Published in final edited form as:

Ethn Health. 2019 July ; 24(5): 463–483. doi:10.1080/13557858.2017.1346785.

Prevalence and Correlates of Everyday Discrimination among Black Caribbeans in the United States: The Impact of Nativity and Country of Origin

Robert Joseph Taylor,

School of Social Work and Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

Ivy Forsythe-Brown,

Department of Behavioral Sciences, University of Michigan, Dearborn

Dawne M. Mouzon,

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research, Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey

Verna M. Keith,

Department of Sociology, Race and Ethnic Studies Institute, Texas A & M University

David H. Chae, and

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Auburn University

Linda M. Chatters

School of Social Work, School of Public Health and Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

Abstract

Objectives—Black Caribbeans in the United States have been the victims of major discrimination (e.g., unfairly fired, denied a promotion, denied housing). What is not known is the degree to which they also experience more routine forms of everyday discrimination such as receiving poor restaurant service, being perceived as dishonest, and being followed in stores. This paper investigates the distribution and correlates of everyday discrimination among a national sample of black Caribbeans in the U.S.

Design—This analysis used the black Caribbean sub-sample (n=1,621) of the National Survey of American Life. Demographic and immigration status correlates of ten items from the Everyday Discrimination Scale were investigated: being treated with less courtesy, treated with less respect, receiving poor restaurant service, being perceived as not smart, being perceived as dishonest, being perceived as not as good as others, and being feared, insulted, harassed, or followed in stores.

Results—Roughly one out of ten black Caribbeans reported that, on a weekly basis, they were treated with less courtesy and other people acted as if they were better than them, were afraid of them, and as if they were not as smart. Everyday discrimination was more frequent for black Caribbeans who were male, never married, divorced/separated, earned higher incomes, and who were second or third generation immigrants. Black Caribbeans attributed the majority of the discrimination they experienced to their race.

Conclusion—To our knowledge, this is the first study to provide an in-depth investigation of everyday discrimination among the black Caribbean population. It provides the frequency, types and correlates of everyday discrimination reported by black Caribbeans in the United States. Understanding the frequency and types of discrimination is important because of the documented negative impacts of everyday discrimination on physical and mental health.

Keywords

Discrimination; Afro-Caribbean; Racism; Racial Discrimination; Microaggression; Immigration

Immigrants and minority groups continue to face high levels of major discrimination in the United States, including discrimination in the workforce (e.g., being unfairly fired, denied a promotion) (Bashi 2017; Vickerman 2001; Rogers 2001; Waters 2001). What is not known is the degree to which they are also the victims of more routine forms of everyday discrimination, which is defined as consistent but less overt forms of intolerance. Examples of everyday discrimination include receiving poor restaurant service, being perceived as unintelligent, being perceived as dishonest, and being followed and monitored in stores.

In the last 10 years, perceived everyday discrimination has received a considerable amount of attention in the mental and physical health literature. For instance, among African Americans, perceived discrimination has a strong and negative impact on a variety of indicators of physical and mental health including mortality (Barnes et al. 2008), elevated blood pressure (Lewis et al. 2009), early stages of atherosclerosis (Lewis et al. 2006), anxiety disorders (Levine et al. 2014), and obesity (Hunte 2011; Hunte and Williams 2009). Scholars suggest that discrimination should be considered more seriously given its high prevalence and wide distribution among persons of disadvantaged social status and because of its strong association with a wide variety of mental and physical health outcomes (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999). Only recently, however, have studies begun to examine the distribution and correlates of discrimination among immigrant minorities. Our study investigates the prevalence and demographic correlates of everyday discrimination among black Caribbeans in the United States.

Black Caribbeans are likely to experience substantial everyday discrimination given their phenotypical resemblance to African Americans. Recent research among black Caribbeans confirms the negative impact of everyday discrimination on their physical and mental health (Clark et al. 2015; Levine et al. 2014), as well as its role in reducing mental health service utilization (Woodward 2011; Woodward et al. 2010). What has yet to be fully investigated are the social and demographic correlates of everyday discrimination, as well as subgroup differences in experiences of discrimination. Studies confirming subgroup or ethnic differences in everyday discrimination among immigrant groups (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008) suggest there may be ethnic group and country of origin (e.g., Jamaica, Dominican Republic, Trinidad, Haiti) differences in discrimination among black Caribbeans. Moreover, given their immigrant status and migration from countries with predominately black populations, black Caribbeans may have had limited exposure to and experience with coping with race-based discrimination prior to migrating to the U.S. (Vickerman 2001a;

Vickerman 2001b). This paper examines the correlates of everyday discrimination among foreign-born and U.S.-born black Caribbeans in the United States.

Everyday Discrimination among Immigrant Minority Populations

Perceived everyday discrimination has a substantial influence on the mental and physical health of immigrant populations. Carlisle and Stone (2015) found that for immigrant groups, negative health outcomes were associated with everyday discrimination and length of residency in the United States. In particular, Latino and Asian immigrants were more likely to have chronic health conditions with longer residency in this country. Although black Caribbean immigrants in the study reported higher levels of everyday discrimination than Latino and Asian immigrants, it was not strongly associated with negative health suggesting that some other factor, such as positive ethnic identification, may be acting as a buffer (Carlisle 2015; Carlisle and Stone 2015).

Research on the prevalence and correlates of everyday discrimination among Latino immigrants indicates that being male, younger, unmarried, more educated, and earning higher incomes increases the likelihood of reporting experiences of everyday discrimination (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008). Latino immigrants who are more educated and earning higher incomes may have greater exposure to whites and, thus, more frequent discriminatory encounters. Second generation immigrants and those who migrated as children (1.5 generation) were also more likely to report everyday discrimination (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008), however, these differences were not maintained in the multivariate models.

Ethnicity and ethnic identity may potentially be an important factor in reporting everyday discrimination. In terms of ethnicity, among Latino immigrants, Mexicans were more likely to report that they were discriminated against than Cubans (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008). Immigrants with strong ethnic identities also appear less likely to experience everyday discrimination, which suggests that ethnic identity may act as a buffer against discrimination (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008; Carlisle and Stone 2015; Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Hughes et al. 2015). Taken together, these findings suggest the need for deeper investigations of ethnicity or country of origin differences in experiencing everyday discrimination (Carlisle 2015). This study addresses this issue by examining the correlates of everyday discrimination among black Caribbeans by ethnic group.

Everyday Discrimination among Black Caribbeans

In contrast to American society, Caribbean blacks come from home countries characterized by unique histories (colonial, post-colonial and independence eras), cultures and social structures in which race plays a significant, but decidedly different and more nuanced role in the social order (Foner 2005; Vickerman 2001a; Vickerman 2001b). This is evident in several key ways. Originating from societies in which blacks are typically the majority racial group, Caribbean blacks are socialized to view African descent as normal and customary. In the post-colonial Caribbean, whites may occupy high positions within these societies. However, blacks are located at all levels of the social and occupational hierarchy (Vickerman 1998). In the Caribbean context, race itself is defined along a continuum that includes other

factors such as education, wealth, occupation, and family standing, all of which assume more prominent roles in defining social status (Maynard-Reid 2000; Vickerman 2001b). Therefore, African ancestry is often a less central and defining issue in determining one's social status. In contrast, race is a salient and all-defining "master status" in the U.S. racial hierarchy and represents a major departure from the alternative systems of power and privilege found in the Caribbean region (Foner 2005). Thus, the U.S. context situates black Caribbeans in a social system in which their racial background is both their most salient characteristic and one that embodies an especially devalued and stigmatized social status. Consequently, black Caribbeans have been historically treated in a manner largely indistinguishable from their African American counterparts, including being the targets of discrimination in employment, housing, education, and health care (Sutton and Chaney 1987; Vickerman 1998).

