness is indeed associated with the imagining of fixed characteristics in such a way that black immigrants are seen as "forever foreign" and therefore forever better than African Americans (Tuan 1998, Ngai 2004). A key

point of evidence for the imagined fixidity of cultural traits among black immigrants is the conception of the children and grandchildren of black immigrants as a certain type of immigrant as opposed to "full blooded" native-born citizens. That said, it is important to note that while for some groups being thought of as "forever foreign" is associated with a negative social bias (e.g., Asian Americans; Tuan 1998), the literature on black ethnic inequality confers stable positive bias to black immigrants (e.g., Sowell 1978). Therefore, I ague that – despite having the same phenotype as African Americans – black immigrants are racialized differently in the public imagination (especially among whites, but also among black immigrants and to some extent African Americans; Waters 1999, Vickerman 1998). Therefore, at different levels of perceived foreignness, blackness means something different (Kim 1999, Ngai 2005).[14]

The fourth theoretical foundation concerns the implication of assigning different racial meanings to black immigrants and African Americans. Differential racialization therefore includes a social process whereby black immigrant behavior attains a different value and meaning in the eyes of whites, even when the behaviors are very similar or even identical to that of African Americans (Waters 1999, Kasinitz 1992). As noted above, Mary Waters (1999) reports that white employers hold more favorable thoughts about black immigrants than they do African Americans. Her notion of *white esteem* proposes that whites feel less threatened by black immigrants because black immigrants are less likely to bring up issues related to American slavery and less likely to complain about working conditions. In addition, black immigrants are thought to be harder workers on the job and therefore white employers use black immigrant social networks for hiring. That is, whites use language and social networks to identify black immigrants and then treat them differently than African Americans. The key limitation of this perspective is that it accepts the perception that white employers have of black immigrants and African Americans as real, objective or factual. The single multi-city survey that considers ethnic differences in black racial attitudes suggests that any differences in racial attitudes are either very small or nonexistent (Benson 2006). Using the differential racialization theoretical framework I contend that in many ways these perceptions are more imagined than real and therefore similar characteristics and behaviors are treated differently across black ethnicity.

Finally, I argue that by assigning different meanings to similar attitudes and behaviors, differential racialization ultimately functions to maintain the position of blacks at the bottom of the U.S. racial hierarchy. This is very similar to the model minority myth. As noted above, scholars have argued that the model minority myth functions to not only maintain the position of Asian Americans, but that it also works to maintain the position of other racial groups. The logic goes: if one minority group can do well, others can do just as well or better; and to the extent that other groups do not succeed, this shows that their lack of mobility is not due to discrimination but instead that it is the result of a lack of effort. Ultimately this logic works to forestall changes in public policy that would benefit all racial minority groups, including Asians. My thinking on differential racialization borrows aspects of state-of-the-art thinking on the model minority concept but reconceives it in terms of what might be termed, 'model ethnicity' (e.g., Pierre 2004). That is, the process I am referring to assigns 'model status' to ethnic groups *within* racial groups in order to preserve the position of said racial group within the larger racial hierarchy. Said more forthrightly, the discourse on black immigrants as a model minority celebrates the economic 'success' of black immigrants in order to keep the vast majority of blacks in position – immigrant and native.

This line of reasoning is supported by two basic findings. First, despite the supposed hard work and color blindness of black immigrants, their socioeconomic status remains far behind whites (Butcher 1994: 269). And second, while whites often claim that black immigrants have more appreciation for America and the basic American values, black immigrants face a form of "civic ostracism" in modern democratic politics (Kim 1999, Rodgers 2006). Indeed Reuel Rodgers (2006) shows that black immigrants in New York are very often not incorporated into local democratic politics. This finding goes against research that shows a correlation between increases in socioeconomic mobility and higher levels of political participation. Why is it that black immigrants don't follow this pattern? In some ways the relatively high levels of socioeconomic status are interacting with the relatively low levels of political participation in ways that suggest the case of the black immigrant might

[14] For an example of groups with the same phenotype being racialized differently see, Mamdani, Mahmood. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism and the Genocide in Rwanda.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

benefit from the theoretical insight of the racial triangulation thesis (Kim 1999, Rogers 2006: 92).[15]

Summary

The literature on black ethnic inequality is an attempt to answer two basic questions. First, why is it that black immigrants tend to do better than African Americans in terms of socioeconomic status? And second, what does this teach us about the reasons for persistence black-white racial inequality in the United States? While the principle aim of this study is to shed light on the latter, I will also be answering the former. Indeed many have employed the story of the black immigrant experience as a natural experiment should allow the researcher to isolate the role of color and culture in the production of racial inequality, but few have questioned the degree to which race is actually "held constant." Therefore, while I will conduct tests of cultural difference and immigrant self-selection, the major contribution of this project will be to rethink the role of race in the production of black ethnic inequality. In short, my claim is the discourse on black immigrant success ultimately assigns very different meanings to the same values, behaviors and racial attitudes of African Americans and black immigrants. I argue that this functions to maintain black-white racial inequality in the United States (Pierre 2004). Ultimately, while black immigrants experience relative valorization vis-à-vis African American peers (and some of the socioeconomic gains associated with relative valorization), they also experience civic ostracism from the both civil rights organizations and formal democratic politics (as a result of the civic ostracism so often accorded to "foreigners"). The result? The vast majority of blacks in the U.S. remain far behind their white counterparts. As for scholars interested in racial inequality, my thinking on differential racialization suggests that it is not that race matters less than culture, but that race matters differently and that culture is in effect, racialized.

As with any large project, there are hosts of hypotheses. This project has two primary hypotheses. First, that while black immigrants may do better than African Americans in terms of socioeconomic status, they do less well when it comes to political participation. Second, that much of the difference in socioeconomic status is due to black immigrants receiving different rewards for same or similar types of cultural practice, human capital investment and racial attitudes.

