

White Managers, Ethnoracism and the Production of Black Ethnic Labor Market Disparities

By Mosi Adesina Ifatunji¹

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill²
Department of Sociology,
Carolina Population Center and
Institute of African American Research

Words: 9,801

¹ Mosi Adesina Ifatunji is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He also holds Fellowships at the Carolina Population Center and the Institute for African American Research. His studies focus on the relationships between race, culture, migration, and various forms of stratification in society. His work has appeared in *Sociological Forum*, *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, and the *Du Bois Review*. His current and forthcoming work compares the labor market participation, physical health and political participation of African Americans and Black immigrants. He is also working on a paper and book manuscript theorizing the political economy of race and ethnicity in settler and colonial societies (www.ifatunji.info).

² Send correspondence to: Mosi Adesina Ifatunji, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 165 Hamilton Hall, Campus Box 3210, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599-3210. Office phone: (919) 962-1007. Campus email: ifatunji@unc.edu.

ABSTRACT

Few have considered the role of White managers in longstanding Black Ethnic labor market disparities. Drawing on ethnoracism theory, I conceptualize the previously documented White manager preference for Afro Caribbeans as a form of prejudice that contributes to the relative success of Afro Caribbeans. White managers say they prefer Afro Caribbeans because they work harder and are less racially antagonistic than African Americans. However, using the *National Survey of American Life*, I show that these populations are virtually indistinguishable in terms of labor quality and racial attitudes. Moreover, net labor quality and racial attitudes, the incomes of English and non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans are greater when working for White managers, but African Americans with White managers receive no greater income than those without a White manager. I conclude with a call for the *formal* development of a new ontological framework for the study of these kinds of ethnoracially dynamic relationships. [150/150]

KEYWORDS

Immigrant Incorporation; Labor Market Disparities; White Managers; Black Ethnicity; Black immigrants

INTRODUCTION

Various unadjusted estimates from the U.S. Census show that English-speaking Black immigrants from the Caribbean¹ have greater earnings than African Americans (Corra and Borch 2014: 110, Doodoo 1997: 534, Hamilton 2014: 985, Mason 2010: 312, Model 2008a: 42). Some argue that these disparities result from the fact that Afro Caribbeans have a greater cultural value for work than African Americans (e.g., Portes and Zhou 1993, Sowell 1978). However, many believe that comparing African Americans to Afro Caribbean immigrants is not to compare ‘African American values’ to ‘Afro Caribbean values,’ but to compare the attributes of migrants to non-migrants (e.g., Chiswick 1978, Model 2008a). These selectivity theorists argue that people who migrate are positively self-selected on soft skills that also contribute to success in the U.S. labor market. While most speculate that earnings disparities between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans are a result of differences in these population characteristics, recent studies suggest that differences in values and skills may only play a limited role in this form of labor market inequality (Ifatunji 2016, Ifatunji 2017, Model 2008b).

When compared to studies that focus on population differences, much less is known about the ways in which contextual factors might structure Black ethnic labor market disparities. Contextual factors shape labor market trajectories but lay outside the control of individual workers (Baron and Bielby 1980, Reich et al. 1973). Manager² prejudice and discrimination are contextual factors that are often considered when investigating labor market disparities (Gaddis 2014, Giuliano et al. 2009, Pager et al. 2009, Rivera 2012, Rivera 2015, Stoll et al. 2004, Wilson and Gilmore 1943). Although immigrants have long experienced prejudice and discrimination from natives (Higham 1955), when compared to African Americans, White managers report a preference for Afro Caribbean workers (Foner and Napoli 1978, Waters 1999a, Waters 1999c,

Waters 1999d). They often attribute this preference to their belief that Afro Caribbeans ‘work harder’ and ‘complain less about race relations’ in the workplace (Foner and Napoli 1978, Waters 1999a, Waters 1999c, Waters 1999d). However, if these perceptions and preferences are prejudiced, or biased in ways that favor Afro Caribbeans (Bryce-Laporte 1972, Domínguez 1975, Model 2008d), meaningful portions of the relative labor market success of Afro Caribbeans may be attributable to a unique form of *ethnoracism* (Aranda 2006a, Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000), or favoritism on the part of White managers, rather than differences in the values and/or skills of Afro Caribbeans and African Americans (Chiswick 1978, Sowell 1978).

There are important limitations to existing studies on the role of White manager preferences in Black ethnic labor market disparities. First, studies that report a preference for Afro Caribbeans among White managers are ethnographic and focus on the Northeast (Foner and Napoli 1978, Waters 1999b). Therefore, much of what we currently know is regionally specific. Second, studies that document White manager preferences do not adequately consider the potential role of bias, discrimination, or favoritism (Waters 1999a, Waters 1999c, Waters 1999d). That is, most concede the “merits” for this preference – that Afro Caribbeans actually do work harder and complain less about race relations than African Americans (Foner and Napoli 1978, Waters 1999b). This orientation to understanding preferences is different from White manager favoritism (Bryce-Laporte 1972, Domínguez 1975, Model 2008d), or the idea that White managers retain their preference for Afro Caribbeans despite the fact that they have work ethics and racial attitudes that are the same as, or at least very similar to, the ethics and attitudes of African Americans (Ifatunji 2016, Ifatunji 2017, Model 2008b). Lastly, the only large scale effort to consider favoritism among White managers relies on queuing theory, arguing that if

Afro Caribbeans benefit from this kind of bias then, “the larger the percentage of African Americans in a metropolitan area’s labor force, the better the economic outcome[s] of [Afro Caribbeans] working in that area” (Model 2008a: 139). While this study did not find support for favoritism, it also did not test for income differences between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans with and without White managers.

The present study contributes to existing research on the role of White managers in the relative success of Afro Caribbeans by conceptualizing White favoritism as a unique form of ethnoracism (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004) and providing the first nationally representative estimates of the association between having a White manager and the incomes of African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. By broadening our conception of prejudice and discrimination to “include how ethnicity, culture, national origin, and the historical relationship between minorities’ country of origin and the country of settlement have been *racialized*” (italics added; Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004: 911, Grosfoguel 2004), the concept of ethnoracism allows for the idea that, White managers may have different racialized stereotypes for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans (Waters 1999c, Waters 1999d), resulting in favoritism, or a biased preference for Afro Caribbeans (Bryce-Laporte 1972, Domínguez 1975, Model 2008d). After reviewing this perspective, I test for the role of ethnoracism and White favoritism using the only nationally representative social survey of African Americans and Afro Caribbeans, the *National Survey of American Life* (Heeringa et al. 2004, Jackson et al. 2004b). My findings are in line with the idea that Afro Caribbeans benefit from ethnoracism and White favoritism. That is, I show that, not only are African Americans and Afro Caribbeans very similar in terms of the characteristics that White managers reference in their distinctions and preferences, but also that, both English- and non-English-speaking Afro Caribbean incomes are greater when working for a

White manager than when working for a non-White manager, net labor quality and racial attitudes. However, the incomes of African Americans with White managers are no different than those without White managers. I conclude the paper by situating the present study within the larger ‘ethnoracial turn’ that is now underway in the social sciences and a call for the *formal* development of an ontological framework for ‘ethnoraciality,’ which might better guide social scientists in their studies of race, ethnicity and the ‘ethnoracial’ (Lewis and Forman 2017).

WHITE MANAGER PERCEPTIONS AND PREFERENCES

One of the oldest and most common working assumptions in labor market economics is that managers select and promote employees as part of an objectively cognitive process focused on identifying and rewarding attributes that are associated with productivity, including hard and soft skills (Chiswick 1978, Heckman and Kautz 2012, Moss and Tilly 2001, Sowell 1978). In addition to the skills we often associate with worker productivity, recent studies show that, “...employers may actively seek workers whom they believe will... make them *feel good* on and off the job” (italics added; Rivera 2012, Rivera 2015: 1342). White manager preferences for Afro Caribbeans reflect both interests. That is, their preference for Afro Caribbeans results from their belief that Afro Caribbeans offer more productive labor quality and that Afro Caribbeans make them feel better about race relations because they are less racially antagonistic than African Americans. For instance, while many Whites feel as though African Americans have betrayed the “moral values embodied in the Protestant work ethic” (Kinder and Sears 1981: 416), Afro Caribbeans are often “...portrayed by the ‘white’ establishment ... as a ‘hard working model minority’ as opposed to the ‘laziness’ of African Americans” (Grosfoguel 2004: 330). Orlando Patterson has observed that, Afro Caribbeans are “... very visible to the Whites who quickly stereotype them as more adaptable and hardworking than [African Americans]” (Patterson 1995:

24) and the White managers that Mary Waters interviewed in her canonical text *Black Identities* often perceived Afro Caribbeans as “more ambitious [and] more hard-working... than... African Americans” (Waters 1999b: 121).

With respect to race relations, many White managers also believe that Afro Caribbeans are less racially antagonistic than African Americans (Waters 1999a, Waters 1999c, Waters 1999d). For example, some White managers read Afro Caribbeans as “not being angry and blaming Whites for historical wrongs” (Waters 1999b: 174-5) and accepting of “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” (italics in the original; Waters 1999b: 173). Conversely, Whites describe African Americans as having a “chip on their shoulder” (Foner 1985, Waters 1999b: 174). One White manager “thought [African Americans] unfairly saw racism where none exists” (Waters 1999b: 178). Referencing the racial tensions that exist between Whites and African Americans, one White manager explained that, “... it’s more and more that the [African Americans] are creating it, and I think it’s a shame... if they would stop blaming us, you know, for everything, then it would be a little easier” (Waters 1999b: 179-80). Given these perceptions, Waters concludes that, “[Afro Caribbeans] who do not see encounters with supervisors or customers as having racial overtones will no doubt be preferred by supervisors [and] managers... over [African Americans] who do” (Waters 1999b: 184).