The ethnic identities of black Caribbeans are often linked to their aspirations and characteristics (e.g. hard working) of upward social mobility (Model 2011; Vickerman 2001a). Black Caribbeans' penchant for maintaining cultural/ethnic traits that distinguish and distance them from stereotypes directed toward African Americans (Vickerman 2001a; Waters 2001) has been linked to two notions. First, American whites prefer black Caribbeans over native-born African Americans, particularly in employment (Model 2011; Waters 2001). Second, many first-generation black Caribbean immigrants deemphasize race and perceive native-born African Americans as not maximizing opportunities that they believe are available in the U.S. despite being black (Vickerman 2001a). Among black Caribbeans, socioeconomic status is related to the ability to maintain a strong ethnic identity. For example, middle class black Caribbeans have greater access to resources that can reinforce or enhance their identity (e.g., cultural events, transnational visits, education) than do their less advantaged counterparts (Butterfield 2004a). Ethnic identity among second generation black Caribbeans is related to their family's social class background, with middle class second generation youth being more apt to adopt an ethnic identity (Waters 2001). Moreover research indicates that second and later generation immigrants have more fluid identities that are simultaneously ethnic and American depending upon the situation or social context (Naber 2012; Butterfield 2004b).

Research on the immigration experiences of black Caribbeans clearly documents encounters with racism and discrimination as a central theme of life in the U.S. However, this research is largely based on ethnographic studies involving small and geographically situated communities. To complement this work, several recent quantitative studies explore experiences of discrimination among black Caribbean adolescents using nationally representative data. Seaton, Caldwell, Sellers and Jackson (2008) found high levels of perceived discrimination among adolescents; roughly 87 per cent of African American youth and 90 per cent of black Caribbean youth report at least one incident of discrimination in the past year. Moreover, male adolescents consistently report more discrimination than do female adolescents; similarly, older adolescents report more incidents of discrimination than younger adolescents (Seaton et al. 2010a, 2008). Finally, regardless of ethnicity, gender, or age, roughly four in ten black youth attribute discrimination to their race/ethnic background (Seaton et al. 2010b).

To our knowledge, these are the only studies of the social and demographic correlates of everyday discrimination using representative samples of the black Caribbean population. Given the mental and physical health impact of discrimination, further explorations of the social and demographic correlates of discrimination within the adult (18 years and older) black Caribbean population are needed.

Focus of the Present Investigation

This study examines the prevalence and distribution of everyday discrimination among Caribbean blacks in the United States. In particular, we investigate nativity (i.e., foreign-born or U.S. born), country of origin, and demographic correlates of: 1) specific forms of everyday discrimination (e.g., insulted, harassed, and followed in stores) and 2) summary measures of everyday discrimination and discrimination based on race. Given the general paucity of prior work in this area, we propose tentative hypotheses regarding these relationships. Consistent with prior findings for demographic factors (i.e., age, gender, family income, education, and marital status), we expect that younger, male, and higher income and education respondents will report higher levels of specific and summary measures of everyday discrimination and attributions that discrimination is based on race (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999); no predictions are made for marital status.

Similarly, prior work on immigration status (generation in U.S.) and length of residency suggests that second and later generation immigrants and immigrants with longer tenures in the U.S. will report greater levels of experienced discrimination than their foreign-born and recent arrival counterparts. That is, respondents who were born in the U.S. will report higher levels of summary and specific measures of everyday discrimination, as well as attributions that discrimination is based on race (Vickerman 2001b; Waters 2001), as compared to persons who were born in a Caribbean country and migrated to the U.S. Country of origin differences are expected such that persons from Anglophone Caribbean countries (e.g., Jamaica, Barbados) will be advantaged with respect to a shared language within the U.S. and report lower levels of everyday discrimination. In contrast, for respondents from countries in which the primary language is French (Haitian Creole) or Spanish, the lack of a common language constitutes a barrier that will be reflected in reports of higher levels of specific and summary everyday discrimination and race-based attributions.

This study contributes to research in the area of immigration studies by providing information about experiences with discrimination among immigrant minorities in the United States. In addition, this study contributes to research on discrimination and health by documenting exposures to these occurrences. This study is based on the black Caribbean sub-sample of the National Survey of American Life.

METHODS

Sample

The National Survey of American Life: Coping with Stress in the 21st Century (NSAL) was collected by the Program for Research on Black Americans at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. The field work for the study was completed by the Institute for

Social Research's Survey Research Center, in cooperation with the Program for Research on Black Americans. The NSAL sample has a national multi-stage probability design which consists of 64 primary sampling units (PSUs). Fifty-six of these primary areas overlap substantially with existing Survey Research Center's National Sample primary areas.

The NSAL includes the first major probability sample of black Caribbeans. For the purposes of this study, black Caribbeans are defined as persons who trace their ethnic heritage to a Caribbean country, but who now reside in the United States, are racially classified as black, and who are English-speaking (but may also speak another language). In both the African American and black Caribbean samples, it was necessary for respondents to self-identify their race as black. Those self-identifying as black were included in the black Caribbean sample if they: a) answered affirmatively when asked if they were of West Indian or Caribbean descent, b) said they were from a country included on a list of Caribbean area countries presented by the interviewers, or c) indicated that their parents or grandparents were born in a Caribbean area country.

The data collection was conducted from February 2001 to June 2003; respondents were compensated for their time. A total of 6,082 face-to-face interviews were conducted with persons aged 18 or older, including 3,570 African Americans, 891 non-Hispanic whites, and 1,621 blacks of Caribbean descent. The overall response rate was 72.3 per cent. The response rate was 77.7 per cent for black Caribbeans. Final response rates for the NSAL two-phase sample designs were computed using the American Association of Public Opinion Research guidelines for Response Rate 3 samples (American Association for Public Opinion Research 2006) (see Jackson et al. 2004 for a more detailed discussion of the NSAL sample). The NSAL data collection was approved by the University of Michigan Institutional Review Board.

Measures

Dependent Variables—The measure of everyday discrimination (Williams et al. 1997) was designed to assess interpersonal forms of routine experiences of discrimination. A total of ten items were used to measure everyday discrimination: being treated with less courtesy, treated with less respect, received poor restaurant service, being perceived as not smart, being perceived as dishonest, or being perceived as not as good as others; and being feared, insulted, harassed, and followed in stores. Response values for each item were: 5 (almost every day), 4 (at least once a week), 3 (a few times a month), 2 (a few times a year), 1 (less than once a year), and 0 (never). In addition, these ten items were combined to create two summary scales. Four items (less courtesy, less respect, not smart, and as not as good as others) were combined into a scale we termed “subtle everyday discrimination” ($\alpha = .87$). The other six items were combined into a scale we termed “overt everyday discrimination” ($\alpha = .78$). Higher scores on both summary scales indicate higher levels of discrimination.

Respondents who reported any discrimination were asked to identify the primary reason for such experiences (e.g., race, ethnicity, age, gender). Based on this item, the two summary everyday discrimination scales were recoded to reflect: 1) perceived subtle discrimination that was attributed to race and 2) perceived overt discrimination that was attributed to race. In total, there are fourteen dependent variables in this analysis. This includes ten specific

indicators of everyday discrimination, the two summary variables of everyday discrimination, and the two summary race-related everyday discrimination variables.

Independent Variables—Sociodemographic factors (i.e., age, gender, family income, education, and marital status) are utilized as independent variables. Age and education are coded in years. Income is coded in dollars; missing data for family income were imputed. Marital status is coded into 4 categories: 1) married and cohabiting, 2) separated and divorced, 3) widowed, and 4) never married. Additionally, two demographic variables that are particularly relevant to the black Caribbean population in the United States—immigration status and country of origin—are included in this analysis. Immigration status has five categories corresponding to respondents who were: 1) third generation born in the United States with U.S.-born parents, 2) second generation born in the United States of at least one foreign born parent, 3) foreign-born, immigrated to the United States 0 to 5 years ago, 4) foreign-born, immigrated to the United States 6–10 years ago, and 5) foreign-born, immigrated to the United States more than ten years ago. Finally, respondents identified over 25 different countries of origin. Consistent with research on the Caribbean region, country of origin was categorized based upon historical and anthropological designations of the Caribbean as Anglophone (English speaking), Hispanophone (Spanish speaking), and Francophone (French Speaking) (see Zane 1999). Jamaica, Trinidad-Tobago, and other English-speaking countries (e.g., Barbados) represent the Anglophone countries; Spanish-speaking countries include Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic and Cuba; and Haiti is the Francophone country. The resulting variable, country of origin, was recoded into five categories: Jamaica, Trinidad-Tobago, Other English-speaking country (e.g., Barbados), Spanish-speaking country (e.g., Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic), and Haiti. The demographic description of the sample is presented in Table 1.