DATA AND METHODS

One of the key limitations of research in this area is the nature of the data being analyzed. That is, the vast majority of the data under study has been from either the U.S. Census or from ethnographic studies with non-random samples that are mostly from the Northeast and Southeast of the United States.[16] The chief limitation of the U.S. Census is that it is known to systematically undercount immigrants and people of color (Butcher 1994: 283, Papademetriou and DiMarzio 1986, Warren and Peck 1980). To the extent that black immigrants are undercounted, their numbers are biased slightly upward. The second major limitation of using the U.S. Census to evaluate the degree to which race or culture are responsible for inequality is that the census has very few measures of racial attitudes. That is, a study of unexplained residuals is not the same as a study of racial dynamics (Bonillia-Silva and Zuberi 2008). As for studies that are more ethnographic, even though these studies tend to talk about race more, their findings often do not account for the ways in which immigrant life can be different in different cities and regions, nor are the processes they document well able to be generalized to all black immigrants in the United States.

In order to address some of these limitations, data for this study will come from two sources: a secondary analysis of survey data that is supplemented with data from the U.S. Census. Survey data will come from the National Survey of American Life (NSAL; Jackson et. al. 2004a, Jackson et. al. 2004b). The NSAL is uniquely suited for this study because it seeks to collect information on the "racial, ethnic and cultural influences on mental health" (Jackson et. al. 2004a, p. 289) and provides the first nationally representative study of both African Americans (Jackson et. al. 1980) and black immigrants from the West Indies, living in the United States; an oversample that also includes

[15] That is, the function of black immigrant patriotism must also be implicated in the in a theory of differential racialization. Indeed, thinking on the concept of racialization has always been concerned with the connections between race and patriotism (i.e., from Keith 1931 to Kim 2004).

[16] This is especially true for the literature in black ethnicity that is chiefly concerned with racial and/or ethnic differences in socioeconomic attainment. While other studies that might be classified as studies of black ethnicity do "take place" in other regions, they are more often interested in intergroup relations, ethnic heritage, ethnic identity and/or immigrant incorporation.

second-generation black immigrants.[17] That is, not only does it attempt to include measures of cultural practice, but it also includes measures of racial attitudes. Supplementing this data with data from the U.S. Census will allow for an assessment of the degree to which various "city level" factors are implicated in shaping social mobility, cultural practice, racial attitude formation and the process of differential racialization.

It is important to note that in order to complete this study I will also need to acquire data that is not currently publicly available. First, I will need to acquire the most current general adult sample from National Survey of American Life. I will also need access to the re-interviews with whites, African Americans and Afro-Caribbeans that are part of the NSAL but are not currently available to the public. [18] Finally I will need to combine survey data with data from the U.S. Census into one large dataset.

MEASUREMENT OF THE CORE CONCEPTS UNDER STUDY

The core concepts that will be operationalized in this study are: (1) socioeconomic status and political participation, (2) cultural behaviors, human capital and selectivity and, (3) racial attitudes and perceived discrimination. From the start, my claim is that although these measures are only imperfect indicators of the true concepts under study, they are either equal to or better than what has been available previously and will therefore advance our understanding of the mechanisms that undergird black ethnic inequality.[19]

Socioeconomic Status and Political Participation

Socioeconomic status and political participation will be the "two" key dependent variables.[20] Socioeconomic status will be assessed with objective and subjective indicators. In terms of *objective indicators*, I will operationalize socioeconomic status in terms of labor force participation, unemployment, occupational prestige and the log of hourly earnings (i.e., *following* Model 2008). Two indicators will serve as measures of *labor force participation*. Respondents are asked whether or not they are currently working for pay and whether or not they have ever worked for pay. A worker is considered *unemployed* if they are not currently employed and are currently seeking a job. *Occupational prestige* will be assessed using responses to the question, "What is your main occupation?" These open-ended answers will then be categorized according to the Treiman prestige score (Treiman 1977, Model 2008).[21] I will use the *natural log of hourly wages* in order to assess personal earnings.[22] Political participation will be measured in terms of involvement in: *neighborhood block clubs*, *civil rights groups* and *electoral politics*.[23]

Cultural Behaviors, Human Capital and Selectivity

There are several ways to evaluate such a complex and nuanced construct as "sociocultural practice." In this study I measure three different aspects of this construct: cultural behaviors, human capital investment and immigrant selectivity. *Cultural behaviors* include indicators of: marital status, number of children, age at birth of the first child, involvement in help groups, whether or not a woman is the head of household, willingness to work and an index of familial support. *Human capital* will be assessed by: level of education (Mincer 1974), years of work experience (Mincer 1974), years of experience squared (to account for diminishing returns) and a subjective assessment of skills. There are three main strategies for assessing *immigrant selectivity*: year of migration, cohort of migration and comparing migrants to immigrants (*see* Chiswick 1978, Borjas 1986, Butcher 1994, respectively). I will include all these measures of the immigrant selectivity and will also include: reason for immigrating to the U.S., the type of visa the respondent might have acquired to come to the U.S. and the current citizenship status of the respondent.

Racial Attitudes and Perceived Discrimination

There are a host of measures that will be used to not only assess the ways in which African Americans and black immigrants think differently about race, but also

[17] It will address limitations associated with findings from the U.S. Census in the assessment of the second generation "native-born West Indians" (Model 2008: 82).
[18] If these data are ultimately not acquired the study will still be conducted although with slightly less nuance. There is only one dependent variable that must be requested: hourly income.
[19] For actual questions, see Appendix.
[20] Although these are two different constructs, I will be considering them both separately and together.
[21] I will also explore categorizing them according to the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Classification System Manual (http://www.bls.gov/ocs/ocsm/commain.htm).
[22] Data for this variable will need to be requested from ICPSR.
[23] The three questions for electoral political will need to be requested from ICPSR.

the various ways in which they experience the racial structure of the United States. *Racial attitudes* will include measures of perceived discrimination (both major life and everyday discrimination), group solidarity, closeness to other groups (to include blacks, whites, West Indians and Africans), linked fate, adoption of various racial stereotypes, explanations for racial inequality and an assessment of the degree to which the respondent thinks racial discrimination has served as a block to their social mobility. Measures of the *racial structure* will include racial and ethnic composition of the neighborhood, racial composition of the work group and the race the employer.