WHITE MANAGER PREJUDICE

Since the worker attributes that managers are interested in are often not readily observable, many use indirect “signals” that they believe indicate these attributes (Becker 1957, Spence 2002). These signals are then used to “statistically discriminate” between job applicants and employees based on the belief that – on average – certain populations are more likely than

others to have their sought after qualities (Arrow 1972, Arrow 1973, Phelps 1972). However, experimental studies show that statistical discrimination is inaccurate and most often represents a form of prejudice that leads to inequality in the labor market (Gaddis 2014, Pager et al. 2009). Therefore, the perceptions and preferences that White managers have for Afro Caribbeans over African Americans might represent a form of statistical discrimination and, if so, it might be that, “[Afro Caribbean] success... has indeed also been fostered by a frequent prejudice among White Americans in favor of [Afro Caribbeans] over [African Americans]” (Bryce-Laporte 1972, Domínguez 1975: 55, Model 2008d).

Although many White managers believe that Afro Caribbeans have a greater value for work and offer more productive labor quality than African Americans, several population studies suggest that – on average – African Americans and Afro Caribbeans have very similar soft skills and work ethnics. For instance, a recent study shows that African Americans and Afro Caribbeans are not meaningfully different on at least two measures of soft skills. According to this study, Afro Caribbeans report slightly more John Henryism (James 1994)³ than African Americans, but African Americans report slightly more personal mastery (Pearlin and Schooler 1978) than Afro Caribbeans (Ifatunji 2017). There are also no differences between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans on a self-reported measure of work ethic (Ifatunji 2016), and a survey of a New York Labor Union shows that, African Americans are more likely than Afro Caribbeans to believe that, “America is a land of opportunity in which you only need to work hard to succeed” (Greer 2013: 107).

As with labor quality, several population studies run counter to the idea that Afro Caribbeans and African Americans have very different racial attitudes. Three studies show that they have similar levels of linked fate, or are about equally likely to believe that their likelihood

of success in the US depends on the success of other Blacks (Benson 2006, Ifatunji 2016, Smith 2013). African Americans are also slightly less likely than Afro Caribbeans to either believe that spending on affirmative action should increase or stay the same (Greer 2013: 96). Providing some nuance to this trend, Milton Vickerman reports that many of the Afro Caribbeans he interviewed try not to “see race” but that most become vocal critics of American racial politics and a good portion are not shy about sharing their discontents in public (Vickerman 1999).

There is also evidence that White managers respond to the same attitudes and behaviors differentially when the worker is Afro Caribbean or African American. With respect to labor quality or worker productivity, Waters notes that White managers often grant Afro Caribbeans “slack” when their work performance is not up to par, a relief from standards she did not see for African Americans. She notes that (1999b: 121),

... where [African Americans] 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.

Moreover, when Afro Caribbeans present with antagonistic racial attitudes it does not trouble relations between Whites and Afro Caribbeans in the way that it does relations with African Americans. For instance, Waters notes that (1999b: 175),

... a significant number of the White managers describe [Afro Caribbeans] 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 [Afro

Caribbeans] in the same way that it dampened relations between African Americans and Whites.

ETHNORACISM AND WHITE FAVORITISM

Although interactions between Whites, African Americans and Afro Caribbeans represent forms of Black-White relations, since African Americans and Afro Caribbeans generally share the same “racial phenotype” (or multivariate distribution of skin color, hair texture and bone structure; Du Bois 1897), we cannot draw on traditional theories of racial prejudice and racism to explain the differential perception and treatment of these Black populations (Sowell 1978), because these theories rely on corporeal racial ontologies (Du Bois 1897, Essed 1991, Feagin and Sikes 1994, Omi and Winant 2014). Additionally, since Black immigrants are being favored relative to African Americans, we cannot rely on traditional theories on nativism and anti-immigrant prejudice (Higham 1955). Therefore, to better understand the nature of these intergroup relations, Ramon Grosfoguel proposes that, “[it] is crucial to locate each racial/ethnic group within the boarder context of the core-periphery relationships between their state of origin and the United States” (Grosfoguel 2004: 317, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000, Grosfoguel 2003). Elizabeth Aranda and Guillermo Rebollo-Gil, then extend and develop this argument, offering the concept of *ethnoracism* to describe forms of prejudice and discrimination that, “include how ethnicity, culture, national origin, and the historical relationship between minorities’ country of origin and the country of settlement have been racialized” (Aranda 2006a, Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004: 911).

Although ethnoracism might also produce additional burdens for some foreign-born Blacks in some situations (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Bryce-Laporte 1972), Waters describes what can be thought of as a unique form of ethnoracism that might result in White manger bias in

favor of Afro Caribbeans vis-à-vis African Americans. That is, Waters identifies the “comfort factor” (Waters 1999b, Waters 1999d), or a racialized “feel good” (Rivera 2015: 1342), that she observed between White managers and Afro Caribbean workers. She reports that (1999b: 172),

“[Afro Caribbeans] 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. [Afro Caribbeans] don’t expect strained relations with Whites and Whites don’t expect strained relations with [Afro Caribbeans].”

This observation suggests that differences in the “country of origin” and “colonial situation” (Grosfoguel and Georas 2000: 87) of African Americans and Afro Caribbeans shapes their relationships with White managers. Since Afro Caribbeans have “state” or “national origins” that exist outside the scope of American colonialism and slavery (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004), their bodies do not signify the history of Black-White racial antagonism and conflict in their “country of settlement” (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004: 911). However, since the “country of origin” for African Americans is the United States, relations between Whites and African Americans stem from the “colonial situation” of American slavery (Blauner 1969, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000: 87, Jordan 1968) and the mere presence of African Americans connotes or symbolizes the “sorry history of American race relations,” irrespective of their actual attitudes and behaviors. Given these distinctions in the colonial histories of Whites, African Americans and Afro Caribbeans, Black nativity (i.e., being Black and native or foreign) works as a signal or marker that imbues the Black body with different racialized meanings for White managers. As a result, White managers might read very similar attitudes and behaviors differently when expressed by African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. While foreign-birth is

usually associated with discrimination and exclusion (Higham 1955), foreignness then marks Black bodies and populations as existing outside the “colonial situation” of American slavery (Grosfoguel 2004, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000), resulting in a unique form of ethnoracism that elevates, privileges or favors Black immigrants relative to African Americans.

In her wide-ranging text on Black ethnic labor market disparities, *West Indian Immigrants*, Susan Model tests three major explanations for labor market disparities between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans (Model 2008a), including a test of the “White Favoritism Hypothesis” (Model 2008d). To test this explanation, Model draws on queuing theory and the expectation that employers “give first preference to members of the group they esteem most and [then] move down the line only as the supply of more favored groups declines” (Model 2008d: 132) and argues that, “... the larger the proportion of African Americans in a United States labor market, the more successful its [English-speaking Afro Caribbeans] will be” (Model 2008d: 116). Model finds, “no relationship between the proportion of the local labor force that is African American and the attainment of its [English-speaking Afro Caribbean] population” (Model 2008d:140) and concludes that her findings, “dispute the linkage between White favoritism and Caribbean advantage” (Model 2008d: 142).

However, since Model does not test for the relationship between White managers and the relative labor market success of these Black populations, there is still more to learn about the role of White managers in Black ethnic labor market disparities. Below, I conduct another test of ethnoracism and White favoritism using nationally representative survey data to assess the relationship between having a White manager and the incomes of African Americans and Afro Caribbeans, net labor quality and racial attitudes.

