



Does an Immigrant Background Ameliorate Racial Disadvantage? The Socioeconomic Attainments of Second-Generation African Americans¹

Arthur Sakamoto,² Hyeyoung Woo,³ and ChangHwan Kim⁴

Although there is a growing literature on the socioeconomic circumstances of the second generation, this issue has not been systematically considered for African Americans. To help fill this research gap, we investigate the extent to which the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans differ from mainstream (i.e., third and higher generation) African Americans. Using data from the Current Population Survey and the 2000 Census, our results indicate that the schooling and wages of second-generation African Americans consistently exceed those of third- and higher generation African Americans. Our findings also reveal that second-generation African Americans do at least as well as whites in terms of years of schooling, but wage differentials differ significantly by gender. Second-generation African-American women earn wages that are at least as high as comparable white women, but second-generation African-American men earn wages that are, on average, about 16% less than measurably comparable white men. While no one theoretical perspective can account for all these results, they nonetheless indicate the continuing significance of racial disadvantage for African-American men, including those with an immigrant background.

KEY WORDS: African Americans; immigration; second generation; segmented assimilation; socioeconomic attainment; wages.

INTRODUCTION

Prior research has extensively investigated the disadvantages of African Americans in the labor force (e.g., Damaske, 2009; Grodsky and Pager, 2001;

¹ For excellent research support, we thank the Population Research Center of the University of Texas and the Minnesota Population Center of the University of Minnesota. We also thank the Editor of *Sociological Forum* and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments.

² Department of Sociology, 1 University Station A1700, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712-0118; e-mail: asakamoto@austin.utexas.edu.

³ Department of Sociology, Portland State University, 1721 SW Broadway, Portland, Oregon 97207-0751.

⁴ Department of Sociology, University of Kansas, Fraser Hall, 1415 Jayhawk Boulevard, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7556.

Kim, 2009; Maume, 2004; Western and Pettit, 2005) and in U.S. society generally (e.g., Kasinitz, 2008; Massey and Denton, 1993; Oliver and Shapiro, 1995; Roxburgh, 2009). However, with a few notable exceptions (Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Kalmijn, 1996; Kasinitz, 1992; Massey et al., 2007; Waters, 1994), scholars have been much less interested in immigrant African Americans and their second-generation offspring. Although the study of immigrants and their second-generation descendants is a well-established area of research (Farley and Alba, 2002; Gans, 1992; Kao and Tienda, 1995; Portes and Rumbaut, 2005; Portes and Zhou, 1993; Xie and Goyette, 2004), the circumstances of second-generation African Americans have not been adequately investigated using nationally representative data.

First- and second-generation immigrants were once rare in the African-American population, but they have grown since the change in immigration laws in 1965. As shown in Table I, the 1960 Census ascertained that only about .7% of African Americans were foreign born (i.e., first generation) while about another .7% were native born with foreign-born parents (i.e., second generation). By 2006, the first generation had grown to 13.8% while the second generation had grown to 2.4% of the single-race African-American population.⁵ Immigrants have thus become a significant component of the black population in the twenty-first century.

In addition to having become an identifiable demographic group, the study of second-generation African Americans is also substantively important because their socioeconomic attainments provide an additional perspective on the complex processes associated with the generation of racial/ethnic inequalities. Second-generation immigrants have often been noted to be relatively high achievers (Farley and Alba, 2002; Kao and Tienda, 1995; Zeng and Xie, 2004). Given the well-known labor market disadvantages faced by African Americans in general, the issue arises as to whether the socioeconomic attainments of their second generation are less constrained due to their immigrant background. In the following analysis, we investigate the extent to which the racial disadvantage that is typically evident among African Americans as a whole may be less pronounced in the socioeconomic attainments of the black second generation.

A few prior studies have documented the labor market disadvantages of black first-generation immigrants (Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Kalmijn, 1996). This research suggests that the earnings of immigrants are significantly affected by whether one's college degree was obtained in the United States, years of work experience in the United States versus years of work experience abroad, period of immigration to the United States, and English-language skills. Because we focus specifically on the African-American second generation, however, none of these variables are substantively significant. As persons who were either born in the United States or arrived here at a very

⁵ Significant political figures in recent years have been second-generation African Americans, including Barack Obama and Colin Powell. W. E. B. Du Bois was also second-generation African American as was groundbreaking actor Sidney Poitier.