ANALYSIS PLAN

My dissertation will include three analytic chapters. In addition to these chapters, there will be an introduction, a theory chapter and a concluding chapter. The first chapter will review the literature that documents black immigration from the West Indies, the interactions between black immigrants, African Americans and whites and the changing nature of black ethnic inequality over the past century. In the theory chapter I will conduct a critical review of the primary explanations for black ethnic inequality. In chapter three I will investigate the role of sociocultural difference in the production of black ethnic inequality. Chapter four will test for the role of the immigration self-selection thesis. Chapter five will test the viability of my thinking on differential racialization in the production of black ethnic inequality. Finally chapter six – the conclusion – will reflect on the general findings of the study and comment on the implications such findings have for our understanding of black ethnic and racial inequality. I will review the analysis plan for the three middle analytic chapters separately.

Nativity and Cultural Behaviors

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, to document the extent to which black immigrants and African Americans differ on various cultural behaviors and second, to investigate the degree to which differences in these cultural behaviors are responsible for black ethnic inequality. In order to document the extent to which black immigrants and African Americans differ on various cultural behaviors, I will use a series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In order to parcel out general differences between the two black ethnic groups and more subtle differences that may exist among black immigrants, I will run a series of ANOVAs with different operationalizations of the independent variable (i.e., immigrations status). First, immigration status will simply be to show differences between African Americans and black immigrants. Second, immigration status will be split into three groups: African Americans, second-generation black immigrants and foreign-born black immigrants. Finally, I will separate the independent variable into several categories: African American, second-generation black immigrants and then three separate categories of foreign-born black immigrants by years since immigration.

In order to observe the extent to which any differences in cultural practice are responsible for differences in socioeconomic status and political participation I will conduct a series of multivariate regressions.[24] In formulaic terms,

$$Y = \alpha + \beta\delta_j + \beta x_c + \varepsilon \qquad (1)$$

where Y is equal to the two different operationalizations of the dependent variable (i.e., socioeconomic status and political participation), δ_j refers to a dummy variable for immigration status and x_c refers to a vector of variables that measure the cultural attributes mentioned in the previous subsection. The focus will be on the ability of the cultural practice measures x_c to explain differences across immigration status δ_j in socioeconomic status and political participation Y.

Immigrant Selectivity and Human Capital

The primary analytic goal of this chapter is to assess the role of immigrant selectivity and human capital in black ethnic inequality. First, using ANOVA I will investigate the degree to which black migrants and immigrants[25] are comparable in terms of socioeconomic status and political participation. In order to investigate the degree to which movement is associated with differences in racial inequality I will also run a second set of ANOVAs that includes 'white movers' and 'white non-movers.' Second, I will use ANOVAs to assess the degree to which movers and non-movers have different levels of human capital.

[24] Using OLS and Ordinal models when appropriate.
[25] Again, I use the term migrant to refer to African Americans that have moved from state to state. I use the term immigrant to refer to black people that have moved from one country to another.

There are two different multivariate modeling techniques to be conducted in this chapter. That is, although the literature that tests for the role of immigrant self-selection has essentially rested on socioeconomic differences between movers and non-movers (Butcher 1994), there is much to gain by incorporating previous analytic strategies that investigate the time it may take for immigrants to catch their native born peers and the potential for cohort and 'reason-for-immigrating' effects (Chiswick 1979, Borjas 1987). The first full model is then,

$$Y = \alpha + \beta\delta_j + \beta x_c + \beta x_{yom} + \beta x_{cohort} + \beta x_{h-cap} + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

where x_{yom} is an indicator for year of migration with the baseline being those born in the United States, x_{cohort} is an indicator for immigrating before or after 1965 immigration reform and x_{h-cap} is a vector of indicators for human capital.

The second multivariate model will be very similar to the one just shown except that the dummy variable δ_j is recoded such that African American movers and non-movers will be separated out, as will second generation black immigrant movers and non-movers, μ_j.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta\mu_j + \beta x_c + \beta x_{yom} + \beta x_{cohort} + \beta x_{h-cap} + \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

Differential Racialization

The analytic goal of this chapter is to assess the degree to which African Americans and black immigrants think differently about race and to what degree these two black ethnic groups experience differential rewards for their cultural behaviors and racial attitudes in terms of various indicators of socioeconomic status and political participation. There are two major steps to the analysis plan for differential racialization. First an assessment of the degree to which African Americans and black immigrants differ in their racial attitudes and in their relationship to the racial structure (e.g., racial segregation in housing and racial segmentation in the workplace). Second, I will employ multivariate decomposition modeling to assess the degree to which African Americans and black immigrants are valued differently with respect to their cultural behaviors and racial 'dispositions' (*see* Jeon and Simmons 1998 and Butcher 1994 for examples of decompositions for human capital across nativity). To assess black ethnic differences in racial attitudes I will conduct a series of ANOVAs that compare African Americans and black immigrants (in terms of immigration status, years in the U.S. and cohort of arrival) in terms of their racial attitudinal and position in the racial structure.

The second step of the analysis plan will be to conduct multivariate decompositions in order to understand the degree to which differences in the outcome variables are a result of different group level characteristics or differential treatment for the same characteristics (Blinder 1973, Oaxaca 1973, Jann 2008). The basic linear model,

$$Y_\ell = X'_\ell\beta_\ell + \varepsilon, \quad E(\varepsilon_\ell) = 0 \quad (5)$$

where Y is a measure of socioeconomic status or political participation, X' is a vector of all predictors in the model (i.e., indicators of cultural behavior, racial attitudes and perceived discrimination) and the constant and β represents the slope coefficient for the vector of all predictors and the intercept (i.e., effect of the constant on the dependent variable). The subscript ℓ denotes group differences,

$$Y_\ell = Y_A - Y_B, \quad \ell \in \{A,B\} \quad (6)$$

where A and B represent any two comparison groups.[26]