DATA AND METHODS

Fieldwork for the *National Survey of American Life* was conducted from February 2001 to June of 2003 by the Program for Research on Black Americans (PRBA) and the Survey Research Center (SRC), which are part of the Institute for Social Research (ISR) at the University of Michigan (Jackson et al. 2004a, Jackson et al. 2004b). The PRBA and SRC designed the sampling frame for the NSAL based on the national distribution of self-identified Blacks, as opposed to the distribution of all US households (Heeringa et al. 2004, Jackson et al. 2012, Jackson 1991). The NSAL is the only survey to have nationally representative samples of both African Americans and Afro Caribbeans – i.e., with known f probabilities of selection for both groups (Heeringa et al. 2004, Kish 1965). This study only includes employed respondents, ages 18 to 65. The analytic sample includes 2,003 African Americans and 756 first-generation foreign-born Afro Caribbean immigrants (516 English-speaking and 240 non-English speaking).⁴ The dependent variable is self-reported annual personal income. I truncated incomes at 200,000.⁵

Independent Variables

The primary independent variable is whether the respondent has a White manager. To assess the presence of a White manager, all employed respondents answered the question, “Is your work supervisor a Black male, White male, Black female or White female?” I recoded responses to this question so that respondents with a White manager were coded one and those with a non-White manager were coded zero, which also includes a response choice for “Other.”⁶ To capture related aspects of the labor market context, I created an index of labor market racial discrimination using three questions: “At any time in your life, have you ever been unfairly fired?” “For unfair reasons, have you ever not been hired for a job?” and “Have you ever been unfairly denied a promotion?” If a respondent answered yes to any of these questions, the surveyor then asked the respondent to attribute their experience to a single factor from a list. If a

respondent attributed their experience to “race,” I assigned the respondent a 1 and if respondents either said they did not have the experience or they did not attribute their experience to race, I assigned the respondent a 0 (following, Brown 2001).⁷

Secondary independent variables include measures of labor quality and racial attitudes. To assess labor quality, I use measures of hard and soft skills. For hard skills I measure years of education. Surveyors asked respondents, “How many years of school did you finish?” Respondents gave a number that ranged from 0 to 17. Those who argue for immigrant selectivity posit that immigrants do better than natives in the labor market because they have more soft skills, including greater motivation (Hamilton 2014, Model 2008c). I assess aspects of the soft skills dimension of immigrant selectivity by using a scale for *personal mastery* (Ifatunji 2017, Pearlin and Schooler 1978), which is a measure of personal motivation and includes five items: “There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have,” “Sometimes I feel that I’m being pushed around in life,” “I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life,” “There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life,” and “I have little control over the things that happen to me.” The Cronbach alpha for all five items is .76 for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. Factor analysis revealed a single factor with an Eigen-value of 1.85 for African Americans and 1.84 for Afro Caribbeans.⁸

With respect to *racial attitudes*, I assess answers to questions that best approximate the kinds of attitudes that White managers reference in their preferences.⁹ Surveyors queried responses to the statement, “I would not mind if a suitably qualified White person was appointed as my boss.” Another question evaluated the role of minorities in racial inequality, “If racial minorities don’t do well in life they have no one to blame but themselves.” Finally, participants responded to the question, “Whites and racial minorities can never be really comfortable with

each other, even if they are close friends.” The response options for all three questions were in the form of Likert scales that ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Control Variables

Since I observe separate models for African Americans and both English and non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans, and because there are so few non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans in the sample, I include a parsimonious set of controls.¹⁰ First, I control for gender because men have greater labor market participation rates and earn more than women, and because historically, women have lead in migration from the Caribbean (Watkins-Owens 2001).¹¹ I control for age and marital status because older and married people have greater incomes than those who are younger and/or not married. I include a dummy variable for those respondents living in the South because most African Americans live in the South where incomes are lower than other U.S. regions and I control for living in Florida and New York, since both states have a large concentration of Afro Caribbean immigrants. Given a recent study on the importance of occupational niching in disparities between African Americans and Black immigrants (Hamilton et al. 2018), I include a measure of occupational status: service workers, laborers, helpers and operatives = 1; craft workers, administrative support and sales workers = 2; and technicians, professionals, officials and managers = 3. Finally, since the dependent variable is personal income, I control for self-employment.

Data Management and Analysis

There are two parts to the survey. First, a household face-to-face interview and then, after the first interview, the interviewer left a re-interview pamphlet for the respondent to complete. The response rates are comparatively high for the face-to-face portion of the survey (Brick and Williams 2013, De Leeuw and De Heer 2002, Groves 2006): 71 percent for African Americans

and 78 percent for Afro Caribbeans (Heeringa et al. 2004). The response rate for the re-interview was similar to response rates in longitudinal and mail surveys (Kaplowitz et al. 2004, Watson and Wooden 2009): 61 percent of African American and 43 percent of Afro Caribbean returned the re-interview pamphlet (Jackson et al. 2012). Respondents that completed the re-interview were more likely to be female, unemployed and more educated than respondents that did not (Jackson et al. 2012). I used sampling weights to correct for differential probabilities of selection (Heeringa et al. 2006).

Since the racial attitude questions were on the re-interview, I also assessed whether respondent racial attitudes influenced decisions to complete the re-interview. I gathered a set of questions that surveyors asked respondents during the face-to-face part of the survey, concerning their attitudes towards various kinds of Blacks (e.g., professional Blacks, working-class Blacks, etcetera) and I gauged whether scores on this scale were associated with returning the re-interview. Results from bivariate and multivariate models (with controls listed above) show no relationship between this summary measure of racial attitudes and returning the re-interview (bivariate: $b = .132, p = .160$; multivariate: $b = .083, p = .383$). As a result, I assume that missingness is “missing at random” (Allison 2002, Rubin 1987) and used multiple imputation with linked chained equations to generate and analyze 50 imputed datasets in order to address missingness (Allison 2002, Davey et al. 2001, Rubin 1987, White et al. 2011).

The analysis plan includes four stages. First, given field reports from White managers concerning the greater labor quality and reduced levels of racial antagonism among Afro Caribbeans, I assess unadjusted mean differences in labor quality and racial attitudes between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. Then, I evaluated unadjusted means for income among African Americans and Afro Caribbeans with and without White Managers. Next, I assessed

separate OLS regression models for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans that show the relationship between having a White manager and income, net social background controls, labor quality and racial attitudes. While there are a range of interesting findings, I focus my description of the results on the central aim of the study – i.e., the relationship between having a White manager and income for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents unadjusted sample means for personal income, labor quality, racial attitudes, perceived discrimination, White management, and social background characteristics for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans that were ages 18 to 65 and employed at the time of the survey.¹² In line with other studies, the table shows that, Afro Caribbeans have greater income than African Americans ($p=.059$) and that this pattern is particularly true for English-speaking Afro Caribbeans ($p=.062$). The remaining comparisons reveal very few differences. Counter to immigrant selectivity theory and field reports from White managers, African Americans report more personal mastery (or motivation) than Afro Caribbeans and there are no other differences in labor quality or racial attitudes.¹³ Employed Afro Caribbeans are no more likely than African Americans to have a White manager or to report personal experiences with labor market racial discrimination.¹⁴ Otherwise, Afro Caribbeans are slightly older, less likely to live in the South, more likely to live in New York or Florida, more likely to be married, and more likely to have high occupational status than African Americans.¹⁵

Tables 2 and 3 present the unadjusted and adjusted associations between having a White manager and the incomes of African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. Table 2 shows that, while there are no unadjusted differences in income between African Americans with and without White managers, Afro Caribbeans that have a White manager report about 32 percent more

income than those without White managers (\$12,736; $p=.021$). While the unadjusted benefits of White management obtain for all Afro Caribbeans, this pattern concentrates among those from English-speaking countries (\$15,778; $p=.020$). That said, the unadjusted incomes of African Americans *with* White managers are about the same as those for Afro Caribbeans *without* White managers and Afro Caribbeans with White managers report about 43 percent more income than African Americans with White managers (\$11,992; $p=.027$).¹⁶ Table 3 shows that basic demographic differences play an influential role in shaping the association between having a White manager and the incomes of Afro Caribbeans. While demographic factors explain about 39 percent of the relationship between having a White manager and the incomes of English-speaking Afro Caribbeans $[(15,778-9639)/15778=.389]$, adjusting for these differences reveals the benefit of White management for non-English-speaking Afro Caribbeans (\$5,362; $p = .004$).

Table 4 shows that, adding controls for skills, racial attitudes and perceptions of discrimination to the models presented in Table 3 accounts for about 19 percent of the White manager benefit for English-speaking Afro Caribbeans $[(9639-7831)/9639=.188]$ but results in about a 23 percent increase $[(6592-5362)/5362=.229]$ in the benefit for non-English-speaking Afro Caribbeans.¹⁷ That said, English-speaking Afro Caribbeans with White managers continue to report about \$7,831 ($p=.006$) more income than those without White managers and non-English-speaking Afro Caribbeans with White managers report about \$6,592 ($p=.005$) more income than those without White managers. The table also shows differential associations between skills, attitudes, discrimination, and income for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. While greater skills are associated with more income for both African Americans and Afro Caribbeans, hard skills matter more for African Americans and soft skills matter more for English-speaking Afro Caribbeans. Racial attitudes are not associated with income, but

greater income is associated with more perceived discrimination for Afro Caribbeans, particularly those from English-speaking countries. Moreover, while the models show some differences across Black populations in the relationship between personal income and model covariates, the most consistent difference is what might be termed the “White manager benefit.”¹⁸

DISCUSSION

Most studies of Black ethnic labor market disparities have focused on the role of differences in various population characteristics – e.g., values, attitudes and skills (Chiswick 1978, Sowell 1978). To date, the role of White managers and their preference for Afro Caribbeans has remained underexplored. While several studies speculate or report that White managers prefer Afro Caribbeans (Domínguez 1975, Foner and Napoli 1978, Waters 1999a, Waters 1999b, Waters 1999d), the only large scale study to investigate the role of White manager favoritism in Black ethnic labor market disparities did not find support for favoritism (Model 2008d). In this study, I argue that because African Americans and Afro Caribbeans have different historical relationships to American colonialism and slavery (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000, Waters 1999c, Waters 1999d), Afro Caribbeans benefit from a particular form of ethnoracism (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004) that results in White manager prejudice in favor of Afro Caribbeans over African Americans (Bryce-Laporte 1972, Domínguez 1975, Model 2008d). I support this argument by showing that, contrary to the field reports of White managers, African Americans and Afro Caribbeans are nearly indistinguishable in terms of their labor quality and racial attitudes and, more importantly, I find that both English and non-English speaking Afro

Caribbean incomes benefit from having a White manager, but no corresponding benefit for African Americans with White managers.