Table I. Percentage Frequency Distribution of Generational Status by Race

	1960 Census		2006 CPS		
	White	Black	White	Black	Multiracial Black
1st generation*	5.74	0.73	15.53	13.79	13.88
2nd generation**	14.57	0.68	6.08	2.40	2.51
3rd or higher generation***	79.69	98.59	78.39	83.81	83.60
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*Born overseas (not in the 51 states).

**Born in the United States but one or more parents were born overseas.

***Born in United States and both parents were born in the United States.

Note: The statistics are calculated using sampling weights and include persons of all ages. Black refers to persons who identify as single-race African American while multiracial black refers to the African-American population that includes persons with either single-race or multirace African-American identity.

young age (i.e., the 1.5 generation), most of the schooling achieved by our target population is obtained in the United States, and English is used with native fluency. Thus, our focus is on ascertaining the racial disadvantage of second-generation African Americans who are not characterized by any of the disadvantages that are often associated with immigrants.

By definition, however, the second generation has an immigrant background (i.e., their parents were immigrants). The investigation of second-generation African Americans therefore addresses the issue as to whether an immigrant background can ameliorate the racial disadvantage that is generally problematic for African Americans. Although prior literature relating to theories of assimilation suggests that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans may differ somewhat from mainstream African Americans, systematic empirical evidence regarding this issue has been largely unavailable. Our analysis contrasts the earnings of the black second generation not only relative to third- and higher generation African Americans but also relative to native-born whites.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES RELATING TO THE ASSIMILATION OF SECOND-GENERATION AFRICAN AMERICANS

Perhaps the most pessimistic vision is provided by Gans (1992) and Portes and Zhou (1993), who suggest that second-generation African Americans are susceptible to being relegated to the U.S. lower class. In the context of pervasive societal discrimination against African Americans as a racial group, black immigrants are vulnerable to falling into the U.S. underclass in an increasingly unequal labor market in which middle-class employment opportunities are vanishing. Due to racial discrimination in the housing market, combined with the disadvantages that an immigrant usually faces in the labor market, first-generation African Americans are more likely to live in segregated,

low-income, inner-city neighborhoods with other disadvantaged African Americans where schools are underfunded and middle-class socioeconomic opportunities are disappearing.

In this context of inadequate job opportunities, inner-city African-American youth are said to sometimes develop “adversarial outlooks” or an “oppositional culture” (Portes and Rumbaut, 2005; Portes and Zhou, 1993). This subculture is hypothesized to discourage educational achievement and is seen as reducing adolescents’ chances for upward social mobility. Second-generation African Americans are more likely to have been raised in traditionally disadvantaged black neighborhoods with inferior schools and to assimilate into the “oppositional culture” of the inner city. Thus, this perspective emphasizing lower-class vulnerability implies that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, less than third- and higher generation African Americans.

A second and somewhat less pessimistic perspective is a version of the segmented assimilation approach that is provided by Waters (1994) in her qualitative study of African immigrants from the West Indies. Her research finds that, despite the fact that West Indian immigrants strongly identified themselves as “black,” a substantial portion also attempted to distance themselves from the traditional African-American community by simultaneously identifying themselves as West Indians, Jamaicans, or “immigrants.” According to Waters (1994), the need for this differentiation stems from their belief that assimilation into “black America” lowers socioeconomic attainment.

Waters (1994) also observed this ethnic identification pattern among second-generation black immigrants. She reported that the need to emphasize their ethnicity was particularly salient among interviewees of middle-class backgrounds. These findings may be interpreted as suggesting that West Indian immigrants promote their ethnic identity so as to reduce their chances of experiencing the discrimination or negative stereotypes that are often associated with being viewed as a member of the traditional African-American population.

Waters’s (1994) segmented assimilation perspective contends that the selective retention of the immigrants’ culture of origin can have a protective effect for second-generation African Americans. Waters’s (1994) findings indicating that West Indians distance themselves from traditional “black America” is consistent with this view because immigrant parents appear to be strategically fostering the acculturation and identity of their children so as to enhance their chances for high achievement in the context of an increasingly unequal labor market. Waters’s (1994) subjects seemed to believe that being viewed as an ethnic or “immigrant” African American is preferable to being a mainstream African American at least in terms of social status or socioeconomic opportunity in the United States.