The "three-fold" multivariate decompositions are composed of three parts: endowment effects, differences in the coefficients and the interaction between different endowments and coefficients in the production of group level differences in the outcome (Jann 2008). In short, the "endowment" effect is the percentage of group level difference in the outcome variable that results from group level differences in the independent variable. The "differences in the coefficient" effect is the percent of group level differences in the dependent variable that stems from the two groups getting different returns when having the same level of the independent variable. The interaction term then allows the investigator to

[26] Because these modeling techniques can only be run with two groups at a time, various models will be run that allow for the observance of differences between African Americans, second generation black immigrants, first generation black immigrants and whites. For simplicity these models only refer to differences between African Americans and black immigrants.

observe what percentage of the difference in the dependent variable is a result of an interaction between the endowment and coefficient effects. That is,

$$Y_\ell = E + C + I \qquad (11)$$

where E is the "endowment effect,"

$$E = (X_A - X_B)'\beta_B \qquad (12)$$

which is the portion of group level differences in the outcome that are the result of group level differences in the predictors and the constant and,

$$C = X_B'(\beta_A - \beta_B) \qquad (13)$$

where C is the portion of group level differences in the outcome that are the result of group level differences in the coefficients or the degree to which differential treatment for the same characteristics contribute to inequality in the outcome and,

$$I = (X_A - X_B)'(\beta_A - \beta_B) \qquad (14)$$

denotes the degree to which group level differences in the outcome are the result of an interaction between group level differences in the predators and coefficients.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In this section I present some preliminary findings from the larger project in order to document baseline differences in socioeconomic status and political participation and to foreshadow the potential explanatory power of differential racialization. I first present findings from a One-Way ANOVA that compares African Americans, black immigrants and whites on several measures of socioeconomic status and political participation. I then present findings from a simple multivariate decomposition in order to show preliminary support for differential racialization.

Table 1 presents results from a bivariate analysis of socioeconomic status and political participation by race, ethnicity and nativity.[27] In general the group differences shown warrant the present study. Black immigrants do better than African Americans on all four measures of socioeconomic status, but not as well as whites. Also, African Americans have higher levels of political participation than do black immigrants.

In Table 2 I present findings from a three-fold multivariate decomposition. The table begins by showing the mean differences between African Americans and black immigrants. These numbers are essentially the same as the numbers presented in the previous table for the poverty-to-needs index.[28] This part of the table shows the total difference to be explained (i.e., .72). As noted above, three different types of effects explain group level differences in the poverty-to-needs index. First group level differences in education and black solidarity explain about half of the overall difference (i.e., the endowment effect is .35). Almost all of the endowment effect is attributable to group level differences in education. Slightly more than half of the difference is explained by the coefficient effect (i.e., .38). Nearly all of the coefficient effect is due to different rewards for similar levels of black solidarity. Whereas African Americans get little to no reward, for black immigrants, higher levels of black solidarity are associated with lower poverty levels. These results provide compelling preliminary evidence for the idea that African Americans and black immigrants get different rewards for having the same racial attitudes.

[27] Nativity refers to whether or not the respondent was born in the United States.

[28] Whatever small differences exist between the two tables are due to listwise case deletion in the latter.

REFERENCES

Benson, Janel F. 2006. "Exploring the Racial Identities of Black Immigrants in the United States." *Sociological Forum* 21:219-247.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Blalock, Herbert M. 1956. "Economic Discrimination and Negro Increase." *American Sociological Review* 21:584-588.

------- . 1957. "Percent Non-White and Discrimination in the South." *American Sociological Review* 22:677-682.

Blaut, James M. 1992. "The Theory of Cultural Racism." *Antipode* 23:289-299.

Blinder, Alan S. 1973. "Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates." *The Journal of Human Resources* 8:436-455.

Bobo, Lawrence, James R. Kluegel, and Ryan A. Smith. 1997. "Laissez-Faire Racism: The Crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Antiblack Ideology." Pp. 15-45 in *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, edited by S. A. Tuch and J. Martin. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward A Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62:465-480.

------- . 2001. *White Supremacy and Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

------- . 2003. "The Central Frames of Color-Blind Racism." Pp. 24-52 in *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistance of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

------- . 2004. ""We Are All Americans" The Latin Americanization of Race Relations in the United States." Pp. 149-183 in *The Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity*, edited by M. Krysan and A. E. Lewis. New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Warren, Robert and Jennifer M. Peck. 1980. "Foreign-Born Emigration from the United States: 1960-1970." *Demography* 17:71-84.

Borjas, George J. 1985. "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics* 3:463-489.

Butcher, Kristin F. 1994. "Black Immigrants in the United States: A Comparison with Native Blacks and Other Immigrants." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 47:265-284.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1977. "Sons of Immigrants: Are They at an Earnings Disadvantage?" *American Economic Review* 67:376.

------- . "The Effects of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men." *Journal of Political Economy* 86:897-921.

Cosby, Bill and Alvin F. Poussaint. 2007. *Come On People: On the Path from Victims to Victors*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Cotton, Jeremiah. 1993. "Color or Culture?: Wage Differences Among Non-Hispanic Black Males, Hispanic Black Males and Hispanic White Males." *Review of Black Political Economy* 21.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1899. *The Philadelphia Negro*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

------- . 1903. *Souls of Black Folks*. New York, New York: Penguin Books.

Economist 1996. "Race in America: Black Like me." *Economist*, 11 May 1996, pp. 57-58.

Feagin, Joe R. 2000. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities and Future Reparations*. London, England: Routledge.

Fields, Barbara. 1990. "Slavery, Race and Ideology in the United States of America." *New Left Review* 181:95-118.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1970. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge and London: The M.I.T. Press.

Gold, Steven J. 2004. "From Jim Crow to Racial

Hegemony: Evolving Explanations of Racial Hierarchy." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27:951-968.

Hall, Stuart. 1996. "The Problem of Ideology: Marxism Without Guarantees." Pp. 25-46 in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by D. Morely and K. H. Chen. London, England: Routledge.

Hanson, Marcus Lee. 1940. *The Immigrant in American History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Jackson, James S. and Gerald Gurin. 1980. "National Survey of Black Americans, 1979-1980." in *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*. Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Jackson, James S., Harold W. Neighbors, Randolph M. Nesse, Steven J. Trierweiler, and Myriam Torres. 2004. "Methodological Innovations in the National Survey of American Life." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 13:289-298.