While these results suggest an alternative direction for future research on ethnoracism and Black ethnic labor market disparities, they are not without limitations. First, although the survey used to complete the analysis is notable in terms of its quality, unique in terms of its measures and novel in that it includes a nationally representative sample of both African Americans and Afro Caribbeans; it is still exceedingly difficult to engage in casual inference when using cross-sectional surveys. Therefore, while this study offers evidence of an association between having a White manager and the incomes of Afro Caribbeans, it is difficult to settle the directionality of this association. Second, although I have done my best to compare African Americans and Afro Caribbeans that are alike in the ways that White managers say matter, statistical controls are an imperfect substitute for controlled experimental manipulations that might directly test the differential evaluation and treatment of African American and Afro Caribbean workers under White management (i.e., White manager/African American worker and White manager/Afro Caribbean worker dyads). Third, Afro Caribbeans have long and concentrated histories within certain regions of the U.S. – e.g., New York and Florida. Therefore, it is unfortunate that the study sample size restricted my ability to stratify the analysis by region, leaving me unable to assess the regional specificity of the White manager benefit.

These limitations notwithstanding, there are reasons for cautious confidence in moving forward with further explorations into the role of ethnoracism in Black ethnic labor market disparities. First, while this is the first study to systematically test for the association between White managers and Black ethnic labor market disparities, earlier studies by different investigators in different places and at different times have noted differential relations between

Whites, Afro Caribbeans and African Americans (Bashi Bobb and Clarke 2001, Bryce-Laporte 1972, Domínguez 1975, Foner and Napoli 1978, Greer 2013, Patterson 1995, Vickerman 1999, Waters 1999b). Second, while it is difficult to assess labor quality and racial attitudes in social surveys, there is no reason to believe that African Americans and Afro Caribbeans answer such questions differently. Therefore, while these measures may not be ideal, variance in measurement between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans is not likely to account for the White manager benefit among Afro Caribbeans. Finally, while there may be some concerns about the potential for regional concentration, I note that aggregating regions does not dissolve the White manager benefit for Afro Caribbeans.

Other than ethnoracism, there are several potential alternatives that might also explain the association between White management and income for Afro Caribbeans. One alternative is that, although African Americans and Afro Caribbeans in this study are equally likely to have White managers, before and after controlling for occupational categories, a more refined analysis of ethnic niching might reveal that Afro Caribbeans have higher incomes when working for White managers because Afro Caribbeans seek employment in higher paid jobs, industries, sectors or firms that are also more likely to have White managers (e.g., medicine or engineering; Hamilton et al. 2018, Wilson 2003). Another, more nuanced, alternative explanation is that Afro Caribbeans change their behavior in the presence of White managers. That is, it may be that the methodological approach taken in this study masks the fact that Afro Caribbeans simply behave differently when in the presence of White managers and that African Americans do not engage in similar behavioral changes. For example, not only were test scores among Afro Caribbeans not suppressed under the condition of stereotype threat when the experimenter was Black, but their test scores actually improved under the stereotype threat condition when the experimenter was

White (Deaux et al. 2007). This suggests that, when compared to African Americans, Afro Caribbeans may respond differently to the presence of Whites. If true, Whites might perceive Afro Caribbeans in the way that they do because Afro Caribbeans behave differently in their presence, even while holding orientations to work and race that are very similar to that of African Americans when Whites are not present.

Future studies should also investigate the relationship between Black management and labor market disparities between African Americans and Black immigrants, including Afro Caribbeans. While this study shows a benefit for Afro Caribbeans with White managers, some part of this benefit might be a result of a corresponding penalty for Afro Caribbeans with Black managers. That is, since Afro Caribbeans often work for other Afro Caribbeans, and small businesses often have lower gross revenues than larger more bureaucratic companies, they may pay less than larger companies, which may also be less likely to have Black and/or Afro Caribbean managers. Alternatively, Afro Caribbean managers may exploit the labor of Afro Caribbean workers by leveraging immigration policy (Bashi 2007) and co-ethnic solidarity (Bao 2001) in ways that reduce the average rate of pay for Afro Caribbeans with “Black managers.”

These limitations and alternative perspectives aside, this study offers an important discovery concerning the association between White management and the incomes of Afro Caribbeans and presents ethnoracism as a workable potential explanation for labor market disparities between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. However, while ethnoracism offers a way to think about experiences with racialized forms of prejudice and discrimination that are not entirely decided by how a person looks, it conflates experiences with ethnoracial discrimination with the process of developing and assigning different racial or ethnoracial stereotypes to specific bodies and populations. That is, the idea that the immigrant experience

with ethnoracism in America is partially determined by the relationship between the United States and the immigrant country of origin is useful (Aranda 2006b, Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000, Grosfoguel 2003), but it assumes or relies on the idea that the racialized meanings or stereotypes that we assign to bodies and populations do not *only* turn on widely recognized ‘racial phenotypes’ (e.g., skin color, hair texture and bone structure; Du Bois 1897, Omi and Winant 2014), but are also shaped, informed or determined by ‘ethnic characteristics’ (e.g., language, religion or nationality; Gans 1979, Hall 1988, Selod and Embrick 2013, Waters 1990, Wimmer 2008). It might be useful to further study and name this intermediary process of *ethnoracialization* – or the process of assigning racialized meanings to bodies and populations based on a varied set of physical and non-physical characteristics, to include skin color, hair texture, bone structure, language, religion, and nationality.

While previous studies have argued for and shown that we often racialize language and nativity status (Kim 1999, Ngai 2004, Tuan 1998, Urciuoli 1996), these studies focus on Asian and Latinx populations and so they often conflate variation in racial phenotypes with variation in language and nativity status, making it difficult to parse whether racial meanings or stereotypes are being assigned or activated based on physical or non-physical characteristics. Therefore, it may well be that ethnoracialization is uniquely evidenced in the presence of different racialized stereotypes for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans (Foner and Napoli 1978, Waters 1999b). That is, the degree to which we make *ethnoracial* modifications to the stereotypes that we associate with Black bodies and populations are informed by the making of distinctions between those with and without origins in American colonialism and slavery (Aranda 2006b, Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004, Grosfoguel and Georas 2000, Grosfoguel 2003), might provide even more compelling evidence for the role of nativity (and possibly language accent) in

the process of assigning racial meanings to bodies and populations, *net* a multivariate distribution of skin color, hair texture and bone structure – i.e., *net* being Black.

Ethnoracism assumes, relies on, or works with, ethnoracialization. If populations that otherwise look the same experience race or ethnoracism differently, we must have different racial or ethnoracial stereotypes for these populations. This is true for African Americans and Afro Caribbeans. That is, it is not only true that Afro Caribbeans allow Whites to interact with Black people that do not inherently symbolize “the sorry history of American race relations,” but that African American and Afro Caribbean bodies and populations are also associated with specific and different racialized stereotypes. Since relations between Whites and African Americans are rooted in the American “colonial situation” (Grosfoguel and Georas 2000: 87, Jordan 1968), Whites associate African Americans with racial troupes that were developed as part of an effort to justify and manage racial slavery (Fields 1990, Jordan 1968). Therefore, African Americans are racially stereotyped as “lazy,” (Allen 1996, Grosfoguel 2004, Kinder and Sears 1981), “racially paranoid” (Jackson 2008) and antagonistic (Waters 1999c, Waters 1999d). However, when the Black body has origins that are outside of American slavery and colonialism, it is often associated with a modified set of racial or ethnoracial stereotypes (Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Grosfoguel 2004). Since slavery and colonialism in the Caribbean was not directly managed by Whites in the United States (Williams 1944) and given the “selective” processes (Bashi 2007, Model 2008c) involved in their “voluntary” decision to migrate (Ogbu 1978), Afro Caribbeans are often stereotyped as a “model minority,” whose relative success results from a ‘greater value for hard work’ and a tendency to be more ‘racially docile and compliant’ than African Americans (Ifatunji 2016, Prashad 2000, Sowell 1978, Suzuki 1977).

Theories of ethnoracism and ethnoracialization fit well within larger trends toward ‘racial multidimensionality’ and the increasing use of ‘ethnoracial terminology’ across assorted studies of race and ethnicity within the social sciences. For instance, a number of scholars are now arguing that we experience race “not as a single, consistent identity but as a number of conflicting dimensions... including racial identity, self-classification, observed race, reflected race, phenotype and racial ancestry” (Roth 2016: 1310). While these scholars work to widen the conceptual terrain for understanding the ways in which race works in our daily lives, the proposed dimensions are corporeal – i.e., they turn on the body and the underlying reasons for its physical form. Recent debates are pointing toward a shift from this kind of ‘racial ontology’ toward a kind of revised multidimensional ontology that jointly references ‘racial’ and ‘ethnic’ elements (Alcoff 2009, Aranda and Rebollo-Gil 2004, Goldberg 1993, Lewis and Forman 2017, Monk 2016, Paredes 2018). Important signs of the coming turn toward such an ontology include the rapidly increasing use of the term ethnoracial in place of race or ethnicity and the development of theories that reference the racialization of ‘ethnic characteristics’ (e.g., language, religion and nationality; Kim 1999, Ngai 2004, Selod and Embrick 2013, Urciuoli 1996). Given the rise of ethnoracial terminology and nomenclature, it may very well be that social scientists will need to *formally* develop an ‘ethnoracial ontology’ for the study of race and ethnicity in settler and colonial societies.