The hypothesis derived from Waters’s (1994) perspective is that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, greater than third- and higher generation African Americans because

the “immigrant” ethnic identity of the second generation will to some extent ameliorate racism and the consequent socioeconomic disadvantages associated with the traditional black community. Given the continuing significance of racism, however, the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, lower than those for third- and higher generation white Americans. Mainstream, third-, and higher generation white Americans are still advantaged in the labor market because second-generation African Americans cannot fully disguise their identity as African Americans due to the perceptibility of their darker skin tones.

Another strand of research on assimilation refers to immigrant optimism (Kao and Tienda, 1995; Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco, 1995). This view suggests that the second generation may have high socioeconomic attainments due to greater selectivity, effort, ambition, and motivation. Second-generation children are frequently reminded of the sacrifices that their parents have made in order to come to the United States, often for the purpose of obtaining better socioeconomic opportunities. Immigrant parents may find that their own labor market prospects are quite constrained, and may motivate their children into becoming high academic achievers in a way that maximizes their chances for career success (Goyette and Xie, 1999).

Although studies referring to immigrant optimism have not focused on African Americans, we interpret this literature as suggesting the hypothesis that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, greater than the third- and higher generation African Americans. This deduction yields the same hypothesis that was just discussed above in regard to Waters’s work on segmented assimilation. In the case of the later view, the immigrant ethnic identity of the second generation to some extent ameliorates racism. In the literature on immigrant optimism, the selectively high aspirations and motivations of the second generation serve to raise the socioeconomic attainments of the second generation above those of mainstream African Americans. These two explanations are complementary (i.e., not mutually exclusive).

To some extent, these conclusions seem to be further compatible with Ogbu’s (1978) distinction between “voluntary” and “involuntary” immigrants. According to Ogbu (1978), “voluntary” immigrants are persons and their descendents who came to the United States with their collective identities intact and positively developed. “Involuntary” immigrants are those who were forced to come to the United States or formed their collective identity in the context of subjugation and oppression by the dominant white society. Being the descendants of slaves, most members of the mainstream African-American community are considered to have a collective identity associated with “involuntary” immigrants. For this reason, according to Ogbu (1978), some aspects of mainstream African-American subculture reject the assumptions of dominant white society (a conclusion that would appear to be consistent with the “oppositional culture” considered above in regard to the studies by Portes and Zhou).

By contrast, recent African-American immigrants can be considered to be “voluntary” because they came to the United States by choice rather than by slavery. African-American immigrants are therefore outside the mainstream collective identity of third- and higher generation African Americans. The second-generation offspring of “voluntary” black immigrants are thus more likely to reject the “oppositional culture” and “adversarial outlooks” of the inner city.

The hypothesis that we derive from Ogbu (1978) is that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, greater than mainstream African Americans. Because they are associated with a “voluntary” immigration stream, second-generation African Americans are predicted to be able to obtain higher earnings because they are more likely to more fully embrace the mainstream culture of dominant white society. This hypothesis is the same that was derived above in regard to the segmented assimilation views of Waters (1994) and the studies of immigrant optimism.

An additional perspective is provided by Farley and Alba (2002), who refer to the offspring of post-1965 immigrants as the new second generation. In contrast to the pessimistic view discussed by Gans (1992), Farley and Alba (2002) note that recent immigrants have a few advantages over immigrants of the early part of the twentieth century. These advantages include the passage and enforcement of various civil rights laws, an expanded educational system, programs for bilingual education of children until they are able to master English, the higher educational levels of immigrant parents, and enhanced opportunities for the socioeconomic attainments of females.

The hypothesis that we derive from the literature on the new second generation is that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will not only be greater than the traditional black community but also at least as high as third- and higher generation whites. Given the higher motivations of the second generation and the increased civil rights for minorities in the contemporary United States, second-generation persons may be able to obtain socioeconomic attainments that are as high as mainstream white Americans if not perhaps slightly higher. Although Farley and Alba (2002) do not explicitly focus on second-generation African Americans, the continuation of racism does not appear to be viewed as a major obstacle according to the new second-generation perspective.

Differences by Gender

Unfortunately, none of this literature appears to have considered gender to a sufficient degree that would clearly imply specific implications about how socioeconomic differentials between whites and second-generation blacks might vary by gender. In fact, of the aforementioned studies, only Farley and Alba (2002) explicitly refer to the socioeconomic attainments of women. As noted above, Farley and Alba argue that an important aspect of the current

period for the new second generation is the enhanced socioeconomic opportunities for women. However, in the other studies, the presumption seems to be that the processes under consideration do not vary appreciably by gender.

