WEST INDIES AND CARIBBEAN IMMIGRANTS EARNINGS IN THE UNITED STATES: THE PENALITIES ASSOCIATED WITH ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND RACIAL SELF-IDENTIFICATION

(WORKING DRAFT)

David G. Embrick
Texas A&M University

and

Rogelio Saenz
Texas A&M University

and

Maria Cristina Morales
University of Las Vegas

*Please direct all correspondence to David G. Embrick, Texas A&M University, Department of Sociology, 311 Academic Building, College Station, TX 77843

West Indies and Caribbean Immigrants Earnings in the United States: The Penalties Associated With English Proficiency and Racial Self-Identification

ABSTRACT

Objective. Research on future U.S. race relations suggest that racial discrimination, especially by employers in the job market, may be determined by skin tone and proficiency of the English language. The influence of these two factors may be especially detrimental to immigrants of color such as those from the West Indies and the Caribbean. The purpose of this research is to examine the impact that skin tone (we operationalize this variable using the Black recode and race variables from the Census) and language proficiency may have on the earnings of West Indies. The earnings of Russian immigrants will serve as a comparison group. *Method*. We use data from the 2000 U.S. Census 5% PUMS to compare the effects of skin tone and language proficiency on earnings. *Results*. When West Indies and Russian Immigrants are compared, we find that for men, skin color and language proficiency determine wage earnings. However, with the exception of language proficiency, there is no evidence that skin color is a factor that influences wage earnings for women. *Conclusion*. There is limited evidence supporting the theory that America is moving from a Black/White racial structure towards one that is tri- or multi-tiered (Bonilla-Silva and Embrick Forthcoming). However, we conclude that much more needs to be done on this relatively untapped research topic.

A consensus has been reached among social science scholars (Bean and Stevens 2003; Clark 1998; Durand et al. 2000; Massey et al. 2003; Saenz and Morales forthcoming; Waters 2003) that the minority population in the United States will numerically surpass that of whites within the next 25 to 50 years, with the largest of that group being comprised of the Mexican-origin population and other Latino groups. This demographic trend has fueled a number of theories predicting future United States race relations among whites and minorities (Alba 1999; Bean and Stevens 2003; Bonilla-Silva and Glover forthcoming; Bonilla-Silva et al.; Clark 1998; Yancey 2003). For example, Bean and Stevens (2003) predict a somewhat favorable outcome for Latino and other minority groups. They claim that as the population of minorities in the U.S. increases, the more likely racial boundaries will become blurred and the more likely Latinos will enter into markets previously dominated by whites. The result is a shifting of race relations that may be more beneficial to those of Mexican-origin, Latino, and other minority groups.

Yancey (2003) predicts a similar outcome with the exception of Blacks in the U.S. According to him, the Black/white divide in America is one that will continue to dominate U.S. race relations. Thus, Asian and Latino groups will eventually assimilate to the dominant white ways of thinking and be much less likely to ally themselves with Blacks. The result will be the continued segregation of Blacks in the U.S. without any support from other racial and ethic groups in the stride for racial equality or justice.

Clark (1998), on the other hand, predicts a much less favorable outcome for Mexican-origin individuals and other Latino groups as they outgrow the white majority in the U. S. The argument is similar to Wilson's (1996) claim that because Blacks have

very little access to job opportunities, compared to whites, they are limited to mostly undesirable jobs in the labor market, in turn creating a new class of people which he refers to as the "underclass." Hence, Clark argues that increased Mexican-origin and Latino groups will most likely experience a similar situation in that they will form a new underclass that is limited to low-wage jobs with little or no benefits. While Clark's (1998) focus is mostly on Mexican-origin and other Latino immigrant workers, a conclusion can be drawn that increased resentment and fear of newly arriving immigrants will also transfer to other Mexican American and Latino groups who have been in the United States for a longer period of time.

Latin Americanization

Alternative studies on race relations in the United States suggest that there is a trend evolving in America that rewards people who adhere to the dominant normative structure of the white middle class, a pattern that is closely resembling the racial structure of many Latin American countries (Bonilla-Silva and Glover forthcoming; Doane and Bonilla-Silva 2003; Bonilla-Silva et al. 2003; Waters 2001). Specifically, these researchers theorize that the racial structure in the U.S. will be determined by noticeable physical and verbal characteristics such as skin color or tone, English fluency, or a combination of the two. Thus, those who are lighter skinned and are more fluent in English will comprise the top levels of "white" American values and hence be afforded the most favorable economic and social rewards, or as many social scientists have claimed, they will gain the privileges of whiteness (Ignatiev 1995; McIntosh 2001; Roediger 1991). In contrast, those who are darker skinned and are less fluent in English will be at the bottom economic and social strata in the U.S. In this case, however, a more

adequate claim would be that lighter skinned and clearer English speaking individuals in America would gain the privileges of "lightness."