Analysis Strategy—Analyses for the distribution of basic demographic characteristics and linear regression analyses were conducted using SAS. The analyses were conducted using SAS 9.13, which uses the Taylor expansion approximation technique for calculating the complex design-based estimates of variance. To obtain results that are generalizable to the black Caribbean population, all of the analyses utilize analytic weights. For linear regression analyses, beta estimates and standard errors are presented with statistical significance determined using the design-corrected F statistic. Standard error estimates are corrected for unequal probabilities of selection, nonresponse, post-stratification, and the sample's complex design (i.e., clustering and stratification).

RESULTS

Table 2 presents frequencies for various forms of everyday discrimination reported by black Caribbeans. Most respondents indicated that they had experienced some form of discrimination, with three out of four indicating that they had been treated with less courtesy, with less respect, people acted as if they were not as smart as others, and people acted as if they were better than them. Roughly ten percent of respondents reported that these incidents of discrimination occurred *at least once a week*. Although not as frequent, many black Caribbeans indicated that they had the experience of being followed around in stores (63 per

cent), receiving poor service in stores and restaurants (70 per cent), being called names (50 per cent), or being threatened or harassed (47 per cent).

Table 3 presents the regression analysis for individual types of everyday discrimination. Age was negatively associated with being followed in stores, receiving poor service, being considered dishonest, being called names/insulted, and being threatened or harassed, indicating that experiencing these types of discrimination were associated with younger age. Being male was significantly associated with the perception that others felt they were better than them, being treated as if they are not smart, being feared, receiving poor service, being perceived as dishonest, being called names/insulted, and being threatened or harassed.

In terms of socio-economic differences, income was positively associated with receiving poor service and being considered dishonest, while education was inversely associated with being perceived as not smart and the perception that others felt they were better than them. Marital status differences indicated that divorced/separated respondents experienced discrimination more frequently than their married/cohabitating counterparts. In particular, divorced and separated respondents were more likely to indicate that people thought that they were better than them, that they were not smart, people were afraid of them, were followed in stores, received poor service, and were considered dishonest. Never married respondents were also more likely than married/cohabiting respondents to experience discrimination in terms of perceiving that others thought they were better than them, being treated as not smart, being treated with less courtesy, being considered dishonest, and being called names/insulted.

Regression analyses revealed relatively few immigration status and country of origin differences. As compared to immigrants who had been in the United States ten or more years (comparison category), U.S.-born, third generation respondents were more likely to experience being treated as though others were better than them, as if they are not smart, treated with less respect, and being called names or insulted. Similarly, immigrants who have been in the United States less than five years reported that they were less likely to receive poor service and less likely to be threatened or harassed than immigrants who had been in the United States ten or more years.

Two different sets of regression analyses examine the impact of country of origin. In the first set of regression analysis, foreign-born respondents from Spanish Caribbean countries (e.g., Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic) are the excluded (or comparison) category. In this set of analyses, respondents from the Spanish Caribbean reported being treated as if others were better than them more frequently than did respondents from Trinidad-Tobago. Respondents from Jamaica and those from other English speaking countries experienced being threatened or harassed more frequently than respondents from the Spanish Caribbean; respondents from English speaking countries also reported being followed in stores more frequently than respondents from the Spanish Caribbean. The second set of regression analysis is presented in the bottom panel of Table 3. This analysis shows several significant differences between immigrants from Jamaica and those from Haiti. In each instance, Jamaicans reported experiencing more frequent everyday discrimination than Haitians. In particular, Jamaicans indicated experiencing that others acted as if they are better than them, being treated with

less courtesy, being considered dishonest, being followed in stores, and having others being afraid of them more frequently than Haitians.

Table 4 presents the regression analysis for the summed subtle (Model 1) and overt (Model 2) everyday discrimination. Gender, marital status, immigration status and country of origin were significantly associated with both subtle and overt discrimination. Black Caribbean men reported higher levels of subtle and overt discrimination than black Caribbean women. Divorced/separated and never married respondents experienced more frequent subtle and overt discrimination than their married/cohabiting counterparts. Third generation, U.S. born immigrants experienced both subtle and overt discrimination on a more frequent basis than first generation immigrants who had been in the United States for eleven or more years. Lastly, Haitians reported experiencing subtle and overt discrimination on a less frequent basis than Jamaicans.

Education was positively related to subtle discrimination (Model 1) but not overt discrimination (Model 2), whereas age and income were significantly related to overt discrimination. Income was positively associated with overt discrimination and age was negatively related to overt discrimination.

The results of the regression analysis of the summed race-based subtle (Model 3) and overt (Model 4) everyday discrimination are also presented in Table 4. Although there are fewer significant relationships in Models 3 and 4, the patterns of relationships are the same. Men and respondents with higher incomes reported experiencing more race-based subtle and overt discrimination than their female and lower income counterparts. Respondents from Trinidad-Tobago reported less frequent race-based subtle discrimination than Jamaicans. Older black Caribbeans reported less frequent race-based overt discrimination than their younger counterparts and divorced/separated respondents experienced more frequent race-based overt discrimination than their married/cohabiting counterparts. Lastly, third generation immigrants reported experiencing race-based overt discrimination on a more frequent basis than first generation immigrants who had been in the United States for eleven or more years.

Discussion

Black Caribbeans in our analysis reported experiencing a wide range of forms of everyday discrimination, which is consistent with findings from both quantitative research on adolescents (Seaton et al. 2008, 2010b, 2010a) and ethnographic research on adults (Bashi 2007; Vickerman 2001a, 2001b). Roughly one out of ten black Caribbeans reported that, on a weekly basis, they were treated with less courtesy and other people acted as if they were better than them, were afraid of them, and were not as smart. A small percentage of black Caribbeans also experienced more overt forms of discrimination on a relatively frequent basis, such as being called names, being insulted, or being followed in stores. The specific types of everyday discrimination experienced varied by demographic characteristics. Overall, our findings indicated that everyday discrimination was more frequent among black Caribbeans who were male, never married, divorced/separated, earning higher incomes, and were second or third generation immigrants. It is also important to note that, as seen in the

descriptive information in Table 1, black Caribbeans attributed the majority of the everyday discrimination they experienced to their race.

As in previous studies of everyday discrimination, overall there were more reports of subtle (e.g., perceived as dishonest, not as smart) than there were of more overt forms of discrimination (e.g., followed in stores, insulted, harassed) (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999; Taylor et al. 2016). Our definition of overt everyday discrimination focuses on issues of explicit behaviors that a perpetrator or agent enacts. In contrast, subtle forms of everyday discrimination often embody an element of ambiguity regarding the intentions and motivations on the part of the perpetrator. As a result, targets of everyday discrimination often have difficulty interpreting these actions and seeking redress. Both subtle and overt forms of everyday discrimination are conceptualized as reflecting less serious forms of discrimination, as compared to major discriminatory occurrences. Nonetheless, it should be clear that both subtle and overt everyday discrimination are impactful events that are distressingly commonplace and associated with increased anxiety and emotional and physical vigilance in social environments, as well as poorer physical and mental health (Mouzon, Taylor, Keith, et al. 2017; Mouzon, Taylor, Woodward, et al. 2017). Additionally, research suggests that specific groups of individuals (those with higher education and income) report higher levels of everyday discrimination overall, as well as the more instances of overt forms of everyday discrimination (young males). Ongoing research examines the ways that different patterns of everyday discrimination are associated with characteristics of the target individual (Keith et al. 2017).