To be more explicit, we interpret the prior literature in terms of their implications for socioeconomic attainment by gender. In regard to the contrast between second-generation African Americans and third- and higher generation African Americans, we believe that our foregoing interpretations of the implications of these studies appear to be generally applicable to both men and women (see Appendix A). Specifically, Gans's (1992) view of lower-class vulnerability implies that the male offspring of African-American immigrants will tend to have lower socioeconomic attainments than mainstream African-American men, while the female offspring are expected to have lower socioeconomic attainments than mainstream African-American women. Regarding the segmented assimilation view (i.e., Waters, 1994), the theory of immigrant optimism (i.e., Kao and Tienda, 1995), and the voluntary immigrant perspective (i.e., Ogbu, 1978), these approaches may be interpreted as hypothesizing that second-generation black men have socioeconomic attainments that are greater than third- and higher generation black men (though still less than white men) and that second-generation black women have socioeconomic attainments that are greater than third- and higher generation black women.

In general, black-white wage differentials are known to be substantially smaller among women than among men, especially after controlling for educational and other demographic characteristics (McCall, 2001). Given this basic pattern, we would interpret the views of Waters (i.e., segmented assimilation), Kao and Tienda (i.e., immigrant optimism), and Ogbu (i.e., voluntary immigration) as implying that the black-white earnings differential is essentially zero among women. Although a racial disadvantage is still expected in the case of men given its substantial size, the lower racial differential among women combined with the premise that second-generation African-American women have higher attainments than third- and higher generation African-American women implies that second-generation black women should have reached approximate parity with white women.

Although delving into a detailed analysis of the sources of gender differentials is beyond the scope of this study, we note that some prior theoretical research is consistent with the empirical finding of a lower racial wage gap for women than for men. Lopez (2003) suggests that negative racial stereotypes are more pronounced among black men than among black women because men in general have higher crime rates. She furthermore argues that the lower expectations for labor market success among women, as well as traditional gender role socialization that places a greater emphasis on social skills for females, facilitates a greater engagement in even limited job opportunities among black women compared to black men. Finally, the perception of a lack of "marriageable black men" has greater motivational significance for economic independence among black women as compared to white women (Wilson and Neckerman, 1986).

In the case of the new second-generation perspective (i.e., Farley and Alba, 2002), this approach, as discussed above, suggests that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be greater than third- and higher generation African Americans. This hypothesis would appear to be readily applicable to both men and women. Regarding the racial differential, the new second-generation view would seem to expect that second-generation African-American men would equal or possibly exceed mainstream white men. In the case of women, however, among whom the racial differential is generally small, as noted above, this view would logically predict that second-generation African-American women would clearly exceed mainstream white women. Appendix A provides a summary of our predictions derived from this literature, including our extensions to the issue of gender differentials.

DATA AND METHODS

We use two nationally representative data sets to investigate these issues. The first is the March Current Population Survey (CPS). We pool the data from 1994 to 2006 so as to obtain an adequate sample size for second-generation African Americans. We define the latter as persons who identify as African American on the race variable and who are native born but who have at least one parent who was not born in any of the 50 U.S. states or Washington, DC. To avoid duplicating individuals due to the rotational-group design of the CPS, we limit our analysis to the even years between 1994 and 2006. Our study is further restricted to African Americans and whites aged 25 to 64 who worked in the paid labor force, as is conventional in labor force studies.⁶

Hispanics are included in our analysis but they are not categorized separately due to space constraints and because the sample size for Hispanic African Americans is generally too small for multivariate analysis.⁷ Furthermore, our study includes the foreign-born, 1.5 generation as well as native-born African Americans whose processes of Hispanic identification may somewhat differ (Choi et al., 2008). We hope that future research will build on our efforts here to factor in the additional complexity of disentangling racial differentials by Hispanic identity.

The second data set that we investigate is the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) from the 2000 U.S. Census. Unlike the CPS, the PUMS does not provide information on place of birth for the respondent's parents. Therefore,

⁶ Due to the higher rates of unemployment among African Americans, we include both part-time and full-time workers in our analysis. We restrict the sample to persons who worked at least 1,000 hours during the year, however, in order to ensure that they have a clear attachment to the labor force.