Of most noticeable importance is the inclusion of a third group labeled "honorary whites" (see Bonilla-Silva et al. 2003) who serve as a buffer between the lightest and the darkest skinned groups in a tri-racial hierarchal pyramid of race relations in the United States (see figure 1). According to Bonilla-Silva et al. (2003), "honorary whites" will gain some of the benefits of being lighter skinned compared to other darker skinned groups at the bottom of the pyramid, but they will most likely be unable to gain the full benefits of whiteness given those at the top of the pyramid.

*****Insert Figure 1 About Here*****

In this paper, we use data from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau's 5% PUMS to determine the effects of skin color and language proficiency on earnings. We focus our research on immigrants from the West Indies countries and Russia. If Bonilla-Silva et al.'s (2003) theory of "Latinization of America" holds true, our data should show a positive relation between English proficiency and earnings as well as a positive relation between skin tone and earnings. Thus, the lighter skinned and more fluent in English a person is, the more earnings that person should receive.

Focusing our models on West Indies countries is useful in two ways. First, although little attention is paid to immigrants coming from these countries (see Waters 2003 for more detail on this) they do constitute one of the larger groups of immigrants coming to the United States (Camarota 2001). Second, because of the language

differences present[1] in the West Indies Islands, we are able to examine differences in earnings that may occur between countries who predominately speak English and countries who predominantly speak French or Spanish. Because the islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe had insufficient sample sizes, we decided to include them in a category we designated as 'other.' Thus, Haiti represents the sole French speaking country in our models.

Russia (measured as a dummy variable: Russia=1, otherwise=0) is included in our model as the reference country. We decided on Russia for several reasons. First, we wanted a group that represented current immigration trends. Second, because we were looking at differences in English fluency and accent as well as skin-tone, we needed a group with a noticeable accent that was easily distinguishable from the English language. Lastly, several studies suggest Russian immigrants as one of the largest groups immigrating to the U.S. since the late 1970's (Foner 1987; Gold and Rumbaut 2004; Magocsi 1996). Moreover, Camarota (2001) lists Russian as one of the top twenty countries of birth since 1970. That is, when looking at solely immigrants coming from Europe, Russian immigrants represent one of the largest current groups coming into the U.S.

Previous Research

Skin Tone and Phenotype Penalties

Plenty of studies have suggested that certain racial and ethnic groups have more economic (Oliver and Shapiro 1997), political (Sugrue 1998), and psychological (Kovel 1984) benefits compared to other groups. However, these studies tend to focus on

[1] The impact of colonialism and other historical factors have influenced language and culture on the islands so that three main languages can be found in the West Indies Islands: French (or a close dialect), English, and Spanish.

discrimination between racial or ethnic groups rather than within groups. Indeed, most of these studies are concentrated along a Black/ white polarization rather than along a racial color continuum. Hence, very little research has been conducted on the impact of skin tone and phenotype on wages and earnings within certain racial and ethnic groups such as Black or Mexican Americans in the United States, although this literature has expanded somewhat in the last several years.

Research that has been conducted on skin tone and phenotype suggests that employers may place negative sanctions on individuals who are darker skinned and who do not exhibit typical Caucasian facial features. For example, studies conducted by Telles and Murguia (1990, 1992) found that skin tone and phenotype are important factors in determining earnings and wages in the United States. Using data from the 1979 National Chicano Survey, Telles and Murguia's (1990) findings illustrated that Mexican Americans who have darker complexions and who exhibit more indigenous features receive substantially lower earnings compared to Mexican Americans who are lighter skinned and who have more European-like phenotype. According to these authors, earnings are structured along a skin tone continuum in which Mexican Americans with light-skinned receive the highest earnings, followed by medium-skinned Mexican Americans, with darker-skinned Mexican Americans at the very bottom making the least highest earnings.

More current research reinforces these previous findings and suggests that lighter-skinned minority group members do enjoy more "white" privileges and greater acceptance in the United States compared to their darker skinned counterparts (Hunter 2002; Murguia and Forman 2003; Murguia and Telles 1996; Saenz and Morales

forthcoming). For example, Murguia and Forman (2003) argue that there are certain factors that need to be taken into consideration when looking at the assimilation or acceptance of Mexican Americans by whites in the United States. Namely, there are eight factors that influence whites' evaluation of Mexican Americans: name and/or surname, English proficiency, phenotype, height, religion, social class, and ethnic and racial self-identity. Thus, the more factors that Mexican Americans have that are similar to those of whites, the more "white privileges" those Mexican Americans will receive in U.S. society. In the case of employment, employers may discriminate less against those Mexican Americans who are more likely to fit the typical white American profile.