Several country of origin differences in the prevalence of discrimination were observed. The majority of these findings reflected differences between immigrants from Haiti and those from Jamaica, while one difference emerged between Jamaicans and persons from Spanish Caribbean countries. We expected that persons from Haiti and Spanish Caribbean countries would experience higher levels of discrimination based on their race, as well as language differences. For example, prior research on Latino and Asian immigrants notes that individuals face discrimination due to their English language ability (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008). Other studies indicate that black Caribbeans (i.e., Haitians, Jamaicans, Trinidadians), have higher rates of perceived discrimination than Latinos (i.e., Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans) (Carlisle 2015). However, our findings indicate that among black Caribbeans, Haitians report experiencing less subtle and overt discrimination than their Jamaican counterparts. In particular, Haitians were less likely than Jamaicans to report being treated with less courtesy, being considered dishonest, being followed in stores, feeling that others are better than them, and that others were afraid of them.

Previous studies suggest that immigrants with higher incomes and more education are more likely to report experiences of everyday discrimination (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008). According to the U.S. Census (2005), Jamaican Americans have higher median family incomes (\$51,910) and educational attainment (e.g., 23.1 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher) than Haitian Americans (with median family income of \$41,589 and 18.1 percent with bachelor's degree or higher). Accordingly, differences in class position, which affects the frequency of interactions with whites and exposure to discriminatory situations, could potentially explain the differences in reported everyday discrimination between Jamaicans

and Haitians. In other words, because Haitians have lower levels of income and education than Jamaicans, they may have less interaction with whites and other groups, reducing the likelihood of experiencing discriminatory behaviors.

Our regression analyses revealed one significant country of origin relationship for a specific type of everyday discrimination. Jamaicans, as compared to persons from Spanish Caribbean countries, more often reported that they had experienced discrimination in the form of threats or harassment. This finding also was not expected. However, similar to Haitians, black Caribbeans from Spanish speaking countries also have lower levels of income and education than immigrants from Jamaica (U.S. Census Bureau 2005). Given this, they may have less frequent interactions with and exposure to discrimination with whites and other populations.

The several significant relationships between immigration status and everyday discrimination are both interesting and complex. Based upon the ethnographic literature (Butterfield 2004a), we expected that second and third generation black Caribbeans would experience higher rates of discrimination, and to some degree that was true. Third generation respondents (U.S.-born) were more likely than foreign-born immigrants who had been in the U.S. 10 years or more to report that other people consider themselves better than them, being called names and insulted, and being treated as if they were not smart, and being treated with less respect. Compared to immigrants residing in the U.S. for more than 11 years, third generation respondents reported more subtle and overt everyday discrimination, as well as higher summed race-based overt discrimination (coefficient for subtle discrimination bordered significance). Collectively, these findings are consistent with previous research (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008; Butterfield 2004a). Research on the social experiences of later generation black Caribbean immigrants emphasizes the importance of race, ethnicity, and immigrant generational status for racial identity development and perceptions and attitudes regarding discrimination (Waters, 2001). Third and later generation black Caribbeans, having both them and their parents been born and raised in the U.S. context, are distinctive from their first generation immigrant counterparts in their social experiences and are particularly attuned to experiences of racial prejudice (Waters 2001).

With respect to gender, black Caribbean men were significantly more likely to indicate that they experienced discrimination than women. Men reported that they experienced seven of the ten forms of discrimination more frequently than did women. However, women and men were no different in terms of reports of being followed in stores, treated with less courtesy, and treated with less respect. Men also are more likely than women to indicate that both the subtle and overt discrimination that they experienced was due to race. Studies of the immigration and resettlement process using a gendered perspective have noted the particular difficulties faced by Caribbean men (Butterfield 2004a; Foner 2005), including problems in the areas of under-employment and status inconsistency in relation to education and skill levels. Part of the difficulty that men encounter in the workforce may be reflected in these higher rates of reported everyday discrimination. Our findings of higher rates of perceived discrimination among black Caribbean men are also consistent with research on the general

population (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999) and Latinos (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008).

Several significant age differences emerged in which age was negatively associated with discrimination. Younger black Caribbeans were more likely to report being followed in stores, receiving poor service, being considered dishonest, being called names/insulted, and being threatened or harassed. Importantly, these occurrences represent the more overt and, in some cases, serious (i.e., threatened) forms of discrimination that could potentially lead to verbal or physical altercations, interventions involving authorities, or other problems. This age finding is consistent with previous research on the general population (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999) and Latinos (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008). Further, in our analysis, younger respondents were also more likely to attribute their experiences with everyday discrimination to their race.

Marital status was associated with the likelihood of experiencing everyday discrimination. Compared to married/cohabiting respondents, those who were never married experienced five forms of discrimination more frequently. Divorced/separated respondents experienced six of the ten forms of everyday discrimination more frequently. Additionally both never married and divorced/separated respondents were more likely to report that the subtle and overt discrimination that they experienced was due to race. There are two possible explanations for differences in everyday discrimination by marital status.

First, being married is recognized as a protective factor against many forms of stress (Musick and Bumpass 2012). Married couples have access to social support resources that are useful for managing the initial stages of the stress process (e.g., personal efficacy appraisals), as well as in providing cognitive, emotional and active behavioral strategies to cope with problematic situations (Musick and Bumpass 2012). Successful use of social support may mean that for persons who are married/cohabiting, negative events such as everyday discrimination have diminished impact and salience and, consequently, may not be accurately recalled in terms of incidence. Another potential, and more likely, explanation is that being married or partnered is associated with lower rates of exposure to discrimination as compared to other marital status groups. Differences in everyday discrimination exposure could result from differences in the types of social and recreational activities engaged in by married/partnered versus single adults. Related to this, single adults who are pursuing activities alone (shopping, travelling by public transportation) or in a peer group may be more likely to experience discriminatory experiences than would couples. This consistent pattern of protective effects of marriage for everyday discrimination, even with controls for other factors, is surprising and indicates that additional research is needed to better understand the relationship between marital status and everyday discrimination. Research questions should include whether and how marriage confers possible benefits due to differences in interpersonal resources and relations and/or involvement in social spaces and activities that are consequential for exposure to perceived discrimination (Pudrovska, Schieman, and Carr 2006).

Socio-economic differences in the prevalence of everyday discrimination indicated that income was positively associated with receiving poor service and being considered

dishonest, as well as for summed overt and summed race-based overt discrimination. Previous studies have also found that higher social status—that is, education for African Americans (Forman, Williams, and Jackson 1997; Gary 1995), and education and employment status for Latino immigrants (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008)—is associated with experiencing more discrimination. Our results are consistent with these studies in finding that income was positively associated with forms of everyday discrimination. Possible explanations for the relationship between higher social status and discrimination include greater sensitivity to discriminatory situations among those who are more assimilated (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008). Similar to research among middle class African Americans (Feagin and Sikes 1995; Cose 1994), higher status black Caribbeans may have greater exposure to members of the dominant group in employment or shopping with those who hold negative stereotypes.

As noted earlier, research generally finds that education is positively associated with everyday discrimination. For instance, Taylor et al.'s (2016) study of African American men found that education was positively associated with experiencing less courtesy, less respect, having individuals being afraid of you, being followed in stores, receiving poor service and being threatened or harassed. However, our findings indicated that persons with lower education levels were more likely to report that others felt that they were better than them and treated them as though they were not as smart—both subtle forms of discrimination. Further, those with lower education reported higher summed scores for subtle everyday discrimination but these differences were not attributable to race. These findings suggest that education differences in everyday discrimination focusing on personal characteristics (others act as though smarter, better than respondent) may be occurring within black Caribbeans' ethnic group. Our findings indicate that education differences in everyday discrimination are more nuanced than previously thought and deserve further study.