Jackson, James S., Myriam Torres, Cleopatra H. Caldwell, Harold W. Neighbors, Randolph M. Nesse, Robert Joseph Taylor, Steven J. Trierweiler, and David R. Williams. 2004. "The National Survey of American Life: A Study of Racial, Ethnic and Cultural Influences On Mental Disorders and Mental Health." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 13:196-207.

Jann, Ben. 2008. "The Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition for Linear Regression Models." *The Stata Journal* 8:453-479.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977 [1993]. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York, New York: Basic Books.

Kasinitz, Philip. 1992. *Caribbean New York: Black Immigrants and the Politics of Race*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Politics & Society* 27:105-138.

------- . 2004. "Imagining Race and Nation in Multiculturalist America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27:987-1005.

Lee, Stacey J. 1996. "Asian Americans: The Absent/Silenced/Model Minority." Pp. 1-16 in *Unraveling the 'Model Minority' Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth*. New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Lewis, Oscar. 1965. *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty - San Juan and New York*. New York, New York: Vintage Books.

Mills, Charles W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Mincer, Jacob. 1974. *Schooling Experience and Earnings*. New York, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Columbia University Press.

Model, Suzanne. 2008. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?* New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for Naitonal Action*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor (Office of Policy and Planning Research).

Ngai, Mae M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Oaxaca, Ronald L. 1973. "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets." *International Economic Review* 14:693-709.

Ogbu, John and H.D. Simons. 1998. "Voluntary and Involuntary Minorities: A Cultural-Ecological Theory of School Performance with Some Implications for Education." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 29:155-188.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York, New York: Rutledge.

Papademetriou, Demetrios G. and Nicholas DiMario. 1986. *Undocumented Aliens in the New York Metropolitan Area: An Exploration into their Social and Labor Market Incorporation*. New York, New York: Center for Migration Studies of New York.

Pierre, Jemima. 2004. "Black Immigrants in the United States and the "Cultural Narratives" of Ethnicity." *Identities* 11:141-170.

Prashad, Vijay. 2000. *The Karma of Brown Folk*.

Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74-96.

Raphael, Lennox. 1964. "West Indians and Afro-Americans." *Freedomways* 4:438-445.

Rogers, Reuel. 2006. *Afro-Caribbean Immigrants and the Politics of Incorporation: Ethnicity, Exception or Exit*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Sowell, Thomas. 1975. *Race and Economics*. New York: David McKay Publishers.

—. 1978. "Three Black Histories." Pp. 7-64 in *Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups*, edited by T. Sowell. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

—. 1981. "The Blacks." Pp. 183-224 in *Ethnic America: A History*. New York, New York: Basic Books.

—. 1983. *The Economics and Politics of Race*. New York, New York: William Morrow and Co.

—. 1984. "The Special Case of Blacks." Pp. 73-90 in *Civil Rights: Rhetoric or Reality?* New York, New York: William Morrow and Company.

Thernstrom, Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom. 1997. *America In Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible*. New York, New York: Simon & Schuster.
Treiman, Donald J. 1977. *Occupational Prestige in Comparitive Perspective*. New York, New York: Academic Press.

Tuan, Mia. 1998. *Forever Foreigners or Honorary Whites? The Asian Ethnic Experience Today*. New Brunswick, New Jersey and London: Rutgers University Press.

Vickerman, Milton. 1998. *Crosscurrents: West Indian Immigrants and Race*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Waters, Mary C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Warren, Robert and Jennifer M. Peck. 1980. "Foriegn-Born Emigration from the United States: 1960-1970." *Demography* 17:71-84.

Winston, James. 2002. "Explaining Afro-Caribbean Social Mobility in the United States: Beyond the Sowell Thesis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*:218-262.

Woodbury, Stephen A. 1993. "Culture, Human Capital and the Earnings of West Indian Blacks." *Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper* 93-20:1-19.

Table 1. **Oneway ANOVA of Socioeconomic Status and Political Participation by Race, Ethnicity and Nativity.**
Unweighted

	WHITES	U.S. BORN	WEST INDIANS			Eta[+]
			All	*U.S. Born*	*Foreign*	
Log Hourly Wages	-	-	-	-	-	
Poverty Index	3.55 [a,d] *(2.79)*	2.47 [f,g] *(2.29)*	3.17 [b,e] *(2.65)*	3.44 *(2.71)*	3.07 *(2.63)*	.176 ***
Occupational Status	5.33 [a,d] *(2.40)*	4.33 [f,g] *(2.35)*	4.99 [b,e] *(2.26)*	5.51 [h] *(2.27)*	4.81 *(2.24)*	.180 ***
Labor Force Participation	.671 [d] *(.470)*	.651 [f,g] *(.477)*	.742 [b,e] *(.438)*	.724 *(.448)*	.748 *(.434)*	.082 ***
Unemployed	.043 [a,c,d] *(.204)*	.105 *(.306)*	.092 [b] *(.289)*	.097 *(.296)*	.090 *(.286)*	.074 ***
Neighborhood Black Clubs	.346 [c,d] *(.476)*	.296 [f,g] *(.457)*	.226 [b,e] *(.418)*	.208 *(.407)*	.234 *(.424)*	.090 ***
Civil Rights Organization	.047 [a,c] *(.212)*	.116 [g] *(.320)*	.072 [b] *(.259)*	.123 [h] *(.329)*	.054 *(.226)*	.107 ***

a = Significant difference between Whites and U.S. Born Blacks, (<.10).
b = Significant difference between Whites and all West Indians, (<.10).
c = Significant difference between Whites and U.S. Born West Indians, (<.10).
d = Significant difference between Whites and Foreign-Born West Indians, (<.10).
e = Significant difference between U.S. Born Blacks and all West Indians, (<.10).
f = Significant difference between U.S. Born Blacks and U.S. Born West Indians, (<.10).
g = Significant difference between U.S. Born Blacks and Foreign-Born West Indians, (<.10).
h = Significant difference between U.S. Born West Indians and Foreign-Born West Indians, (<.10).
[+] = The eta is only for four of the five groups shown. It does not include the "All West Indian" group.
*** = Eta is significant (<.001).