Accent and English Proficiency Penalties

There is also plenty of evidence supporting the argument that English proficiency enhances earnings and social standing in the United States (Davila et al. 1993; Davila and Mora 2000; Garcia 1984; Mora 1998; Tienda and Neidert 1984; Murguia and Forman 2003). Speaking proper grammatical English is equated with assimilation into the acceptable white middle class norms of America. Thus, as noted by Murguia and Forman (2003), as a factor influencing social acceptance, the more fluent Mexican Americans and other minorities are at speaking English, the more likely whites will view them as different from others in their minority group and thus, closer to the "white" majority. However, as further noted by Murguia and Forman (2003), this is only one of eight factors that need to be taken into consideration when looking at how whites view Mexican Americans and other minorities in the U.S. Thus in addition to their status as "foreigners" some immigrants also must deal with issues of English proficiency.

Less studied are the penalties associated with having accented speech. According to Davila et al. (1993), there is an assumption that individuals with similar levels of English fluency will also have similar accents. Hence, the authors note that English proficiency is, and should be, held independent of accent. Davila et al. (1993) found that independent of English proficiency, Mexican Americans without accents tended to earn significantly higher wages compared to their accented counterparts. One of the reasons the authors gave to account for this phenomenon is that having an accent could be equated to undocumented immigration. Thus, in being a minority and having an accent[2], white employers may attach any number of labels to a person such as unskilled labor or undocumented immigrant, and in turn would be more likely to pay that person lower wages compared to others who do not exhibit an accented speech.

Following the theoretical arguments made by Bonilla-Silva and others, we anticipate the following hypotheses:

> H_1: Individuals from West Indies countries that are not primarily English speaking countries should receive fewer earnings compared to West Indies countries that speak primarily English.
>
> H_2: Individuals from West Indies countries should receive less earnings compared to the reference group, individuals from Russia.
>
> H_3: Skin tone should have a negative correlation with hourly wage earnings. Thus, the lighter skin tone a person is, the higher earnings that person should receive. Contrary, the darker the persons' skin tone, the fewer earnings received.
>
> H_4: English proficiency should have a positive correlation with hourly wage earnings. Hence, being fluent in the English language increases earnings. On the other hand, the less fluent a person is in the English language, the lower earnings they are expected to receive.

[2] There are a significant number of immigrants, both first and second generation, who are citizens and still have an accent.

Methods

This study uses data from the 5% Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2004) of the 2000 U.S. Census. Because the PUMS represents a 5 percent sample of the nation's population, it is one of the largest and comprehensive data sets available to examine demographic and socioeconomic patterns. The PUMS contains person weights, which are a function of both the "full census sample weight and the PUMS sample design" (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1993: 4-1). Because we are not interested in producing population estimates in our analysis, we remove the full census sample weights from the person by dividing each person by the average sample weight (i.e., 19.9852704) for the entire PUMS. These revised weights are used throughout the analysis to account for differential sampling probabilities.

The analysis includes persons of Russian or West Indies origin 16 years of age and older, who had earnings in 1999, and who worked at least 1040 hours (the equivalent of six months of full-time, or twelve months of half-time employment) in the civilian labor force that year. The 1040-hour minimum allows us to ensure that our sample is significantly established in the labor force. The sample used in our analysis contains 92,282 persons meeting these criteria. The sample is broken down by gender, of which 52,263 persons in the sub-sample are males and 46,019 persons in the sub-sample are females.

Our dependent variable in this study is the logged hourly earnings in 1999. We calculate this by taking the number of weeks a given worker worked in 1999 and multiplying that by that workers number of hours worked per week in 1999. The hourly wage can then be determined by dividing the wages of a given worker by the number of

hours that s/he worked in 1999. Finally, we use the natural logarithm of hourly wage. The log transformation is used to minimize outliers in the distribution of wage income. Because the log form of earnings is used in the analysis, the regression coefficients can be interpreted as the percentage change in earnings given a unit change in a given independent variable.

The analysis contains three primary independent variables: place of birth, skin tone, and English language proficiency. Our first main variable, place of birth, includes 9 countries located in the West Indies. We create dummy variables for each of the major West Indies countries: 1) Barbados=1, otherwise=0; 2) Grenada=1, otherwise=0; 3) Haiti=1, otherwise=0; 4) Jamaica=1, otherwise=0; 5) Trinidad=1, otherwise=0; 6) (Puerto Rico) PuertoR=1, otherwise=0; 7) Cuba=1, otherwise=0; 8) Dominica=1, otherwise=0; and 9) (Dominican Republic) Domrep=1, otherwise=0. We included only the largest populated West Indies countries whose recent immigration to the U.S. has been in large numbers. Hence, we grouped all other West Indies countries into a category designated "othwest" and created a dummy variable for it (othwest=1, otherwise=0).

Because the 2000 U.S. Census provided information on persons who designated themselves as multiracial, we were able to create an independent variable that allowed us to roughly measure skin tone. Hence, for our second variable, skin tone, we created two dummy variables from the Census recode variable "Black." Persons choosing Black and marking another race on the Census form are listed as multiracial black (blkmulti=1, otherwise=0) and persons choosing Black without marking another race on the Census form is listed as Black (blkrace=1, otherwise=0). The reference group for the skin tone dummy variables is persons not indicating Black as their race on the 2000 Census form.