Lastly, the vast majority of black Caribbeans felt that race was the primary reason for the discrimination that they experienced, a comparable finding in research focused on African Americans. As noted earlier, black Caribbeans in the U.S. face discrimination that they did not experience in their (often majority-black) homelands. Despite strong aspirations and efforts for socioeconomic advancement, they frequently experience negative stereotypes and treatment by whites and others that directly contradicts their conceptualizations of themselves and their ethnic group (Vickerman 2001a). Recent black Caribbean immigrants may continue to operate using the racial-ethnic socialization perspective of their homelands, which downplays race and may limit their perception of certain interpersonal encounters as discriminatory. However, over time and over generations, many black Caribbeans come to better understand the depth and persistence of racial discrimination in the United States. In essence, with increased length of residency in the U.S., black Caribbean immigrants learn to be “black” and become more similar to African Americans in regards to their lived experiences and perceptions of race (Foner 1987; Vickerman 2001a).

Directions for Future Research

A considerable amount of research on discrimination and health among African Americans identifies everyday discrimination as a risk factor for poor physical and mental health

(Lewis, Cogburn, and Williams 2015; Mouzon, Taylor, Keith, et al. 2017; Mouzon, Taylor, Woodward, et al. 2017) While there is substantially less research on discrimination and health among the black Caribbean population, it also finds that discrimination has a deleterious effect on physical and mental health (Carlisle, 2015). Generally, research in this area investigates the overall impact of everyday discrimination on health and mental health outcomes. Future research may want to investigate the differential impact of discrimination that is specifically attributed to race versus discrimination attributed to other causes including age, gender, physical size, and disability. Future studies may also want to investigate the differential impact of more subtle types of discrimination (e.g., treated with less courtesy, treated with less respect), as compared to the more overt types of discrimination (being called names or insulted or being followed around in stores). In some instances, the more subtle types of discrimination may have a stronger impact on health and mental health (Major, Quinton, and McCoy 2002; Sue et al. 2007) due to their pervasiveness, chronicity, and ambiguous nature. Our findings also suggest the need for future examinations of the prevalence and demographic correlates of everyday discrimination among other racial minority immigrant groups, such as the rapidly growing Sub-Saharan African population.

Limitations and Conclusion

Like any study, this study has several important limitations. The everyday discrimination measure is a global measure assessing both the frequency and types of discrimination. Individuals are asked to only identify the primary reason that they experienced discrimination. As such, the measure does not allow individuals to provide multiple possible reasons as to why they were discriminated against. Consequently, the measure cannot assess the degree to which individuals endorse intersectional explanations for their experience of discrimination (i.e., the extent to which individuals identify discrimination as arising from the intersection or confluence of several devalued social statuses). For example, research on intersectionality argues that the experiences of race-based discrimination are qualitatively different for African American men (i.e., based on race) vs. women (i.e., based on race and gender) (Else-Quest and Hyde 2016)

With regards to intersectionality, there is also some concern that the everyday discrimination measure may not adequately address the unique experiences of discrimination faced by immigrants (Gee et al. 2009, 2007). We have no doubt that intersectional perspectives incorporating the added dimension of immigrant status are similarly important for black Caribbeans. Consequently, it is important for future research to fully investigate the experiences of discrimination encountered by black Caribbeans using an intersectional approach. Similar to our previous discussion of gender based discrimination, a limitation of the everyday discrimination measure is that it cannot adequately address discrimination based on both race and immigration status. Clearly, it is important for future research to develop discrimination measures that are efficient in terms of use and can provide an intersectional approach to address issues such as discrimination based upon, race, gender, and immigration status.

It is also important to note that the everyday discrimination measure has been successfully used in research with Latino (Pérez, Fortuna, and Alegria 2008) and Asian American populations (Gee et al. 2009). The types of subtle and overt forms of discrimination indicators that make up the everyday discrimination scale (such as less courtesy, less respect, poor restaurant service, not smart, dishonest, and as not as good as others) are fairly universal. Instead of altering the everyday discrimination scale, researchers who study immigrant populations such as black Caribbeans might consider supplementing it with items that are directly relevant to immigrants such as being questioned about legal status, being treated badly because of language skills, being treated with less respect than in their country of origin (Gee et al. 2007). Finally, the NSAL dataset is 15 years old. Given the present social climate regarding immigration and documented increases in reported hate crimes (“U.S. Hate Crimes up 20 Percent in 2016, Fueled by Election Campaign: Report” 2017), study findings would likely provide a more sobering portrayal of everyday discrimination if the survey were conducted today.

References

- American Association for Public Opinion Research. Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. Lenexa, KS: 2006.
- Barnes, Lisa L; Mendes de Leon, Carlos F; Lewis, Tené T; Bienias, Julia L; Wilson, Robert S; Evans, Denis A. 2008; Perceived Discrimination and Mortality in a Population-Based Study of Older Adults. *American Journal of Public Health*. 98(7):1241–47. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2007.114397 [PubMed: 18511732]
- Bashi, Vilna Francine. *Survival of the Knitted: Immigrant Social Networks in a Stratified World*. 2007. <http://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=1306>
- Branscombe, Nyla R; Schmitt, Michael T; Harvey, Richard D. 1999; Perceiving Pervasive Discrimination among African Americans: Implications for Group Identification and Well-Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 77(1):135–49. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.135
- Butterfield, Sherri-Ann P. 2004a; Challenging American Conceptions of Race and Ethnicity: Second Generation West Indian Immigrants. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. 24(7/8): 75–102. DOI: 10.1108/01443330410791028
- Butterfield, Sherri-Ann P. ‘We’re Just Black’: The Racial and Ethnic Identities of Second Generation West Indians in New York. In: Kasnitz, Philip; Mollenkopf, John H; Waters, Mary C, editors. *Becoming New Yorkers*. Russell Sage Foundation; 2004b. 288–312. <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/11212>
- Carlisle, Shauna K. 2015; Perceived Discrimination and Chronic Health in Adults from Nine Ethnic Subgroups in the USA. *Ethnicity & Health*. 20(3):309–26. DOI: 10.1080/13557858.2014.921891 [PubMed: 24920185]
- Carlisle, Shauna K; Stone, Andrea L. 2015; Effects of Perceived Discrimination and Length of Residency on the Health of Foreign-Born Populations. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*. 2(4):434–44. DOI: 10.1007/s40615-015-0090-2 [PubMed: 26863551]
- Clark, Trenette T; Salas-Wright, Christopher P; Vaughn, Michael G; Whitfield, Keith E. 2015 Everyday Discrimination and Mood and Substance Use Disorders: A Latent Profile Analysis with African Americans and Caribbean Blacks. *Addictive Behaviors*. 40Jan.:119–25. DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.08.006 [PubMed: 25254321]
- Cose, Ellis. *Harperperennial. The Rage of a Privileged Class: Why Are Middle-Class Blacks Angry? Why Should America Care?*. New York: Harper Perennial; 1994.
- Else-Quest, Nicole M; Hyde, Janet Shibley. 2016; Intersectionality in Quantitative Psychological Research: II. Methods and Techniques. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 40(3):319–36. DOI: 10.1177/0361684316647953