ENDNOTES

¹ I refer to those born in the Caribbean Islands (or West Indies) and that would likely self-identify and/or be identified by others as Black in the United States as ‘Black immigrants from the Caribbean’ or ‘Afro Caribbeans.’

² I refer to business owners, employers, supervisors, bosses, and managers as ‘managers.’

³ This is a measure of “... efficacious mental and physical vigor... a strong commitment to hard work; and... a single-minded determination to succeed” in the face of blocked opportunities (James 1994: 169).

⁴ Most of the English-speaking Afro Caribbeans are Jamaicans. Most of the non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans are Haitians but some are from Spanish-speaking countries.

⁵ Models with log transformations for income were not substantively different on the association between White management and income. I use models without transformations to aid in interpretation. Using the same filters used by Model (2008: 48), estimates for annual personal income in the NSAL are \$30,904 (+/- 1,252) for African American men, \$37,792 (+/- 5,812) for Afro Caribbean men, \$22,370 (+/- 771) for African American women and \$27,551 (+/- 1,550) for Afro Caribbean women. These estimates are within range of those presented by Model for the 2000 U.S. Census.

⁶ Four-hundred respondents, or about 14 percent, reported a manager that was neither Black nor White. Separate bivariate regression models for employed African Americans and Afro Caribbeans with log annual income as the outcome and a dummy variable for the race and gender of the manager [White male (omitted), White female, Black male, Black female] show no differences across the four manager categories for African Americans (White female $b = -.020$, $p = .827$; Black male $b = -.147$, $p = .310$; Black female $b = -.220$, $p = .201$) and that the main differences for Afro Caribbeans are between White and Black managers (White female $b = -.283$, $p = .137$; Black male $b = -.663$, $p = .006$; Black female $b = -.527$, $p = .019$).

⁷ In analyses that are available upon request, I considered measures for respondent accent. These models revealed no association between accent and income and did not change the association between having a White manager and income. As White managers do not reference accent in their evaluations, accent is not in the final models.

⁸ In analyses that are available upon request, I also tested for a measure of self-reported work ethnic and John Henryism. These are not associated with income (Ifatunji 2016, Ifatunji 2017) and did not change the effect of having a White manager.

⁹ In analyses that are available upon request, I considered a wider set of racial attitudes. These did not change the association between White management and income. I include measures that are closest to the attitudes White managers reference in their Afro Caribbean preference.

¹⁰ The association between White Management and income was not sensitive to including more controls, including: a squared term for age, a measure of earlier work experience, whether the respondent lived in a suburb and weekly hours worked.

¹¹ Given the sample size, I was unable to examine separate models for men and women.

¹² Appendix F presents models for labor force participation and employment. They show that the full set of study covariates do not explain differential labor market participation rates and that social background factors alone account for differences in employment.

¹³ Estimates for differences in years of education are within the range of earlier estimates (see Hamilton 2014).

¹⁴ This pattern holds even after adjusting for all other study variables (*see* Appendix E).

¹⁵ Appendix F shows no association between occupational status and having a White manager.

¹⁶ These statistical tests are available upon request.

¹⁷ Most of this reduction is attributable to education (*see* Appendices A-E).

¹⁸ Appendix F shows that these patterns are no different for log annual personal income.

REFERENCES

- Alcoff, Linda Martín. 2009. "Latinos Beyond the Binary." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 47(S1):112-28.
- Allen, Bem P. 1996. "African Americans' and European Americans' Mutual Attributions: Adjective Generation Technique (Agt) Stereotyping." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 26(10):884-912.
- Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Aranda, Elizabeth. 2006a. "Ethnoracial Marginalization and Cultural Alienation." Pp. 105-42. *Emotional Bridges to Puerto Rico: Migration, Return Migration and the Struggles of Incorporation*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Aranda, Elizabeth M. 2006b. *Emotional Bridges to Puerto Rico: Migration, Return Migration, and the Struggles of Incorporation*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Aranda, Elizabeth M. and Guillermo Rebollo-Gil. 2004. "Ethnoracism and the "Sandwiched" Minorities." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47:910-27.
- Arrow, Kenneth J. 1972. "Models of Discrimination." Pp. 142-59 in *Economic Life*, edited by A. H. Pashal. Washington, DC: Heath and Company.
- Arrow, Kenneth J. 1973. "The Theory of Discrimination." in *Discrimination in Labor Markets*, edited by O. Ashenfelter and A. Rees. Princeton, New Jersey: University of Princeton Press.
- Bao, Xiaolan. 2001. *Holding up More Than Half the Sky: Chinese Women Garment Workers in New York City, 1948-92*: University of Illinois Press.

- Baron, James N. and William T. Bielby. 1980. "Bringing the Firms Back In: Stratification, Segmentation, and the Organization of Work." *American Sociological Review* 45(5):737-65.
- Bashi Bobb, Vilna and Averil Clarke. 2001. "Experiencing Success: Structuring the Perception of Opportunities for West Indians." Pp. 216-36 in *Islands in the City: West Indian Migration to New York*, edited by N. Foner. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bashi, Vilna. 2007. *Survival of the Knitted: Immigrant Social Networks in a Stratified World*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Becker, Gary Stanley. 1957. *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Benson, Janel F. 2006. "Exploring the Racial Identities of Black Immigrants in the United States." *Sociological Forum* 21(2):219-47.
- Blauner, Robert. 1969. "Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt." *Social Problems* 16(4):393-408.
- Brick, J Michael and Douglas Williams. 2013. "Explaining Rising Nonresponse Rates in Cross-Sectional Surveys." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645(1):36-59.
- Brown, Tony N. 2001. "Measuring Self-Perceived Racial and Ethnic Discrimination in Social Surveys." *Sociological Spectrum* 21(3):377-92.
- Bryce-Laporte, Roy Simon. 1972. "Black Immigrants: The Experience of Invisibility and Inequality." *Journal of Black Studies* 3(1):29-56.

- Chiswick, Barry R. 1978. "The Effects of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men." *Journal of Political Economy* 86(5):897-921.
- Corra, Mamadi K and Casey Borch. 2014. "Socioeconomic Differences among Blacks in America: Over Time Trends." *Race and Social Problems* 6(2):103-19.
- Davey, Adam, Michael J. Shanahan and Joseph L. Schafer. 2001. "Correcting for Selective Nonresponse in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Using Multiple Imputation." *Journal of Human Resources* 36(3):500-19.
- De Leeuw, Edith and Wim De Heer. 2002. "Trends in Household Survey Nonresponse: A Longitudinal and International Comparison." Pp. 41-54 in *Survey Nonresponse*, edited by R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge and R. J. A. Little. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Deaux, Kay, Nida Bikmen, Alwyn Gilkes, Ana Ventuneac, Yvanne Joseph, Yasser A. Payne and Claude M. Steele. 2007. "Becoming American: Stereotype Threat Effects in Afro-Caribbean Immigrant Groups." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(4):384-404.
- Dodoo, Francis Nii-Amoo. 1997. "Assimilation Differences among Africans in America." *Social Forces* 76(2):527-46.
- Domínguez, Virginia R. 1975. *From Neighbor to Stranger: The Dilemma of Caribbean Peoples in the U.S.* New Haven, CT: Antilles Research Program.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1897. "The Conservation of Races." *The American Negro Academy Occasional Papers* 2.
- Essed, Philomena. 1991. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory.* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Feagin, Joe R. and Melvin P. Sikes. 1994. *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience.* Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.

- Fields, Barbara. 1990. "Slavery, Race and Ideology in the United States of America." *New Left Review* 181:95-118.
- Foner, Nancy and Richard Napoli. 1978. "Jamaican and Black-American Migrant Farm Workers: A Comparative Analysis." *Social Problems* 25(5):491-503.
- Foner, Nancy. 1985. "Race and Color: Jamaican Migrants in London and New York City." *International Migration Review* 19(4):708-27.
- Gaddis, S Michael. 2014. "Discrimination in the Credential Society: An Audit Study of Race and College Selectivity in the Labor Market." *Social Forces*:sou111.
- Gans, Herbert. 1979. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Culture." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:1-20.
- Giuliano, Laura, David I Levine and Jonathan Leonard. 2009. "Manager Race and the Race of New Hires." *Journal of Labor Economics* 27(4):589-631.
- Goldberg, David Theo. 1993. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Greer, Christina M. 2013. *Black Ethnics: Race, Immigration and the Pursuit of the American Dream*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2004. "Race and Ethnicity or Racialized Ethnicities? Identities within Global Coloniality." *Ethnicities* 4(3):315-36.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón and Chloe S Georas. 2000. "'Coloniality of Power' and Racial Dynamics: Notes toward a Reinterpretation of Latino Caribbeans in New York City." *Identities* 7(1):85-125.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2003. *Colonial Subjects: Puerto Ricans in a Global Perspective*: Univ of California Press.