Although the U.S. Census has a major disadvantage in that it does not provide for information on accents, it does provide data on English fluency. Thus, we created two dummy variables for persons who either spoke English exclusively at home (1=persons who speak English at home, 0=everyone else) or who were bilingual (1=persons who speak non-English at home yet speak English "well" or "very well;" 0=everyone else). For the English fluency dummy variables, the reference group is persons who speak non-English at home and who speak English "not well" or "not at all."

*****Insert Table 1 About Here*****

A variety of variables, which have been observed in previous research to be related to earnings, are included as control variables in our analysis. These include age, education, disability limitation, marital status, self-employment, work experience, work experience squared, and immigration to U.S. between 1995 and 2000. For a description of the operational definitions of all the control variables, see Table 1.

Empirical Results

We run separate regressions models for males (see Tables 1 and 2, models A) and females (see Tables 1 and 2, models B) in our analysis. Males and females have historically been segregated into different lines of work and different pay scales (see Reskin and Roos 1990). Hence, in labor market studies it is appropriate to acknowledge gender differentials in the labor market. In this analysis this is dealt with by separating the models by gender.

*****Insert Tables 2 and 3 About Here*****

Table 1

In Model 1, we control for all of the human capital variables and examine the relationship between these variables and earnings among immigrants from West Indies countries and Russia. In looking at males (see Table 2), we find that men in six of the nine countries, and within the "Othwest" category, tend to make significantly less earnings compared to male Russian immigrants (Haiti, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Dominica, and Dominican Republic), Jamaica being the only country not statistically significant. Interestingly enough, we also find that in regards to men in West Indies countries who tend to have higher earnings compared to male Russian immigrants, the percentage is not that high, being less than two percent in most cases (Barbados- .019, Grenada- .009, Trinidad- .012).

For females (see Table 3), we find almost the reverse of the above analysis on men. Although six out of nine West Indies countries and the dummy variable "Othwest" are statistically significant, women in only one of the West Indies countries are making lower earnings compared to women Russian immigrants (Dominican Republic- .10). In four of the West Indies countries, all of which are statistically significant at the <.01% level, women have significantly higher earnings compared to their Russian counterparts (Barbados- .16, Grenada- .15, Jamaica- .13, Trinidad- .14).

Model 2

In Model 2, in addition to the human capital variables, we also control for skin color. For men (see Table 2), there are several differences compared to model 1. First, the number of West Indies countries that are statistically significant has increased (7 out of 9), although only four of the countries (Haiti, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Dominican

Republic) are signed according to our expectations. Both of the dummy variables for skin color are statistically significant and display the expected signs. The results suggest that single race and multiracial Blacks do not differ with respect to earnings, although both of these groups have lower earnings compared to male Russian immigrants.

For women (see Table 3), there are no differences between models 1 and 2 when looking at earnings by country. However, there are some noticeable differences when looking at the skin tone variables compared to males. First, only the dummy variable "blkmulti" (individuals marking Black and one other race on the 2000 Census form) is signed in the expected direction. However, the variable is not statistically significant. Second, the "blkrace" variable (individuals marking Black only on the 2000 Census form) is not signed in the expected direction and indicates that individuals under this category are making three percent more earnings compared to women Russian immigrants. This variable is statistically significant.

Model 3

In model 3, in addition to the human capital variables, we control for skin color and language fluency. The results of model 3 were significantly different from that of models 1 and 2 for men. However, there was not that much difference between the models when looking at women. For men, all of the variables for place of birth, skin tone, and English proficiency in model 3 display the expected signs. In model 3, six of the nine West Indies countries and those allocated under the "Othwest" category are statistically significant (Barbados, Grenada, and Trinidad being the only countries that are not). For the skin tone dummy variables, while there is a slight decrease in the earnings of individuals who mark themselves as Blacks and another race compared to

male Russian immigrants, there is a substantial decrease in earnings of individuals who mark themselves as Black only compared to male Russian immigrants (a jump from 3.8 % to 4.5%). For the English speaking dummy variables, both indicate that individuals who speak fluent English tend to make more earnings compared to individuals who do not speak any English or who do not speak English very well. There is also indication that West Indies countries that primarily speak English receive significantly more earnings compared to West Indies countries that primarily speak Spanish or French (we discuss this in further detail in the next section).

For women, Table 3 illustrates only slight changes in model 3 compared to the first two models. First, three of the West Indies countries show sign changes more consistent with our expectations, although they are not statistically significant. Nonetheless, this represents good news for us as continued research may uncover new findings toward our theoretical perspective. To our disappointment, neither skin tone variables were statistically significant although "blkmulti" was correctly signed to our expectations. One noticeable difference was in the English fluency variables for women compared to that of men. Here we observe that women speaking only English, although receiving on average more earnings compared to persons who speak little or no English, make less than persons who are bilingual. Thus, persons listed as bilingual receive on average 26% more earnings compared to persons who speak little or no English. In Contrast, persons who speak only English receive on average only 24% more earnings compared to persons who speak very little or no English.