- Feagin, Joe R, Sikes, Melvin P. *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience*. Beacon Press; 1995. Reprint edition
- Foner, Nancy. *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration*. New York: NYU Press; 2005.
- Forman, Tyrone A, Williams, David R, Jackson, James S. *Race, Place, and Discrimination*. In: Gardner, C, editor. *Perspectives on Social Problems*. JAI Press; 1997.
- Gary, Lawrence E. 1995; African American Men's Perceptions of Racial Discrimination: A Sociocultural Analysis. *Social Work Research*. 19(4):207–17.
- Gee, Gilbert C; Ro, Annie; Shariff-Marco, Salma; Chae, David. 2009; Racial Discrimination and Health Among Asian Americans: Evidence, Assessment, and Directions for Future Research. *Epidemiologic Reviews*. 31(1):130–51. DOI: 10.1093/epirev/mxp009 [PubMed: 19805401]
- Gee, Gilbert C; Spencer, Michael; Chen, Juan; Yip, Tiffany; Takeuchi, David T. 2007; The Association between Self-Reported Racial Discrimination and 12-Month DSM-IV Mental Disorders among Asian Americans Nationwide. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982). 64(10):1984–96. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.02.013 [PubMed: 17374553]
- Hughes, Michael; Jill Kiecolt, K; Keith, Verna M; Demo, David H. 2015; Racial Identity and Well-Being among African Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 78(1):25–48. DOI: 10.1177/0190272514554043
- Hunte, Haslyn ER. 2011; Association Between Perceived Interpersonal Everyday Discrimination and Waist Circumference Over a 9-Year Period in the Midlife Development in the United States Cohort Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 173(11):1232–39. DOI: 10.1093/aje/kwq463 [PubMed: 21354988]
- Hunte, Haslyn ER; Williams, David R. 2009; The Association Between Perceived Discrimination and Obesity in a Population-Based Multiracial and Multiethnic Adult Sample. *American Journal of Public Health*. 99(7):1285–92. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2007.128090 [PubMed: 18923119]
- Jackson, James S; Torres, Myriam; Caldwell, Cleopatra H; Neighbors, Harold W; Nesse, Randolph M; Taylor, Robert Joseph; Trierweiler, Steven J; Williams, David R. 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(4):196–207. DOI: 10.1002/mpr.177 [PubMed: 15719528]
- Keith, Verna M; Nguyen, Ann W; Taylor, Robert Joseph; Mouzon, Dawne M; Chatters, Linda M. 2017; Microaggressions, Discrimination, and Phenotype among African Americans: A Latent Class Analysis of the Impact of Skin Tone and BMI. *Sociological Inquiry*. 87(2):233–55. DOI: 10.1111/soin.12168 [PubMed: 28603300]
- Kessler, Ronald C; Mickelson, Kristin D; Williams, David R. 1999; The Prevalence, Distribution, and Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 40(3):208–30. [PubMed: 10513145]
- Levine, Debra Siegel; Himle, Joseph A; Abelson, Jamie M; Matusko, Niki; Dhawan, Nikhil; Taylor, Robert Joseph. 2014; Discrimination and Social Anxiety Disorder among African-Americans, Caribbean Blacks, and Non-Hispanic Whites. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. 202(3): 224–30. DOI: 10.1097/NMD.0000000000000099 [PubMed: 24566508]
- Lewis, Tené T; Barnes, Lisa L; Bienias, Julia L; Lackland, Daniel T; Evans, Denis A; Mendes de Leon, Carlos F. 2009; Perceived Discrimination and Blood Pressure in Older African American and White Adults. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series A, Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 64(9):1002–8. DOI: 10.1093/gerona/glp062
- Lewis, Tené T; Cogburn, Courtney D; Williams, David R. 2015 Self-Reported Experiences of Discrimination and Health: Scientific Advances, Ongoing Controversies, and Emerging Issues. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 11Mar.:407–40. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032814-112728
- Lewis, Tené T; Everson-Rose, Susan A; Powell, Lynda H; Matthews, Karen A; Brown, Charlotte; Karavolos, Kelly; Sutton-Tyrrell, Kim; Jacobs, Elizabeth; Wesley, Deidre. 2006; Chronic Exposure to Everyday Discrimination and Coronary Artery Calcification in African-American Women: The SWAN Heart Study. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. 68(3):362–68. DOI: 10.1097/01.psy.0000221360.94700.16 [PubMed: 16738065]

- Major, Brenda; Quinton, Wendy J, McCoy, Shannon K. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 34. San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press; 2002. Antecedents and Consequences of Attributions to Discrimination: Theoretical and Empirical Advances; 251–330.
- Maynard-Reid, Pedrito U. *Diverse Worship: African-American, Caribbean and Hispanic Perspectives*. Downers Grove, Ill: IVP Academic; 2000.
- Model, Suzanne. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2011.
- Mouzon, Dawne M; Taylor, Robert Joseph; Keith, Verna M; Nicklett, Emily J; Chatters, Linda M. 2017; Discrimination and Psychiatric Disorders among Older African Americans. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 32(2):175–82. DOI: 10.1002/gps.4454 [PubMed: 26924389]
- Mouzon, Dawne M; Taylor, Robert Joseph; Woodward, Amanda Toler; Chatters, Linda M. 2017; Everyday Racial Discrimination, Everyday Non-Racial Discrimination, and Physical Health Among African-Americans. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*. 26(1–2):68–80. DOI: 10.1080/15313204.2016.1187103 [PubMed: 28286428]
- Musick, Kelly; Bumpass, Larry. 2012; Reexamining the Case for Marriage: Union Formation and Changes in Well-Being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 74(1):1–18. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00873.x [PubMed: 22611285]
- Naber, Nadine. *Arab America: Gender, Cultural Politics, and Activism*. New York: NYU Press; 2012.
- Pérez, Debra Joy; Fortuna, Lisa; Alegria, Margarita. 2008; Prevalence and Correlates of Everyday Discrimination among U.S. Latinos. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 36(4):421–33. DOI: 10.1002/jcop.20221 [PubMed: 19960098]
- Pudrovskaya, Tetyana; Schieman, Scott; Carr, Deborah. 2006; Strains of Singlehood in Later Life: Do Race and Gender Matter? *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 61(6):S315–22. DOI: 10.1093/geronb/61.6.S315
- Seaton, Eleanor K; Caldwell, Cleopatra H; Sellers, Robert M; Jackson, James S. 2008; The Prevalence of Perceived Discrimination among African American and Caribbean Black Youth. *Developmental Psychology*. 44(5):1288–97. DOI: 10.1037/a0012747 [PubMed: 18793063]
- Seaton, Eleanor K; Caldwell, Cleopatra H; Sellers, Robert M; Jackson, James S. 2010a; An Intersectional Approach for Understanding Perceived Discrimination and Psychological Well-Being among African American and Caribbean Black Youth. *Developmental Psychology*. 46(5):1372–79. DOI: 10.1037/a0019869 [PubMed: 20822246]
- Seaton, Eleanor K; Caldwell, Cleopatra H; Sellers, Robert M; Jackson, James S. 2010b; Developmental Characteristics of African American and Caribbean Black Adolescents' Attributions Regarding Discrimination. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 20(3):774–88. DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00659.x [PubMed: 23966759]
- Sue, Derald Wing; Capodilupo, Christina M; Torino, Gina C; Bucceri, Jennifer M; Holder, Aisha MB; Nadal, Kevin L; Esquilin, Marta. 2007; Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice. *The American Psychologist*. 62(4):271–86. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271 [PubMed: 17516773]
- Sutton, Constance R, Chaney, Elsa. *Caribbean Life in New York City: Sociocultural Dimensions*. 1. New York, NY: Center Migration Studies; 1987.
- Taylor, Robert Joseph; Miller, Reuben; Mouzon, Dawne; Keith, Verna M; Chatters, Linda M. 2016 *Everyday Discrimination Among African American Men: The Impact of Criminal Justice Contact, Race and Justice*. Aug.doi: 10.1177/2153368716661849
- U.S. Census Bureau. *American Community Survey: Selected Population Profile in the United States*. U.S Census Bureau, American Community Survey; 2005.
- U.S. Hate Crimes up 20 Percent in 2016, Fueled by Election Campaign: Report. NBC News. 2017. Mar 14, <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/u-s-hate-crimes-20-percent-2016-fueled-election-campaign-n733306>
- Vickerman, Milton. *Crosscurrents: West Indian Immigrants and Race*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998.
- Vickerman, Milton. *Jamaicans: Balancing Race and Ethnicity*. In: Foner, Nancy, editor. *New Immigrants in New York*. 2. Columbia University Press; 2001a. 176–99.