Table 2. **Threefold Multivariariate Decompositions of Group Differences in the Poverty-to-Needs Index by Black Nativity.**
Unweighted

	Coeff.	*SE*	*z*	*p-value*	*Confidence Interval*	
Poverty Index						
Afro-Caribbeans	3.18	.071	44.67	.000	3.04	3.31
African Americans	2.46	.039	63.48	.000	2.38	2.54
Difference	.72	.081	8.84	.000	.56	.87
Endowment Effect						
Education	.349	.034	10.25	.000	.282	.415
Black Solidarity	.002	.009	.24	.812	-.015	.019
Total	.351	.035	10.00	.000	.282	.419
Coefficent Effect						
Education	.155	.159	.98	.328	-.156	.466
Black Solidarity	.851	.445	1.91	.056	-.022	1.724
Intercept	-.632	.477	-1.32	.186	-1.567	.304
Total	.375	.079	4.76	.000	.220	.529
Interaction						
Education	.025	.026	.97	.330	-.026	.076
Black Solidarity	-.035	.019	-1.86	.063	-.072	.002
Total	-.010	.032	-.31	.757	-.072	.052

Table X. Main Variables by Theoretical Explination

Abreviated Variable Name	**QUESTION WORDING**	**RESPONSE OPTIONS**
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION		
Occupation Prestiege (occ28mog)	Based on US Census Catagories	1 to 10
	D4. What is your current occupation? (What sort of work do you do?) (IF NOT CLEAR: Tell me a little more about what you do.)	_____
	D5. What do they make or do at the place you work (or what kind of place is it?)	_____
	D23. (Follow up to "ever worked"). What was your main occupation (What sort of work did you do?) (IF NOT CLEAR: Tell me a little more about what you did.)	_____
	D24. (Follow up to "ever worked"). What did they make you do at the place you worked (or what kind of place is it)?	_____
Annual Household income (hhinc)	H45/H46. Now thinking about your (and your family's) total family income from all sources, how much did you (and all the members of your family living here) receive in the year 2000 (2001 IF INTERVIEWED IN 2002) before taxes?	_____ Dollar amount (H45) Select from boxes (H46)
Annual Personal Income	H43/H44. Top get a picture of people's financial situation we need to know the general range of income of all people we interview. Now thinking about your own prsonal income, what wasa your total income from all sources (including your job) in the year 2000 (2001 IF INTERVIEWED IN 2002) before taxes?	_____ Dollar amount (H43) Select from boxes (H44)
Hourly Wages	REQUESTING.	
Labor Force Participation	wkstat3c. Work status in three catagories.	1 - Employed 2 - Unemployed 3 - Not in labor force
	D6. About how many hours do you work on your job in an average week?	_____ Hours (1-97)
	D21. Have you ever done any work for	1 - Yes 5 - No
Income-to-Needs Ratio (povindex)	A contructd variable relating household income to number of people in the house.	0 = Below poverty 1 = Poverty 2 to 17 = Various degrees above poverty
Neighborhood help groups (a5)	Are there any groups in this neighborhood such as block clubs, community associations, social clubs, helping groups and so forth?	1 - Yes 5 - No GO TO A6 9 - Don't know GO TO A6
Involved w/ block clubs (a5a)	Are you involved in any of these groups?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Member of black organizations (h38)	Do you belong to any national groups or organizations working to improve the conditions of black people in America?	1 - Yes 5 - No

SOCIOCULTURAL PATHOLOGY AND CONTEXT

Educational Attainment	How many years of school did you finish?	Ranged from 4 or less to 17 or more.
Foreign Education (h30)	Where did you receive most of your education, in the United States, or outside the United States?	1 - In the United States 2 - Outside the United States
Experience	Age - years of education - 6	
Your age at first birth (e24)	How old were you when your first child was born?	Age at age of first birth.
Satisfaction if child had same job (d10)	How would you feel if a (son/daughter SAME SEX as R) of yours had your job as a regular, permanent job? Would you say	1 – Very satisfied 2 – Somewhat satisfied 3 – Somewhat dissatisfied 4 – Very dissatisfied
Job satisfaction (d9)	All in all, how satisfied are you with your job? Would you say…?	1 - Very satisfied 2 - Somewhat satisfied 3 - Somewhat dissatisfied 4 - Dissatisfied
Frequency family helps you out (e1)	How often do people in your family - including children, grandparents, aunts, uncles, in-laws and so on -- help you out? Would you say very often, fairly often, not too often, or never?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Never 6 – (IF VOL:) Never needed help 7 – (IF VOL:) I have no family GO TO E8
Frequency you help family out (e2)	How often do you help out people in your family - including children, gradparents, aunts, uncles, in-laws and so on? Would you say very often, fairly often, or never?	1 - Nearly everyday (4 or more Xs a week) 2 - At least once a week (1 to 3 times) 3 - A few times a month (2 to 3 times) 4 - At least once a month 5 - A few times a year 6 - Hardly ever 7 – Never
Frequency of contact w/ fam out home (e3)	How often do you see, write or talk on the phone with family or relatives who do not live with you? Would you say nearly everyday, at least once a week, a few times a month, at least once a month, a few times a year, hardly ever or never?	1 - Nearly everyday (4 or more Xs a week) 2 - At least once a week (1 to 3 times) 3 - A few times a month (2 to 3 times) 4 - At least once a month 5 - A few times a year 6 - Hardly ever 7 – Never
Number of family can help you (e4)	How many people in your family would help you out if you needed help [PROBE: Can you give me a number?]	NUMBER (0-97)
How close to family members (e4a)	How close do you feel towards your family members? Would you say very close, fairly close, not too close or not close at all?	1 - Very close 2 - Fairly close 3 - Not too close 4 - Not close at all
Family is close-knit (e5)	Would you say your family members are very close in their feelings toward each other, fairly close, not close, or not close at all?	1 - Very close 2 - Fairly close 3 - Not too close 4 - Not close at all
Family loves and cares (e6a)	Other than your (spouse/partner), how often do your family members… make you feel loved and cared for? Would you say very often, fairly often, not too often, or never?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Never