Discussion and Concluding Remarks

Our results indicate that there is support for our fourth hypothesis, that English fluency increases wage earnings. This is consistent with previous research findings that have concluded that because speaking clear and grammatically correct English is a factor in assimilation into the white majority group, attached to it are the privileges that whites get in U.S. society, in this case being better off economically. This holds true for both men and women immigrants.

We find some support for our third hypothesis, that skin tone should have a negative correlation with hourly wage earnings. Thus, we find that males from the West Indies countries who indicated that they are either Black or multiracial Black make significantly less than those who are not Black. However, our prediction that earnings reflect skin tone is inconsistent with Telles and Murguia (1990). For example, looking at the data for men in model 3 we find that whereas, on average, persons listing themselves as multiracial Black are likely to make 10% less than persons not marking Black, persons who marked themselves as Black alone are likely to make 4% less than persons not marking Black. A number of explanations may account for this finding. For example, because we are using Census data which is self reported, our results may reflect misreporting by subjects who are not reporting themselves as black on the Census form (see also Rodriguez 2000 for more information on Census misreporting). The results differ, however, for women. In this case, the skin tone variables are not significant.

We also find limited support for our first and second hypotheses, but only in regards to men. In looking at model 3 for males, we find that men from West Indies countries are making less hourly wage earnings when compared to the Russian immigrant

group. However, 3 of the 10 country variables listed are not statistically significant (Barbados, Grenada, and Trinidad), although the signs are in the correct direction. The interesting pattern to note here is that there is there is a difference in hourly wage earnings when comparing English-speaking countries from Spanish or French speaking countries. Thus, the reference group, Russian immigrants, is at the top of the list in terms of most hourly wage earnings received, followed by West Indies English speaking countries, followed by West Indies Spanish and French speaking countries (see Table 4). The results seem the same taking into account statistical significance or not. Other interesting patterns to note is that in most of the models Cuban immigrants tend to do slightly worse than Puerto Ricans, and Haitians tend to do slightly worse than Dominican Republic immigrants. Although the difference in hourly wage earnings is too slight to be really noticeable and does not affect the "Latinization" theory, there are some explanations that can be made as to why we see such results in our models. On the former, according to Ojito (2001), Black Cubans do not have near the same privileges compared to their white counterparts. Thus, when accounting for the fact that Puerto Ricans are more likely to speak more fluent English than Cubans and are naturalized U.S. citizens by virtue of Puerto Rico being a commonwealth of the U.S.A., it makes sense that darker skinned Puerto Ricans may be more likely to earn more than darker-skinned Cubans. On the latter, Haitians immigrants may be doing slightly better in terms of hourly wage earnings compared to Dominican Republic immigrants due to the fact that they are one of the few immigrant groups that have established enclave networks in the United States which shield them slightly from some of the economic, social, political, and psychological discrimination immigrants face from whites in the United States.

*****Insert Table 4 About Here*****

Looking at Table 3 (model 3), the findings for female in regards to our first and second hypotheses is consistent with that of men in that we find that if we arrange the West Indies countries in order of most earnings to least earnings, those West Indies countries that speak English tend to do significantly better than West Indies countries that speak predominantly Spanish or French (see Table 5). What is strikingly different between the male and female regression models is that for the most part, the coefficient signs for female immigrants are positive rather than negative. Thus, with the exception of four countries (Puerto Rico, Cuba, Dominican Republic and Haiti), only one of which is statistically significant (Dominican Republic), female West Indies immigrants tend to do better than female Russian immigrants.

*****Insert Table 5 About Here*****

Finally, our preliminary findings indicate that there may be considerable merit to the idea that the United States is moving towards a Latin American-like racial structure where privileges will be garnered by those individuals and ethnic and racial groups who are better able to fit the normative culture and values of the current white majority. It also means that contrary to the notion that increased Mexican American, Latino, and other minorities growth will create greater economic, political, and social opportunities, American society will be further segmented into three (or more) racial classifications where a decreasing white population will continue to hold the majority of wealth and resources in America, followed by light skinned and "white" assimilated minority groups. Thus, those individuals and ethnic and racial groups who are dark-skinned and who lack the "white" cultural skill necessary to navigate in America will continue to linger at the

bottom in all areas. We conclude by suggesting that much more needs to be done on this relatively untapped research topic. For example, what would explain why male Russian immigrants do significantly better in terms of earnings in the U.S. compared to males from West Indies countries, yet female Russian immigrants tend to make fewer earnings when compared to their West Indies counterparts?

References

Alba, Richard. 1999. "Immigration and the American Realities of Assimilation and Multiculturalism." *Sociological Forum* 14 (1): 3-25.