- Vickerman, Milton. Tweaking a Monolith: The West Indian Immigration Encounter with 'blackness'. In: Foner, Nancy, editor. *Islands in the City: West Indian Migration to New York*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2001b.
- Waters, Mary C. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. New York, NY: Harvard University Press; 2001.
- Williams, David R; Yu, Yan; Jackson, James S; Anderson, Norman B. 1997; Racial Differences in Physical and Mental Health Socio-Economic Status, Stress and Discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*. 2(3):335–51. DOI: 10.1177/135910539700200305 [PubMed: 22013026]
- Woodward, Amanda T; Chatters, Linda M; Taylor, Robert Joseph; Neighbors, Harold W; Jackson, James S. 2010; Differences in Professional and Informal Help Seeking among Older African Americans, Black Caribbeans and Non-Hispanic Whites. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*. 1(3):124–39. DOI: 10.5243/jsswr.2010.10 [PubMed: 21666782]
- Woodward, Amanda Toler. 2011; Discrimination and Help-Seeking: Use of Professional Services and Informal Support Among African Americans, Black Caribbeans, and Non-Hispanic Whites with a Mental Disorder. *Race and Social Problems*. 3(3):146.doi: 10.1007/s12552-011-9049-z
- Zane, Wallace W. *Journeys to the Spiritual Lands: The Natural History of a West Indian Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1999.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample and Distribution of Study Variables

	%	N	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max
Age		1621	40.27	5.78	18	94
Gender						
Male	50.87	643				
Female	49.13	978				
Years of Education		1621	12.89	1.02	0	17
Imputed Family Income		1621	47044	15190	0	484000
Marital Status						
Married/Cohabit	50.14	690				
Divorced/Separated	14.66	306				
Widowed	4.29	78				
Never Married	30.92	542				
Immigration Status						
Immigrated >11 years Ago	48.10	876				
Immigrated 6–10 years Ago	8.25	164				
Immigrated 0–5 Yrs Ago	7.89	119				
2 nd Generation Immigrant	21.34	316				
3 rd Generation Immigrant	14.42	124				
Country of Origin						
Jamaica	31.72	510				
Spanish	14.08	180				
Haiti	12.64	298				
Trinidad-Tobago	9.99	170				
Other English	31.58	440				
Sum of Any Subtle Discrimination		1606	6.55	1.69	0	20
Sum of Any Overt Discrimination		1606	5.30	1.63	0	25
Sum of Any Subtle Racial Discrimination		1550	4.10	1.83	0	20
Sum of Any Overt Racial Discrimination		1550	3.42	1.65	0	25

Percents and N are presented for categorical variables and Means and Standard Deviations are presented for continuous variables. Percentages are weighted and frequencies are un-weighted

Table 2

Percentage Distribution of Different Types of Perceived Everyday Discrimination among Black Caribbeans in the NSAL

	Almost Everyday	Once per week	Few Times a Month	Few Times per Year	Less than once per Year	Never	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	N
People act like they are better than you	11.33	6.40	13.77	25.23	19.66	23.63	1590
People act as if you are not smart	7.31	2.37	9.85	28.24	28.00	24.23	1596
Treated with less courtesy than others	3.30	6.95	9.75	26.60	30.36	23.04	1601
Treated with less respect than others	2.04	4.89	11.59	25.69	32.09	23.70	1596
People act as if they are afraid of you	7.71	3.65	9.70	13.10	27.57	38.26	1597
You are followed around in stores	4.28	3.27	8.35	18.67	27.87	37.56	1595
Receive poor service in stores/restaurants	2.33	0.98	5.61	27.00	33.72	30.35	1601
People act as if you are dishonest	3.82	1.84	8.26	10.54	32.62	42.92	1598
You are called names or insulted	4.44	0.96	2.92	8.09	34.39	49.20	1600
You are threatened or harassed	1.51	0.42	3.16	5.37	36.13	53.40	1605

Table 3

Correlates of Specific Indicators of Everyday Discrimination

Predictors/ <i>Ethnicity</i>	Better than You	Not Smart	Less Courtesy	Less Respect	Afraid of You	Followed in Stores	Poor Service	Dishonest	Call Names/Insulted	Threatened or Harassed
	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)
Age	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00) [#]	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.00) ^{***}	-0.01 (0.00) ^{**}	-0.01 (0.00) [*]	-0.01 (0.00) [*]	-0.01 (0.00) ^{**}
Gender										
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	0.44 (0.21) [*]	0.44 (0.11) ^{***}	0.23 (0.15)	0.22 (0.13)	0.68 (0.17) ^{***}	0.25 (0.13)	0.23 (0.11) [*]	0.56 (0.14) ^{***}	0.34 (0.11) ^{**}	0.36 (0.10) ^{**}
Imputed Family Income	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.00) ^{***}	0.02 (0.01) [*]	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.00)
Years of Education	-0.06 (0.02) ^{**}	-0.05 (0.02) ^{**}	0.00 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	0.00 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	0.00 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Marital Status										
Married/Cohabiting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Divorced/Separated	0.29 (0.13) [*]	0.31 (0.09) ^{**}	0.25 (0.17)	0.17 (0.12)	0.45 (0.22) [*]	0.27 (0.10) [*]	0.26 (0.12) [*]	0.33 (0.13) [*]	0.20 (0.15)	0.14 (0.08)
Widowed	0.07 (0.28)	0.01 (0.24)	-0.15 (0.25)	-0.23 (0.23)	-0.28 (0.29)	0.03 (0.30)	0.05 (0.23)	-0.07 (0.16)	0.19 (0.31)	0.26 (0.24)
Never Married	0.35 (0.14) [*]	0.47 (0.14) ^{**}	0.30 (0.10) ^{**}	0.19 (0.10)	0.32 (0.17)	0.29 (0.20)	0.19 (0.13)	0.48 (0.17) [*]	0.38 (0.11) ^{**}	0.22 (0.17)
Immigration Status										
Immigrated > 5 years Ago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Immigrated 6-10 years Ago	0.02 (0.17)	-0.05 (0.11)	-0.23 (0.20)	-0.14 (0.16)	-0.09 (0.14)	0.04 (0.17)	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.17 (0.11)	0.00 (0.15)	-0.18 (0.11)
Immigrated 0-5 Yrs Ago	-0.24 (0.49)	-0.28 (0.43)	-0.22 (0.44)	-0.19 (0.46)	-0.54 (0.33)	-0.54 (0.23) [*]	-0.52 (0.24) [*]	-0.12 (0.32)	-0.01 (0.36)	-0.35 (0.17) [*]
2 nd Generation Immigrant	0.23 (0.18)	0.10 (0.12)	0.06 (0.17)	-0.04 (0.19)	0.39 (0.20)	0.13 (0.17)	0.13 (0.13)	0.23 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.12)	0.22 (0.14)
3 rd Generation Immigrant	0.77 (0.31) [*]	0.48 (0.22) [*]	0.41 (0.24)	0.44 (0.19) [*]	0.67 (0.46)	0.81 (0.46)	0.37 (0.21)	0.09 (0.19)	0.77 (0.21) ^{***}	0.49 (0.24) [#]
Country of Origin										
Spanish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haiti	-0.42 (0.21) [#]	-0.36 (0.23)	-0.04 (0.24)	0.05 (0.17)	-0.67 (0.35)	-0.32 (0.18)	-0.09 (0.10)	-0.35 (0.21)	0.16 (0.21)	0.15 (0.08)
Jamaica	-0.04 (0.23)	-0.26 (0.22)	0.29 (0.19)	0.24 (0.17)	-0.25 (0.32)	0.11 (0.20)	-0.04 (0.13)	-0.12 (0.22)	0.12 (0.12)	0.28 (0.10) [*]
Trinidad-Tobago	-0.61 (0.26) [*]	-0.33 (0.24)	0.19 (0.19)	0.01 (0.17)	-0.39 (0.29)	-0.10 (0.20)	-0.05 (0.19)	-0.30 (0.26)	-0.01 (0.19)	0.19 (0.10)
Other English-speaking	-0.08 (0.27)	-0.03 (0.27)	0.23 (0.19)	0.26 (0.21)	-0.20 (0.33)	0.38 (0.16) [*]	0.04 (0.17)	-0.04 (0.18)	0.22 (0.20)	0.49 (0.20) [*]
Constant	3.74 (0.43) ^{***}	3.07 (0.33) ^{***}	2.25 (0.41) ^{***}	2.22 (0.43) ^{***}	2.06 (0.59) ^{**}	2.92 (0.62) ^{***}	2.23 (0.32) ^{***}	2.20 (0.42) ^{***}	1.92 (0.32)	1.55 (0.23) ^{***}