- Groves, Robert M. 2006. "Nonresponse Rates and Nonresponse Bias in Household Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70(5):646-75.
- Hall, Stuart. 1988. "New Ethnicities." Pp. 27-31 in *Black Film/British Cinema*, edited by K. Mercer. London, England: Institute of Contemporary Arts.
- Hamilton, Tod G, Janeria A Easley and Angela R Dixon. 2018. "Black Immigration, Occupational Niches, and Earnings Disparities between Us-Born and Foreign-Born Blacks in the United States." *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 4(1):60-77.
- Hamilton, Tod G. 2014. "Selection, Language Heritage and the Earnings Trajectories of Black Immigrants in the United States." *Demography* 51(3):975-1002.
- Heckman, James J and Tim Kautz. 2012. "Hard Evidence on Soft Skills." *Labour Economics* 19(4):451-64.
- Heeringa, Steven G., James Wagner, Myriam Torres, Naihua Duan, Terry Adams and Patricia Berglund. 2004. "Sample Designs and Sampling Methods for the Collaborative Psychiatric Epidemiology Studies (Cpes)." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 13(4):221-40.
- Heeringa, Steven G., Myriam Torres, J. Sweetman and R. Baser. 2006. "Sample Design, Weighting and Variance Estimation for the 2001-3 National Survey of American Life Adult Sample." Vol.: Survey Research Center of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.
- Higham, John. 1955. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*: Rutgers University Press.

- Ifatunji, Mosi Adesina. 2016. "A Test of the Afro Caribbean Model Minority Hypothesis: Exploring the Role of Cultural Attributes in Labor Market Disparities between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 31(1):109-38.
- Ifatunji, Mosi Adesina. 2017. "Labor Market Disparities between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans: Re-Examining the Role of Immigrant Selectivity." *Sociological Forum* 32(3):522-43.
- Jackson, James, Cleopatra Howard Caldwell, Myriam Torres and Julie Sweetman. 2012. "The National Survey of American Life: Innovations in Research with Ethnically Diverse Black Samples." Pp. 171-89 in *Researching Black Communities: A Methodological Guide*, edited by J. S. Jackson, C. H. Caldwell and S. L. Sellers. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Jackson, James S. 1991. "Methodological Approach." Pp. 13-30. *Life in black America*. Sage Publications.
- Jackson, James S., Harold W. Neighbors, Randolph M. Nesse, Steven J. Trierweiler and Myriam Torres. 2004a. "Methodological Innovations in the National Survey of American Life." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 13(4):289-98.
- Jackson, James S., Myriam Torres, Cleopatra H. Caldwell, Harold W. Neighbors, Randolph M. Nesse, Robert Joseph Taylor, Steven J. Trierweiler and David R. Williams. 2004b. "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.

- Jackson, John L. 2008. *Racial Paranoia: The Unintended Consequences of Political Correctness*. New York, NY: Basic Civitas Books.
- James, Sherman A. 1994. "John Henryism and the Health of African Americans." *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 18(2):163-82.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. 1968. *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kaplowitz, Michael D, Timothy D Hadlock and Ralph Levine. 2004. "A Comparison of Web and Mail Survey Response Rates." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68(1):94-101.
- Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Politics & Society* 27(1):105-38.
- Kinder, Donald R. and David O. Sears. 1981. "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism Versus Racial Threats to the Good." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 40(3):414-31.
- Kish, Leslie. 1965. *Survey Sampling*. New York, New York: J. Wiley Publishers.
- Lewis, Amanda E. and Tyrone A. Forman. 2017. "Race, Ethnicity and Disciplinary Divides: What Is the Path Forward?". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*:1-8.
- Mason, Patrick. 2010. "Culture and Intra-racial Wage Inequality among America's African Diaspora." *American Economic Review* 100(2):309-15.
- Model, Suzanne. 2008a. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Model, Suzanne. 2008b. "Testing the Cultural Hypotheses." Pp. 89-115. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?* Russell Sage Foundation.
- Model, Suzanne. 2008c. "Testing the Hypothesis of Selectivity." Pp. 71-88. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?* Russell Sage Foundation.

- Model, Suzanne. 2008d. "Testing the White Favoritism Hypothesis." Pp. 116-42. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?* Russell Sage Foundation.
- Monk, Ellis P. 2016. "The Consequences of "Race and Color" in Brazil." *Social Problems* 63(3):413-30.
- Moss, Philip and Chris Tilly. 2001. *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America*: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ngai, Mae M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ogbu, John U. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 2014. *Racial Formation in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pager, Devah, Bruce Western and Bart Bonikowski. 2009. "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market a Field Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 74(5):777-99.
- Paredes, Cristian L. 2018. "Multidimensional Ethno-Racial Status in Contexts of Mestizaje: Ethno-Racial Stratification in Contemporary Peru." *Socius* 4:2378023118762002.
- Patterson, Orlando. 1995. "The Culture of Caution: The Caribbean Roots of Powell's Decision." *The New Republic*, November 27, pp. 22-26.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. and Carmi Schooler. 1978. "The Structure of Coping." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 19(1):2-21.
- Phelps, Edmund S. 1972. "The Statistical Theory of Racism and Sexism." *American Economic Review* 62(4):659-61.

- 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(1):74-96.
- Prashad, Vijay. 2000. *The Karma of Brown Folk*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Reich, Michael, David M Gordon and Richard C Edwards. 1973. "A Theory of Labor Market Segmentation." *American Economic Review* 63(2):359-65.
- Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. "Hiring as Cultural Matching the Case of Elite Professional Service Firms." *American Sociological Review* 77(6):999-1022.
- Rivera, Lauren A. 2015. "Go with Your Gut: Emotion and Evaluation in Job Interviews." *American Journal of Sociology* 120(5):1339-89.
- Roth, Wendy D. 2016. "The Multiple Dimensions of Race." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39(8):1310-38.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1987. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New Jersey, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Selod, Saher and David G. Embrick. 2013. "Racialization and Muslims: Situating the Muslim Experience in Race Scholarship." *Sociology Compass* 7(8):644-55.
- Smith, Candis Watts. 2013. "Ethnicity and the Role of Group Consciousness: A Comparison between African Americans and Black Immigrants." *Politics, Groups and Identities* 1(2):199-220.
- Sowell, Thomas. 1978. "Three Black Histories." Pp. 7-64 in *Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups*, edited by T. Sowell and L. D. Collins. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- Spence, Michael. 2002. "Signaling in Retrospect and the Informational Structure of Markets." *The American Economic Review* 92(3):434-59.
- Stoll, Michael A, Steven Raphael and Harry J Holzer. 2004. "Black Job Applicants and the Hiring Officer's Race." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 57(2):267-87.
- Suzuki, Bob H. 1977. "Education and the Socialization of Asian Americans: A Revisionist Analysis of the 'Model Minority' Thesis." *Amerasia Journal* 4:23-52.
- Tuan, Mia. 1998. *Forever Foreigners or Honorary Whites? The Asian Ethnic Experience Today*. New Brunswick, New Jersey and London: Rutgers University Press.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie. 1996. "Racialization and Language." Pp. 15-40 in *Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race and Class*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Vickerman, Milton. 1999. *Crosscurrents: West Indian Immigrants and Race*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Waters, Mary C. 1999a. "West Indians and African Americans at Work: Structural Differences and Cultural Stereotypes." Pp. 194-227 in *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*, edited by F. D. Bean and S. Bell-Rose. New York, New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Waters, Mary C. 1999b. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Waters, Mary C. 1999c. "Encountering American Race Relations." Pp. 140-91 in *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

- Waters, Mary C. 1999d. "Explaining the Comfort Factor: West Indian Immigrants Confront American Race Relations." Pp. 63-96 in *The Cultural Territories of Race: Black and White Boundaries*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Watkins-Owens, Irma. 2001. "Early-Twentieth Century Caribbean Women: Migration and Social Networks in New York." Pp. 25-51 in *Islands in the City: West Indian Migration to New York*, edited by N. Foner. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Watson, Nicole and Mark Wooden. 2009. "Identifying Factors Affecting Longitudinal Survey Response." Pp. 157-59 in *Methodology of Longitudinal Surveys*, edited by P. Lynn. United Kingdom: John Wiley and Sons.
- White, Ian R., Patrick Royston and Angela M. Wood. 2011. "Multiple Imputation Using Chained Equations: Issues and Guidance for Practice." *Statistics in Medicine* 30(4):377-99.
- Williams, Eric. 1944. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Kingston and Miami: Ian Randle Publishers.
- Wilson, Franklin D. 2003. "Ethnic Niching and Metropolitan Labor Markets." *Social Science Research* 32(3):429-66.
- Wilson, Logan and Harlan Gilmore. 1943. "White Employers and Negro Workers." *American Sociological Review* 8(6):698-705.
- Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(4):970-1022.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables by Black Ethnicity and Immigrant Language (Unadjusted Means)