Bean, Frank D. and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62: 465-80.

_____. 2003. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Karen Glover. Forthcoming. "We Are All 'Americans': The Latin-Americanization of Race Relations in the USA." In *The Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity*, ed. Maria Krysan and Amanda Lewis. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, Tyrone Forman, Amanda Lewis, and David Embrick. 2003. "It Wasn't Me: How Will Race and Racism Work in 21st Century America." *Research in Political Sociology* 12: 111-35.

Camarota, Steven A. 2001. “Immigrants in the United States—2000: A Snapshot of America’s Foreign-Born Population.” *Backgrounder* (Center for Immigration Studies): (Jan.) 1-19.

Clark, William A.V. 1998. “Mass Migration and Local Outcomes: In International Migration to the United States Creating a New Urban Underclass?” *Urban Studies* 35 (3): 371-83.

Cotton, Jeremiah. 1985. “ ‘More on the Cost’ of Being a Black or Mexican American Male Worker.” *Social Science Quarterly* 66: 867-85.

Davila, Alberto, Alok K. Bohara, and Rogelio Saenz. 1993. “Accent Penalties and the Earnings of Mexican Americans.” *Social Science Quarterly* 74 (4): 902-16.

Davila, A., and M. T. Mora. 2000. “English Skills, Earnings, and the Occupational Sorting of Mexican Americans along the U.S.-Mexico Border.” *International Migration Review* 34 (1): 133-57.

Doane, Ashley W., and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (Eds.). 2003. *Whiteout: The Continuing Significance of Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Fernando Charvet. 2000. “The Changing Geography of Mexican Immigration to the United States: 1910-1996.” *Social Science Quarterly* 81 (1): 1-15.

Foner, Nancy. 1987. *New Immigrants in New York*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Garcia, Philip. 1984. “Dual-Language Characteristics and Earnings: Male Mexican Workers in the United States.” *Social Science Quarterly* 13: 221-35.

Gold, Steven J., and Ruben G. Rumbaut (Eds.). 2004. *The New Americans: Recent Immigration and American Society*. **[FINISH CITATION]**

Hunter, Margaret L. 2002. " 'If You're Light You're Alright': Light Skin Color as Social Capital for Women of Color." *Gender and Society* 16: 175-93.

Ignatiev, Noel. 1995. *How the Irish Became White*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kovel, Joel. 1984. *White Racism: A Psychohistory*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Magocsi, Paul R. 1996. *The Russian Americans*. New York, NY: Chelsea House Publishers.

Massey, Douglas, Jorge Durand, Nolan J. Malone. 2003. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

McIntosh, Peggy. 2001 [1988]. "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies." In *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*, ed. Margaret L. Anderson and Patricia Hill Collins. 2001. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mora, M. T. 1998. "Did the English Deficiency Earnings Penalty Change for Hispanic Men between 1979 and 1989?" *Social Science Quarterly* 79 (3): 581-94.

Murguia, Edward, and Tyrone Forman. 2003. " In pp. A.W. Doane, and E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.). 2003. *Whiteout: The Continuing Significance of Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Murguia, Edward, and Edward E. Telles. 1996. "Phenotype and Schooling among Mexican Americans." *Sociology of Education* 69: 276-89.

Ojito, Mirta. 2001. “Best of Friends, Worlds Apart.” Pp. 23-40 in The New York Times, *How Race is Lived in America: Pulling Together, Pulling Apart*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.

Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. 1997. *Black Wealth/ White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women’s Inroads into Male Occupations.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Rodriguez, Clara E. 2000. *Changing Race: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity in the United States.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Roediger, David R. 1991. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. New York, NY: Verso.

Saenz, Rogelio, and Maria Cristina Morales. “Demography of Race and Ethnicity.” Forthcoming in D.L. Poston, Jr. and M. Micklin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Population*. New York, NY: Klewer Academic/ Plenum Publishers.

Sugrue, Thomas J. 1998. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Telles, Edward E., and Edward Murguia. 1992. “The Continuing Significance of Phenotype Discrimination among Mexican Americans.” *Social Science Quarterly* 73: 120-22.

_____. 1990. “Phenotype Discrimination and Income Differences among Mexican Americans.” *Social Science Quarterly* 71: 682-96.