Family listens and talks a/ problems (e6b)	Other than your (spouse/partner), how often do your family members… listen to you talk about your private problems and concerns?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Never
Family express interest a/ concern (e6b)	Other than your (spouse/partner), how often do your family members… express interest and concern in your well-being?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Never
Family makes too many demands (e7a)	Other than your (spouse/partner), how often do your family members… make too many demands on you?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Never
Family criticizes you (e7b)	Other than your (spouse/partner), how often do your family members… criticize you and the things you do?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Never
Perception of crime in neighborhood (a3)	How often are there problems with muggings, burglaries, assaults or anything else like that in your neighborhood? Would you say these things happen very often in your neighborhood, failrly often, not too often. hardlv ever or never?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Hardly ever 5 - Never
Perception of drugs in neighborhood (a4)	How much of a problem is the selling and use of drugs in your neighborhood? Would you say it is a very serious problem, fairly serious, not too serious, or not serious at all?	1 - Very serious 2 - Fairly serious 3 - Not too serious 4 - Not serious at all
Family member or you crime victim (c27f)	Next, I am going to read you a list of things that may have happened to you during the past month or so. Over the past month or so, have you… have you or your family been the victim of a crime?	1 - Yes 5 - No 9 - Don't know
Marital Status (mar3cat)	(This item is composed of a series of questions regarding the respondent's marital status)	1 - Married/cohabiting 2 - Divorced/seperated/widowed 3 - Never married
You or family traced roots (j4)	Have you or anyone in your family ever tried to trace your family roots?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Mother work for pay (h11)	Did (your mother/woman who raised you) ever work for pay while you were growing up?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Father work for pay (h7a)	Did (your father/man who raised you) ever work for pay while you were growing up?	1 - Yes 5 - No
What woman raised you (h6)	Up to age 16 what woman raised you?	1 - Biological mother 2 - Step mother 3 - Grand mother 4 - Aunt 5 - Other 6 - No woman raised me
What man raised you (h5)	Up to age 16 what man raised you?	1 - Biological father 2 - Step father 3 - Grand father 4 - Uncle 5 - Other

		6 - No man raised me
Neighborhood social cohesion (a2)	How often do you get together with any of your neighbors, that is, either visiting at each other's home or going places together? Would you say nearly very day, at least once a week, a few times a month, at least once a month, a few times a year or never.	1 - Nearly everyday -- 4 or more times a wk 2 - At least once a week -- 1 to 3 times 3 - A few times a month -- 2 to 3 times 4 - At least once a month 5 - A few times a year 6 - Never
Not looking for job (d40)	A lot of people would like to work but have lost hope that they can find a decent job. Do you feel that way?	1 - Yes 5 - No
English speaking proficiency (h29c)	How well do you feel that you speak English? Would you say not at all, a little, somewhat, well, very well?	1 - Not at all 2 - A little 3 - Somewhat 4 - Well 5 - very well
Spoke non-English growing up (h4)	Did you speak a language other than English at home when you were growing up?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Looking for work (d37)	Are you looking for work at the present time?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Take a job (d38)	Would you take a job if you were offered one?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Worried not finding job (d39)	How worried are you about not being able to find a job in the near future? Would you say…?	1 - A lot 2 - Somewhat 3 - Not at all
Lost hope about finding job (d40)	A lot of people would like to work but have lost hope that they can find a decent job. Do you feel that way?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Received public assistance (h49)	Have you ever received public assistance or welfare since turning age 18? By public assistance or welfare we mean Aid to Families with Dependent Children or General Assistance or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.	1 – Yes 5 – No GO TO H50
Years on public assistance (h49a)	In how many years total have you received public assistance since you turned 18?	_____ NUMBER OF YEARS
Currently on public assistance (h49b)	Are you (your family) currently receiving public assistance?	1 – Yes GO TO H50 5 – No
Last year on public assistance (h49c)	What was the last year in which you (your family) received public assistance?	YEAR
Subjective financial well-being index	H39. Do you think you are better off financially, about the same, or worse off now than you were 10 years ago?	1 - Better 2 - Same 3 - Worse
	H40. How difficult is it for (you/your family) to meet the monthly payments on your (family's) bills? Would you say extremely difficult, very difficult, somewhat difficult, slightly difficult or not difficult at all?	1 - Extremely difficult 2 - Very difficult 3 - Somewhat difficult 4 - Slightly difficult 5 - Not difficult at all
	H41. In the past 12 months, in your household was there enough to eat,	1 - Enough to eat 2 - Sometimes not enough

	sometimes not enough to eat, or often not enough to eat?	3 - Often not enough to eat
	H42. How much do you worry that your total (family) income will not be enough to meet your (family's) expenses and bills? Would you say you worry a great deal, a lot, a little, or not at all?	1 - A great deal 2 - A lot 3 - A little 4 - Not at all
Participation in wellfare state index	H42_5a. In the past year, have you or any member of your family living here received any income from the following sources… social security?	1 - Yes 5 - No
	H42_5b. Workers compensation.	
	H42_5c. Unemployment compensation.	
	H42_5d. Food stamps.	
	H42_5e. Supplemental security income.	
	H42_5f. Earned income tax credit.	
	H42_5g. Child support payments.	