	African American	Afro Caribbean		
		All	English	Non
Annual personal income	27281 ^a (859)	33327 [^] (3002)	34654 (3769)	28422 (1919)
Labor Quality				
Years of education	12.92 (.083)	13.02 (.170)	13.03 (.204)	12.99 (.215)
Personal Mastery	3.28 ^b (.020)	3.16 ^{**} (.038)	3.23 ^c (.051)	2.93 (.069)
Racial Attitudes				
Okay with qualified white manager ⁱ	1.02 (.036)	1.16 (.089)	1.16 (.100)	1.18 (.143)
Whites and minorities never comfortable ⁱ	3.12 (.033)	3.05 (.091)	3.09 (.111)	2.92 (.138)
Minorities should blame themselves ⁱ	2.61 (.039)	2.76 (.086)	2.77 (.109)	2.72 (.120)
Firm Context				
Labor market discrimination	.399 (.023)	.349 (.065)	.353 (.079)	.336 (.061)
Has a white manager	.518 (.012)	.505 (.021)	.504 (.030)	.510 (.045)
Demographics				
Male	.471 (.011)	.503 (.031)	.500 (.038)	.516 (.042)
Age	37.8 ^{ab} (.391)	39.9 [*] (.849)	39.8 (1.11)	40.3 (.948)
South	.569 ^{ab} (.027)	.332 ^{**} (.081)	.346 (.096)	.283 (.065)
New York	.039 ^{ab} (.009)	.416 ^{***} (.047)	.419 (.055)	.407 (.059)
Florida	.042 ^{ab} (.009)	.172 [*] (.050)	.157 (.065)	.229 (.057)
Currently married	.450 ^{ab} (.014)	.632 ^{***} (.028)	.640 (.033)	.603 (.034)
Lower Occupation	.457 (.012)	.423 (.027)	.406 (.033)	.488 (.052)
Middle Occupation	.335 (.011)	.310 (.039)	.301 (.046)	.343 (.058)
High Occupation	.207 ^a (.011)	.267 (.041)	.293 ^c (.050)	.169 (.031)
Self-employment	.120 (.007)	.167 (.036)	.184 (.045)	.106 (.036)
N	2,003	756	516	240

¹ Statistical significance for the comparison between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans: p < .10 = ^, p < .05 = *, p < .01 = ** and p < .001 = ***.

^a Statistical significance for the comparison between African Americans and English-speaking Afro Caribbeans, p < .10.

^b Statistical significance for the comparison between African Americans and Non-English-speaking Afro Caribbeans, p < .10.

^c Statistical significance for the comparison between English and non-English-speaking Afro Caribbeans, p < .10.

ⁱ The questions for this variable were included on the re-interview questionnaire.

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

Since the study used a complex survey design, the numbers in parentheses are linearized standard errors, not standard deviations.

Table 2.

**Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables by
Black Ethnicity and Immigrant Language (Unadjusted Means)**

	Afro Caribbean							
	African American		All		English		Non	
	non	White	non	White	non	White	non	White
Annual personal income	26894 (1177)	27641 (839)	26897 (1319)	39633 * (5203)	26709 (1780)	42487 * (6415)	27598 (2459)	29214 (1632)
N	968	1,035	398	358	286	230	112	128

¹ Statistical significance for the comparison between African Americans and Afro Caribbeans: $p < .10 = ^\wedge$, $p < .05 = *$, $p < .01 = **$ and $p < .001 = ***$.

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

Since the study used a complex survey design, the numbers in parentheses are linearized standard errors, not standard deviations.

Table 3.

**OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on
White Management and Social Demographic Controls**

	Afro Caribbeans			
	African Americans	All	English	Non
White manager	308 (1006)	9195** ^a (3009)	9639* ^b (3483)	5362** ^c (1636)
Demographics				
Male	6594*** (949)	9420** (3199)	10875* (3960)	536 ^c (2234)
Age	373*** (36)	557*** (138)	618*** ^b (161)	213 (155)
South	-4428** (1347)	-3271 (6421)	-6364 (7794)	14685*** ^c (2238)
New York	-2596 (2885)	2097 (4330)	-51 (5315)	11052** ^c (2836)
Florida	-1436 (2120)	-5960 (4701)	-5326 (4995)	-13625*** ^c (2786)
Currently married	7068*** (1296)	357 ^a (2302)	-421 ^b (2995)	5210 [^] (2536)
High Occupation	12907*** (1749)	24341*** ^a (4039)	24383*** ^b (4004)	17574*** (3563)
Self-employed	2559 (2363)	7033 (7859)	8507 (8000)	-2631 (4725)
Intercept	6439** (1865)	-4946 ^a (5127)	-5630 (6026)	5454 (5797)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.190	.233	.271	.152

Statistical significance: p < .10 = [^], p < .05 = *, p < .01 = ** and p < .001 = ***.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

Table 4. OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on White Management, Social Demographic Controls, Labor Quality, Racial Attitudes and Racial Discrimination

	African Americans	Afro Caribbeans		
		All	English	Non
White manager	-407 (894)	7845** ^a (2217)	7831** ^b (2597)	6592** ^c (2043)
Demographics				
Male	6918*** (861)	7527** (2503)	8966* (3213)	150 ^c (2620)
Age	352*** (35)	528*** (128)	553** (147)	368* (153)
South	-2669* (1265)	-5325 (4984)	-8703 (5836)	16109*** ^c (3329)
New York	-1357 (1696)	506 (3453)	-959 (4062)	7388** ^c (2514)
Florida	-1679 (2242)	-2555 (3470)	-934 (3732)	-15959*** ^c (3275)
Currently married	6382*** (1082)	1190 ^a (1875)	922 ^b (2345)	4123 (3007)
High Occupation	5283*** (1335)	16269*** ^a (2733)	16059*** ^b (2912)	11720** (3394)
Self-employed	2469 (2038)	6609 (5654)	8299 (5408)	-3621 (4395)
Labor Quality				
Years of education	3398*** (289)	2120*** ^a (477)	2112*** ^b (471)	2360** (789)
Personal Mastery	2846*** (567)	4067** (1213)	4663** (1581)	15 (1719)
Racial Attitudes				
Okay with qualified white manager	618 (597)	788 (1472)	1331 (1838)	-879 (1479)
Minorities should blame themselves	-413 (559)	454 (1306)	336 (1608)	21 (1360)
Whites and minorities comfortable	-99 (596)	-101 (1420)	447 (1769)	-896 (1574)
Racial discrimination	668 (787)	5075 [^] (2910)	5614 [^] (2984)	984 (1209)
Intercept	-44453*** (5555)	-43766** (12171)	-47392** (12709)	-25222 [^] ^c (13864)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.299	.287	.352	.167

Statistical significance: p < .10 = [^], p <.05 = *, p <.01 = ** and p <.001 = ***.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

**OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on
Appendix A. White Management, Social Demographic Controls and Years of Education**

	African American	Afro Caribbeans		
		All	English	Non
White manager	-421 (914)	8458** ^a (2844)	8347* ^b (3295)	6113** ^c (1766)
Demographics				
Male	7253*** (868)	8457** (2875)	9752* (3571)	519 ^c (2495)
Age	352*** (35)	593*** (144)	639*** (166)	360* (159)
South	-2840* (1250)	-5987 (5905)	-10141 (7106)	15891*** ^c (1933)
New York	-1465 (1721)	-955 (4218)	-3505 (5026)	7967** ^c (2631)
Florida	-1597 (2175)	-3655 (3886)	-2329 (4291)	-15157*** ^c (2500)
Currently married	6382*** (1106)	2208 (1902)	2180 (2363)	4170 (2786)
High Occupation	5677*** (1401)	17146*** ^a (3045)	16625*** ^b (3107)	11917** (3567)
Self-employed	2632 (2042)	7714 (7071)	9325 (6960)	-4096 (4362)
Years of Education	3650*** (297)	2686*** (594)	2868*** (636)	2288** (715)
Intercept	-38977*** (4330)	-38108** (12409)	-39870** (13234)	-27559* (12328)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.291	.278	.330	.179

Statistical significance: p < .10 = ^, p <.05 = *, p <.01 = ** and p <.001 = ***.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

**OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on
Appendix B. White Management, Social Demographic Controls and Personal Mastery**

	African American	Afro Caribbeans		
		All	English	Non
White manager	295 (977)	8783** (2767)	9209** (3146)	5175** (1763)
Demographics				
Male	6300*** (933)	9265** (3027)	10745** (3731)	485 ^c (2263)
Age	381*** (35)	547*** (137)	613*** (158)	212 (152)
South	-4268** (1317)	-3079 (5898)	-5056 (7087)	14034*** ^c (2248)
New York	-2566 (2424)	2928 (4146)	1814 (4997)	10914** ^c (2843)
Florida	-1398 (2174)	-4555 (3898)	-4149 (4048)	-12908*** ^c (2329)
Currently married	6941*** (1260)	-239 ^a (2442)	-791 ^b (3114)	4820 ^a (2736)
High Occupation	11975*** (1606)	21784*** ^a (3539)	21611*** ^b (3531)	16800*** (3412)
Self-employed	2262 (2291)	7422 (7549)	9515 (7634)	-2951 (5128)
Personal Mastery	4476*** (642)	5909*** (1384)	7072*** (1682)	1516 (1693)
Intercept	-8205** (2692)	-22620* (8254)	-28549** ^b (10049)	1643 (8888)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.212	.249	.304	

Statistical significance: p < .10 = ^, p <.05 = *, p <.01 = ** and p <.001 = ***.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = p <.05

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

Appendix C. OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on White Management, Social Demographic Controls and Labor Quality