Tienda, Marta, and Lisa J. Neidert. 1984. "Language, Education and the Socioeconomic Achievement of Hispanic Origin Men." *Social Science Quarterly* 65: 516-36.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1993. *Census of Population and Housing, 1990: Public Use Microdata Sample U.S. Technical Documentation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Waters, Mary. 2003. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wilson, William Julius. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Yancey, George. 2003. *Who is White: Latinos, Asians, and the New Black/Nonblack Divide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Table 1. Operational Definitions of Variables Used in the Analysis

Variable	Description
Wage income in 1999	Total earnings from wages in 1999
Logged wage income	Natural logarithm of total earnings in 1999
Country:	
Russia	Reference Category
Barbados	Barbados=1; else=0
Grenada	Grenada=1; else=0
Haiti	Haiti=1; else=0
Jamaica	Jamaica=1; else=0
Trinidad	Trinidad=1; else=0
Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico=1; else=0
Cuba	Cuba=1; else=0
Dominica	Dominica=1; else=0
Dominican Republic	Dominican Republic=1; else=0
Other West Indies	All other West Indies countries=1; else=0
Skin Color:	
Not Black	Reference category
Blacks Multiracial	Marked Black, and other=1; else=0
Black	Marked Black, no other=1; else=0
Language:	
Monolingual Spanish	Reference category
Bilingual	Speaks Span. at home, Eng. very well/well=1; else=0
Monolingual English	Speaks English at home=1; else=0
Age:	
16-24	Reference category
25-34	25-34=1; else=0
35-44	35-44=1; else=0
45-54	45-54=1; else=0
55-64	55-64=1; else=0
65-74	65-74=1; else=0
75+	75 and older=1; else=0
Education:	
0-8 years of schooling	Reference category
9-11 years of schooling	9 to 11 years of schooling=1; else=0
High school graduate	High school diploma or GED=1; else=0
Some college	Some college- no degree, or associate's degree=1; else=0
College graduate	Bachelor's or advanced degree=1; else=0

Disability Limitation	Limited in kind or amount of work=1; else=0
Marital Status	Married=1; else=0
Self-Employment	Self-employed=1; else=0
Work experience	Potential years of education in the labor force=age – (years of education – 6)
Work experience squared	Work experience^2
5-year migration:	
Same house, in U.S.	Reference category
Different house, in U.S.	Lived in U.S., different house=1; else=0
Outside U.S.	Lived outside of U.S.=1; else=0

Figure 1

Preliminary Map of Tri-Racial System in the USA*
"Whites" * Whites * New Whites (Russians, Albanians, etc.) * Assimilated white Latinos * Some multiracials * Assimilated (urban) Native Americans * A few Asian-origin people
"Honorary Whites" * Light-skinned Latinos * Japanese Americans * Korean Americans * Asian Indians * Chinese Americans * Middle Eastern Americans * Most multiracials
"Collective Black" * Filipinos * Vietnamese * Hmong * Laotians * Dark-skinned Latinos * Blacks * New West Indian and African immigrants * Reservation-bound Native Americans

*Reprinted with permission from author (Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, Tyrone Forman, Amanda Lewis, and David Embrick. 2003. "It Wasn't Me: How Will Race and Racism Work in 21st Century America." *Research in Political Sociology* 12: 111-35.).

Table 2. Model 1: Logged Hourly Earnings on Place of Birth, Skin Tone, and English Proficiency (OLS Coefficients, Standard Errors in Parenthesis) for Males and Females

	Males Model A	**Females** Model B
Barbados	-0.01718	0.09816****
	(.030)	(.028)
Grenada	-0.02969	0.08308***
	(.041)	(.033)
Haiti	-0.12792****	-0.02538
	(.018)	(.018)
Jamaica	-0.03805**	0.06971****
	(.019)	(.019)
Trinidad	-0.02487	0.08749****
	(.021)	(.020)
PuertoR	-0.06008****	-0.00420
	(.013)	(.012)
Cuba	-0.06509****	-0.00261
	(.013)	(.013)
Dominica	-0.07911*	0.03889
	(.046)	(.042)
Domrep	-0.13988****	-0.05980****
	(.014)	(.014)
Othwest	-0.05915***	0.03809*
	(.023)	(.022)
blkmult	-0.09941****	-0.01775
	(.016)	(.016)
blkrace	-0.04471****	0.01940
	(.012)	(.012)
monoeng	0.24515****	0.23869****
	(.012)	(.013)
biling	0.19045****	0.25533****
	(.008)	(.009)
age2534	0.20282****	0.18050****
	(.014)	(.014)
age3544	0.27513****	0.21455****
	(.021)	(.022)
age4554	0.30640****	0.22376****
	(.028)	(.028)
age5564	0.32052****	0.22393****
	(.035)	(.035)
age6574	0.21973****	0.18867****
	(.045)	(.045)
age7593	0.23775****	0.30170****
	(.065)	(.075)
somehs	0.05025****	0.02514*
	(.012)	(.013)
hsgrd	0.14042****	0.15821****
	(.012)	(.014)
somecoll	0.28105****	0.33362****
	(.013)	(.014)
collgrd	0.62187****	0.68016****
	(.016)	(.016)
disabl	-0.04149****	-0.03331****
	(.006)	(.006)
married	0.12523****	0.01619****
	(.006)	(.005)
selfemp	-0.06436****	-0.06025****
	(.013)	(.020)
exp	0.01014****	0.01175****
	(.002)	(.002)
exp2	-0.0002****	-0.0002****
	(.00002)	(.00003)
migout	-0.19682****	-0.21471****
	(.010)	(.010)

migin	-0.04435****	-0.04651****
	(.006)	(.006)
Adjusted R^2	20.88	23.28
F [df]	[31]	[31]
N	52263	46019