IMMIGRATION SELECTIVITY BIAS

Years in the United States

Reason for Coming to the US (h29a)	Why did you come to the United States?	1 - Work 2 - To be with Family 3 - Education 4 - Political Oppression 7 – Other (SPECIFY)
Age at Immigration (ageimmg5)	How old were you when you came to live in the United States?	0 - US Born 1 - Less than 12 years 2 - 13 to 17 years 3 - 18 to 34 years 4 - 36 or more years
	H29. How old were you when you came to live in the United States?	_____
Country in which you were born (h2)	Where were you born? (In what country)?	1 – In U.S.A. GO TO H2a 2 - Outside U.S.A. GO TO H2b
Where lived when growing up (h3)	And where did you mostly live while you were growing up? (IF R MENTIONS MORE THAN ONE PLACE, PROBE FOR PLACE LIVED MOST BETWEEN AGES 6-16).	1 – In U.S.A. GO TO H3a 2 - Outside U.S.A. GO TO H3b
Type of visa when first came to US (h34)	When you first came to this country, what kind of visa did you have?	1 – Permanent or Green Card 2 – Visitors 3 – Student 4 – Work/Working 7 – Other (SPECIFY)
Region of country (region)	Constructed in the dataset.	1 - Northeast 2 - Midwest 3 - South 4 - West

RACE, RACISM AND WHITE ESTEEM

Afro-Carib better job than white (d11b)	… In the place where you work, do people from the Caribbean area get better, worse, or the same jobs that white people get?	1 - Better 2 - Worse 3 - Same

Afro-Carib better job than blacks (d11bcb)	… In the place where you work, do people from the Caribbean area get better, worse, or the same jobs that Black Americans get?	1 - Better 2 - Worse 3 – Same
Personal/ fam racial discrimination (c27i)	Next, I am going to read you a list of things that may have happened to you during the past month or so. Over the past month or so, have you… have you or your family been treated badly because of your race?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Everyday discrimination (g18a-g18j)	Standard Index	
Major life discrimination (g12a-g12i)	Standard index	
Response to discrimiantion (g21a-g21g)	How did you respond to this/these experiences(s) Please tell me if you did each of the following things… Tried to do something about it. Accepted it as a fact of life. Worked harder to prove them wrong. Realized that you brought it on yourself. Talked to someone about how you were feeling. Expressed anger or got mad. Prayed about the situation.	1 - Yes 5 - No
Black stereotypes index (g5)	Many different words have been used to describe (Black people/Black Americans) in general. Some of these words describe good points and some of these words describe bad points. How true do you think each of these words is in describing most (black people/Black Americans)? How true do you think it is, that most (Black people/Black Americans) are intelligent? … are lazy? … are hard working? … give up easily? … are proud of themselves? … are violent?	1 - Very true 2 - Somewhat true 3 - A little true 4 - Not true at all
Black immigrant stereotypes index (g5_cb)	Now about people from the Caribbean area, how true do you think each of these words is in describing most people from the Caribbean area? How true do you think it is that most people from the Caribean are intelligent? … are lazy? … are hard working? … give up easily? … are proud of themselves? … are violent?	1 - Very true 2 - Somewhat true 3 - A little true 4 - Not true at all
Racial composition of neighborhood (US Census)	From U.S. Census Track.	

Ethnic composition of neighborhood (US Census)	From U.S. Census Track.	
Race of employer	D14. Is your work supervisor a black male, white male, black female or white female?	1 - Black male 2 - White male 3 - Black female 4 - White female 5 - No supervisor 7 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
	D15. Is there any group of people that you work with on the job - people who do the same kind of work you do and who are under the same supervisor?	1 - Yes 5 - No
	D16. Is your work group all black, mostly black, about half black, mostly white, all white except you or what?	1 - All black 2 - Mostly black 3 - About half black 4 - Mostly white 5 - All white except you 6 - None of the above 7 - Other (SPECIFY) _____
Ethnic makeup of workgroup (d16_cb)	Are the black people in your work group mostly from the Caribbean area, about half from the Caribbean area, or mostly all black Americans?	1 - Mostly Caribbean 2 - Half Caribbean 3 - Mostly black Americans
Black job (d12)	Is your job one that black people tend to get more than whites?	1 - Yes 5 - No
Whites keep blacks down (g6a_cb/g6) * different wording for whites (g6a_wh)	On the whole, do you think most white people want to see black Americans get a better break, or do they want to keep black Americans down or don't they care one way or the other?	1 - Black Americans get a better break 2 - Keep Black Americans down 3 - Whites don't care one way or the other
Whites skin tone discrimination (g10a)	How often would you say that whites treat you badly because of the shade of your skin color? Would you say…?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Hardly ever 5 - Never
Blacks skin tone discrimination (g10b)	… that blacks treat you badly because of the shade of your skin color?	1 - Very often 2 - Fairly often 3 - Not too often 4 - Hardly ever 5 - Never
Linked fate (g11)	Do you think what happens generally to black people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?	1 - Yes 5 - No 9 - Don't know
Linked fate, degree (g11a)	Will it affect you a lot, some, or not very much?	1 - A lot 2 - Some 3 - Not very much
Closeness to population groups (g3a-g3g)	Now I am going to ask you some questions about how close you feel in your ideas and feelings about things to different groups of people. For each one, please tell me if you feel very close, fairly close, not too close, or not close at all…. How close do you fel in your ideas and felings about things to black people in this country? … to white people in this country?	1 - Very close 2 - Fairly close 3 - Not to close 4 - Not close at all

	… to Spanish speaking groups like Puerto Ricans, Cubans or Mexicans? … How about American Indians? … How about Asian Americans like Chinese and Japanese in this country? … How about people from the Caribbean, like Jamacians, Berundians or Hatians? … How about black people in Africa?	
Black solidary index (g4a-g4h)	Now I'm going to read you a list of different kinds of black people. For each one, tell me how close you fel to them in your ideas and feelings. How close do you feel in your ideas and feelings about things to black people who are poor? (Do you feel very close, fairly close, not too close, or not close at all?) … Religious church-going black people? … Young black people? … Upper class black people? … Working class black people? … Older black people? … Black elected officials? … Black doctors, lawyers and other black professional people?	1 - Very close 2 - Fairly close 3 - Not to close 4 - Not close at all
Closeness to r ethnic group (h23)	How close do you fel in your ideas and feelings about things to people of 9GROUP NAMED IN H20 OR H22) descent? Would you say very close, fairly close, not too close or not close at all?	1 - Very close 2 - Fairly close 3 - Not to close 4 - Not close at all

Caribbeans treated unfairly at job (d31cb/d13cb)

Blacks treated unfairly at your job (d31/d13)

Amount race problems upset you (c28i)

Explinations for racial inequality