Ethnicity Author Manuscript; available in PMC 2020 July 01

Predictors ¹	Better than You	Not Smart	Less Courtesy	Less Respect	Afraid of You	Followed in Stores	Poor Service	Dishonest	Call Names/Insulted	Threatened or Harassed
	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)
F	26.43 ***	16.61 ***	39.27 ***	18.94 ***	33.21 ***	43.57 ***	63.79 ***	38.88 ***	53.97 ***	82.06 ***
R ²	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.16	0.14	0.11	0.15	0.12	0.17
N	1569	1575	1580	1575	1576	1574	1580	1577	1579	1584
Country of Origin ²										
Spanish	0.04 (0.23)	0.26 (0.22)	-0.29 (0.19)	-0.24 (0.17)	0.25 (0.32)	-0.11 (0.20)	0.04 (0.13)	0.12 (0.22)	-0.12 (0.12)	-0.28 (0.10) *
Haiti	-0.38 (0.12) ***	-0.10 (0.14)	-0.33 (0.14) *	-0.19 (0.12)	-0.42 (0.20) *	-0.43 (0.12) **	-0.05 (0.13)	-0.23 (0.11) *	0.03 (0.16)	-0.13 (0.10)
Jamaica	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad-Tobago	-0.57 (0.26) *	-0.07 (0.13)	-0.10 (0.17)	-0.23 (0.13)	-0.14 (0.18)	-0.21 (0.18)	-0.01 (0.17)	-0.18 (0.15)	-0.14 (0.14)	-0.09 (0.14)
Other English speaking	-0.04 (0.19)	0.24 (0.21)	-0.06 (0.15)	0.02 (0.14)	0.05 (0.17)	0.26 (0.16)	0.09 (0.17)	0.07 (0.12)	0.09 (0.19)	0.21 (0.18)
F	26.43 ***	16.61 ***	39.27 ***	18.94 ***	33.21 ***	43.57 ***	63.79 ***	38.88 ***	53.97 ***	82.06 ***
R ²	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.16	0.14	0.11	0.15	0.12	0.17
N	1569	1575	1580	1575	1576	1574	1580	1577	1579	1584

¹ Several independent variables are represented by dummy variables. Gender, 0 = female, 1 = male; Marital Status, married and cohabit is the excluded category; Immigration Status, Immigrated 11 or more years ago is the excluded category; Country of Origin, Spanish is the excluded category.

² These are the results of separate regression analyses. In these analyses Jamaica is the excluded category for the Country of origin variable. These analyses controls for age, gender, income, education, marital status and immigration status.

*
p < .05;

**
p < .01;

p < .001;

p < .06

Table 4

Correlates of Everyday Discrimination

Predictors ¹	Sum of Subtle Everyday Discrimination (Model 1)	Sum of Overt Everyday Discrimination (Model 2)	Sum of Race Based Subtle Everyday Discrimination (Model 3)	Sum of Race Based Overt Everyday Discrimination (Model 4)
	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)
Age	−0.03 (0.02) [#]	−0.05 (0.02) ^{**}	−0.03 (0.02)	−0.04 (0.02) [*]
Gender				
Female	0	0	0	0
Male	1.32 (0.49) [*]	1.84 (0.43) ^{***}	1.24 (0.39) ^{**}	1.30 (0.43) ^{**}
Imputed Family Income	0.07 (0.04)	0.07 (0.02) ^{**}	0.08 (0.04) [*]	0.08 (0.03) ^{**}
Years of Education	−0.13 (0.06) [*]	−0.09 (0.08)	0.03 (0.09)	−0.02 (0.10)
Marital Status				
Married/Cohabit	0	0	0	0
Divorced/Separated	1.04 (0.41) [*]	1.31 (0.28) ^{***}	1.29 (0.73)	1.53 (0.52) ^{**}
Widowed	−0.26 (0.76)	0.27 (1.07)	1.06 (0.78)	1.49 (1.00)
Never Married	1.31 (0.38) ^{**}	1.38(0.59) [*]	0.14 (0.61)	0.45 (0.70)
Immigration Status				
Immigrated >11 years Ago	0	0	0	0
Immigrated 6–10 years Ago	−0.39 (0.51)	−0.27 (0.42)	−0.59 (0.46)	0.20 (0.53)
Immigrated 0–5 Yrs Ago	−0.90 (1.77)	−1.95 (1.18)	−1.52 (0.90)	−1.55 (0.82)
2 nd Generation Immigrant	0.36 (0.48)	0.87 (0.53)	0.88 (0.74)	1.22 (0.68)
3 rd Generation Immigrant	2.14 (0.74) ^{**}	3.14 (1.46) [*]	1.58 (0.77) [#]	2.46 (1.17) [*]
Country of Origin				
Spanish	0	0	0	0
Haiti	−0.83 (0.75)	−0.77 (0.57)	−0.21 (0.59)	−0.23 (0.55)
Jamaica	0.20 (0.72)	0.23 (0.60)	0.68 (0.69)	0.43 (0.76)
Trinidad-Tobago	−0.73 (0.76)	−0.35 (0.67)	−0.54 (0.79)	−0.10 (0.91)
Other English-speaking	0.39 (0.86)	0.93 (0.73)	1.15 (1.25)	1.37 (1.32)
Constant	7.32 (1.26) ^{***}	5.73 (1.14) ^{***}	2.55 (1.71)	2.55 (1.68)
F	88.39 ^{***}	116.93 ^{***}	29.7 ^{***}	147.47 ^{***}
R²	0.11	0.22	0.10	0.15
N	1585	1585	1529	1529
Country of Origin²				
Spanish	−0.20 (0.72)	−0.23 (0.60)	−0.68 (0.69)	−0.42 (0.76)
Haiti	−1.03 (0.39) [*]	−0.99 (0.44) [*]	−0.89 (0.46)	−0.66 (0.41)
Jamaica	0	0	0	0
Trinidad-Tobago	−0.93 (0.59)	−0.58(0.58)	−1.22(0.57) [*]	−0.53 (0.56)
Other English-speaking	0.19 (0.60)	0.71 (0.60)	0.48 (0.77)	0.94 (0.72)
F	88.39 ^{***}	116.93 ^{***}	29.7 ^{***}	147.47 ^{***}

Predictors ¹	Sum of Subtle Everyday Discrimination (Model 1)	Sum of Overt Everyday Discrimination (Model 2)	Sum of Race Based Subtle Everyday Discrimination (Model 3)	Sum of Race Based Overt Everyday Discrimination (Model 4)
	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)
R ²	0.11	0.22	0.10	0.15
N	1585	1585	1529	1529

¹ Several independent variables are represented by dummy variables. Gender, 0 = female, 1 = male; Marital Status, married and cohabit is the excluded category; Immigration Status, Immigrated 11 or more years ago is the excluded category; Country of Origin, Spanish is the excluded category.

² These are the results of separate regression analyses. In these analyses Jamaica is the excluded category for the Country of origin variable. These analyses controls for age, gender, income, education, marital status and immigration status.

*
p < .05;

**
p < .01;

p < .001;

p < .06