*p= 10%; **p= 5%; ***p= 1%; ****p= <.01%
Source: U.S. Census 2000 5% PUMS

Table 3. Model 2: Logged Hourly Earnings on Place of Birth, Skin Tone, and English Proficiency (OLS Coefficients, Standard Errors in Parenthesis) for Males and Females; Russian Immigrants as Reference Group

	Males Model A	**Females** Model B
Barbados	-0.01718	0.09816****
	(.030)	(.028)
Grenada	-0.02969	0.08308***
	(.041)	(.033)
Haiti	-0.12792****	-0.02538
	(.018)	(.018)
Jamaica	-0.03805**	0.06971****
	(.019)	(.019)
Trinidad	-0.02487	0.08749****
	(.021)	(.020)
PuertoR	-0.06008****	-0.00420
	(.013)	(.012)
Cuba	-0.06509****	-0.00261
	(.013)	(.013)
Dominica	-0.07911*	0.03889
	(.046)	(.042)
Domrep	-0.13988****	-0.05980****
	(.014)	(.014)
Othwest	-0.05915***	0.03809*
	(.023)	(.022)
blkmult	-0.09941****	-0.01775
	(.016)	(.016)
blkrace	-0.04471****	0.01940
	(.012)	(.012)
monoeng	0.24515****	0.23869****
	(.012)	(.013)
biling	0.19045****	0.25533****
	(.008)	(.009)
age2534	0.20282****	0.18050****
	(.014)	(.014)
age3544	0.27513****	0.21455****
	(.021)	(.022)
age4554	0.30640****	0.22376****
	(.028)	(.028)
age5564	0.32052****	0.22393****
	(.035)	(.035)
age6574	0.21973****	0.18867****
	(.045)	(.045)
age7593	0.23775****	0.30170****
	(.065)	(.075)
somehs	0.05025****	0.02514*
	(.012)	(.013)
hsgrd	0.14042****	0.15821****
	(.012)	(.014)
somecoll	0.28105****	0.33362****
	(.013)	(.014)
collgrd	0.62187****	0.68016****
	(.016)	(.016)
disabl	-0.04149****	-0.03331****
	(.006)	(.006)
married	0.12523****	0.01619****
	(.006)	(.005)
selfemp	-0.06436****	-0.06025****
	(.013)	(.020)
exp	0.01014****	0.01175****
	(.002)	(.002)
exp2	-0.0002****	-0.0002****
	(.00002)	(.00003)
migout	-0.19682****	-0.21471****
	(.010)	(.010)

migin	-0.04435****	-0.04651****
	(.006)	(.006)
Adjusted R^2	20.88	23.28
F [df]	[31]	[31]
N	52263	46019

*p= 10%; **p= 5%; ***p= 1%; ****p= <.01%
Source: U.S. Census 2000 5% PUMS

Table 4. Hierarchal Listing of Male Immigrants' Countries (place of birth) in Order of Earnings Compared to Male Russian Immigrants.

Statistically Significant	All West Indies Country Variables
Jamaica (English; -0.03805)	Barbados (English; -0.01718)
Othwest (-0.05915)	Grenada (English; -0.02969)
Puerto Rico (Spanish; -0.06008)	Jamaica (English; -0.03805)
Cuba (Spanish; -0.06509)	Othwest (-0.05915)
Dominica (Spanish; -0.07911)	Puerto Rico (Spanish; -0.06008)
Haiti (French; -0.12792)	Cuba (Spanish; -0.07911)
Dominican Rep. (Spanish; -0.13988)	Dominica (Spanish; -0.07911)
	Haiti (French; -0.12792)
	Dominican Rep. (Spanish; -0.13988)

*** Hierarchy is based on Model 3**

Table 5. Hierarchal Listing of Female Immigrants' Countries (place of birth) in Order of Earnings Compared to Male Russian Immigrants.

Statistically Significant	All West Indies Country Variables
Barbados (English; 0.09816)	Barbados (English; 0.09816)
Trinidad (English; 0.08749)	Trinidad (English; 0.08749)
Grenada (English; 0.08308)	Grenada (English; 0.08308)
Dominica (Spanish; 0.03889)	Jamaica (English; 0.06971)
Othwest (0.03809)	Dominica (Spanish; 0.03889)
Dominican Rep. (Spanish; -0.05980)	Othwest (0.03809)
	Dominican Rep. (Spanish; -0.05980)
	Cuba (Spanish; -0.00261)
	Puerto Rico (Spanish; -0.00420)
	Haiti (Spanish; -0.02538)

*** Hierarchy is based on Model 3**