	African American	Afro Caribbeans		
		All	English	Non
White manager	-393 (901)	8282** ^a (2715)	8243* ^b (3103)	6163** ^c (1903)
Demographics				
Male	7036*** (852)	8470** (2834)	9818* (3514)	531 ^c (2476)
Age	358*** (35)	583*** (143)	633*** (163)	362* (152)
South	-2820* (1243)	-5555 (5524)	-8803 (6690)	16049*** ^c (2188)
New York	-1503 (1464)	-81 (4121)	-1854 (4958)	7953** ^c (2612)
Florida	-1565 (2197)	-3032 (3449)	-1973 (3721)	-15334*** ^c (2418)
Currently married	6337*** (1100)	1620 ^a (2017)	1598 (2507)	4238 (3022)
High Occupation	5458*** (1338)	16352*** ^a (2816)	15878*** ^b (2955)	12007** (3408)
Self-employed	2442 (2029)	7880 (6933)	9860 (6766)	-4049 (4509)
Labor Quality				
Years of education	3467*** (281)	2380*** (548)	2489*** (580)	2320** (790)
Personal Mastery	2798*** (572)	3729** (1175)	4524* (1656)	-327 (1737)
Intercept	-45849*** (4877)	-45490*** (12115)	-50009** (13640)	-27209* (12430)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.299	.285	.346	.176

Statistical significance: $p < .10 = ^\wedge$, $p < .05 = *$, $p < .01 = **$ and $p < .001 = ***$.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = $p < .05$

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = $p < .05$

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = $p < .05$

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

**OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on
Appendix D. White Management, Social Demographic Controls and Racial Attitudes**

	African American	Afro Caribbeans		
		All	English	Non
White manager	333 (1025)	8816** ^a (2744)	9217** ^b (3134)	5678** ^c (1818)
Demographics				
Male	6552*** (953)	9568** (3031)	11019** (3659)	499 ^c (2357)
Age	372*** (36)	559*** (138)	620*** (158)	212 (154)
South	-4151** (1325)	-4032 (6433)	-7738 (7593)	14832*** ^c (3243)
New York	-2436 (3049)	2134 (4245)	-210 (5146)	10851** ^c (2776)
Florida	-1759 (2191)	-5044 (4458)	-3847 (4698)	-13971** ^c (3484)
Currently married	7160*** (1280)	383 ^a (2232)	-349 ^b (2940)	5242 [^] (2572)
High Occupation	12289*** (1747)	24054*** ^a (3960)	23691*** ^b (3902)	17538*** (3576)
Self-employed	2803 (2362)	7030 (7530)	8625 (7486)	-2198 (4724)
Racial Attitudes				
Okay with qualified white manager	1234 [^] (630)	1976 (1589)	3018 (1949)	-929 (1612)
Minorities should blame themselves	-1304* (579)	256 (1412)	193 (1785)	-459 (1474)
Whites and minorities comfortable	620 (623)	591 (1506)	1186 (1884)	-231 (1626)
Intercept	6590* (3107)	-9521 (9467)	-12757 (10989)	8485 (9343)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.197	.233	.272	.146

Statistical significance: p < .10 = [^], p < .05 = *, p < .01 = ** and p < .001 = ***.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

**OLS Regression Models of Annual Personal Income on
Appendix E. White Management, Social Demographic Controls and Racial Discrimination**

	African American	Afro Caribbeans		
		All	English	Non
White manager	250 (989)	8779** ^a (2548)	9148** ^b (3002)	5374** ^c (1639)
Demographics				
Male	6396*** (953)	8168* (3079)	9451* (4048)	434 ^c (2308)
Age	363*** (35)	492*** (122)	515** (150)	214 (155)
South	-4226** (1346)	-2939 (5489)	-6104 (6431)	14878*** ^c (2466)
New York	-2502 (2992)	2438 (3655)	641 (4312)	10963*** ^c (2712)
Florida	-1453 (2076)	-5588 (4491)	-4371 (4718)	-13847*** ^c (2819)
Currently married	7135*** (1289)	98 ^a (2184)	-905 ^b (2862)	5187 ^a (2531)
High Occupation	12803*** (1808)	23451*** ^a (3186)	23509*** ^b (3141)	17518*** (3522)
Self-employed	2439 (2350)	5643 (6437)	6605 (6349)	-2675 (4636)
Racial discrimination	1088 (848)	6229 ^a (3230)	7456* (3450)	548 (1190)
Intercept	6385** (1860)	-3379 (4580)	-2808 (5543)	5322 (5879)
N	2003	756	516	240
Adjusted R ²	.190	.237	.282	.148

Statistical significance: p < .10 = ^a, p < .05 = *, p < .01 = ** and p < .001 = ***.

^a Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

^b Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all English-speaking Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

^c Results from a two-tailed z-test for the difference between African Americans and all non-English speaking Afro Caribbeans = p < .05

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size.

Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

Table includes all respondents ages 18-65 that were employed at the time of the study.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

Logit and OLS Regression Models of Labor Market Participation, Employment,

Appendix F. Having A White Manager and Log Annual Personal Income on Social Demographics, Labor Quality and Racial Attitudes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
White manager					0.130 (0.085)	0.380** (0.110)	0.366* (0.131)	0.441* (0.155)
Non English-speaking Afro Caribbean	0.965* (0.382)	0.303 (0.395)	0.592 (0.409)	0.116 (0.217)				
English-speaking Afro Caribbean	1.432*** (0.316)	0.674 (0.484)	0.874^ (0.493)	0.187 (0.158)				
Male	0.254^ (0.140)	0.153 (0.140)	0.164 (0.156)	0.161 (0.118)	0.202* (0.074)	0.203* (0.086)	0.163 (0.103)	0.315^ (0.158)
Age	-0.047*** (0.009)	0.022*** (0.006)	0.020*** (0.006)	-0.006 (0.005)	0.026*** (0.004)	0.017*** (0.004)	0.017*** (0.004)	0.022^ (0.011)
South	0.138 (0.154)	0.222 (0.177)	0.356^ (0.187)	-0.123 (0.101)	-0.126 (0.091)	0.056 (0.209)	-0.044 (0.269)	0.762* (0.276)
New York	-0.439* (0.184)	-0.422 (0.333)	-0.488^ (0.273)	-0.871*** (0.122)	-0.004 (0.132)	0.193 (0.154)	0.178 (0.203)	0.142 (0.151)
Florida	-0.174 (0.466)	-0.268 (0.174)	-0.314^ (0.169)	0.448* (0.191)	-0.263 (0.321)	-0.176 (0.120)	-0.073 (0.134)	-0.855** (0.269)
Currently married	0.319^ (0.160)	0.426* (0.211)	0.379^ (0.214)	0.290** (0.104)	0.374*** (0.073)	0.090 (0.098)	0.092 (0.127)	0.068 (0.145)
Self employed	0.138 (0.228)	0.488^ (0.291)	0.530 (0.335)	-1.127*** (0.185)	-0.107 (0.125)	-0.117 (0.166)	-0.011 (0.167)	-0.664^ (0.329)
Years of education	0.077* (0.029)		0.257*** (0.045)	0.056* (0.024)	0.152*** (0.017)	0.063** (0.018)	0.067** (0.021)	0.079* (0.033)
Personal Mastery	0.435*** (0.086)		0.357*** (0.091)	-0.008 (0.083)	0.220** (0.062)	0.117 (0.073)	0.133 (0.093)	-0.021 (0.117)
Okay with qualified white manager	-0.069 (0.084)		-0.160 (0.100)	0.037 (0.060)	0.010 (0.042)	-0.005 (0.069)	0.001 (0.085)	-0.009 (0.102)
Minorities should blame themselves	-0.145 (0.086)		-0.059 (0.088)	0.106 (0.076)	-0.012 (0.049)	0.011 (0.065)	0.000 (0.080)	0.041 (0.114)
Whites and minorities comfortable	-0.073 (0.083)		-0.028 (0.107)	0.040 (0.076)	-0.000 (0.052)	0.002 (0.064)	0.014 (0.076)	-0.021 (0.103)
Racial discrimination	0.196* (0.086)		-0.095 (0.118)	0.108 (0.069)	0.075^ (0.039)	0.043 (0.067)	0.054 (0.078)	-0.010 (0.108)
High Occupation				0.138 (0.124)	0.153 (0.102)	0.474*** (0.090)	0.415*** (0.099)	0.615*** (0.132)
Intercept	1.696** (0.596)	0.796** (0.245)	-3.029*** (0.708)	-0.907^ (0.525)	5.822*** (0.392)	7.693*** (0.423)	7.633*** (0.549)	7.504*** (0.907)
N	3591	3120	3120	2759	2003	756	516	240
R-sq	.105	.034	.100	.036	.155	.145	.192	.092

Statistical significance: p < .10 = ^, p < .05 = *, p < .01 = ** and p < .001 = ***.

Tests of statistical significance are sensitive to differences in sample size. Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3.

The analysis includes sampling weights that account for the probability of selection and returning the re-interview questionnaire.

¹ Logit regression model predicting labor market participation.

² Logit regression model predicting employment. Only includes labor market participants.

³ Logit regression model predicting employment. Only includes labor market participants.

⁴ Logit regression model predicting having a White manager. Only includes employed respondents.

⁵ OLS regression model predicting log annual personal income for African Americans. Only includes employed respondents.

⁶ OLS regression model predicting log annual personal income for Afro Caribbeans. Only includes employed respondents.

⁷ OLS regression model predicting log annual personal income for English-speaking Afro Caribbeans. Only includes employed respondents.

⁸ OLS regression model predicting log annual personal income for non-English-speaking Afro Caribbeans. Only includes employed respondents.