⁷ A few of our CPS files include "other" as a racial category, but our analysis excludes persons who identify with that category. A sensitivity analysis suggests that the estimated net effect of being black is not significantly different for those years of the CPS that did not include an "other" racial category compared to those years that did.

in contrast to the analysis using the CPS, our statistical results for the PUMS cannot identify the second-generation population. We instead use the PUMS to analyze the so-called 1.5 generation (i.e., those who were born overseas but who came to the United States at a relatively young age and received most of their schooling in the United States) because this group is usually combined together with the second generation (Portes and Rumbaut, 2005). The PUMS can identify the 1.5 generation because place of birth and age of immigration to the United States is ascertained for each person in the Census. More specifically, we define the African-American 1.5 generation as persons who identify as African American on the race variable and who were not born in any of the 50 U.S. states or Washington, DC but who immigrated to the United States before the age of 13. Defined in exactly same way, we also include the African-American 1.5 generation in the analysis using the CPS as well.

The advantage of using the PUMS is that it has a very large sample size that permits the grouping the 1.5 generation according to region of birth. In our analysis of the PUMS, we distinguish between the following eight regions of birth (as shown in Appendix B): Africa, South America, Central America, Europe or North America, British Caribbean, U.S. Caribbean, Other Caribbean, and Asia or elsewhere. Persons from these different regions may vary on average in their socioeconomic origins or other human-capital-related characteristics (e.g., persons from Europe or North American may have higher socioeconomic origins, better quality schooling, and greater exposure to English [Bratsberg and Ragan, 2002]). By contrast, the sample size for the CPS is too small to distinguish 1.5- or second-generation persons in terms of region of origin.⁸

As noted above, we follow standard practice in this area of research by also considering the 1.5 generation when studying the second generation (Portes and Rumbaut, 2005; Zhou, 1997). The multivariate OLS regression model that we estimate using the CPS includes a dichotomous variable to indicate whether 1.5- or second-generation African American, a dichotomous variable to indicate whether 1.5- or second-generation white, and another dichotomous variable to indicate whether third- or higher generation white. In this categorization, the reference group for the regression model is third- and higher generation African American. The latter group is defined as persons who identify on the race variable as African American and whose parents are both native born. Third- and higher generation whites are correspondingly defined as persons who identify on the race variable as white and whose parents are both native born.

⁸ The 2004 and 2006 CPS as well as the 2000 PUMS include information on multiracial identity. For those data, only single-race African Americans were included in our sample. According to McKinnon (2001), over 95% of the total African-American population in the 2000 U.S. Census identified as single race. For this reason, combining the CPS files from 2002 and earlier (when the single-race classification system was used) with the 2004 and 2006 files is unlikely to be problematic. Furthermore, dropping the 2004 and 2006 files from our analysis did not change any of our major findings for the CPS data. The consistency between our estimates for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans for both genders in the PUMS and CPS results furthermore suggests that the measurement of racial identity across these data sets is reliable.

The regression model that we estimate using the PUMS includes a dichotomous variable to indicate whether 1.5 African American, a dichotomous variable to indicate whether 1.5 white, and another dichotomous variable to indicate whether second- or higher generation white. In this categorization using the PUMS, the reference group for the regression model is second- and higher generation African American because the lack of information on parental place of birth prohibits us from specifically identifying the second generation.

The dependent variable for our regressions is the log of the hourly wage. The log transformation is applied in order to correct for positive skew in the distribution of the hourly wage. Although other measures of labor market outcomes are of course available, we focus on the wage because disadvantaged workers often need to work longer hours (giving up their leisure time) in order to obtain adequate earnings (Zeng and Xie, 2004). In addition to the dichotomous variables for the demographic groups as described above, the independent variables for the regressions include age, age squared, years of schooling, years of schooling squared, region of residence, metropolitan status, and disability status. They are included in the regressions for both the CPS and the PUMS because these covariates are commonly used in labor market studies that seek to estimate net racial differentials (Grodsky and Pager, 2001; McCall, 2001; Saenz and Morales, 2005; Zeng and Xie, 2004). Appendix C provides more information on these variables.

Since we pool data for several different years of the CPS, the regression using those data also includes dichotomous variables to indicate each of the different years (i.e., period effects) with 1994 serving as the reference category. For the regressions using the 2000 PUMS, period effects are not included because the PUMS refer to only one year. All the regressions are estimated separately by gender because race and generational differentials are our primary theoretical focus (i.e., the differentials are considered separately by gender). Furthermore, the effect of age is known to vary by gender due to substantial gender differentials (at least on average) in patterns of labor force experience (Tam, 1997).

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics for Men in the CPS

The right side of Table II shows the descriptive statistics for men using the CPS sample. The number of male respondents who are 1.5- or second-generation African American in the CPS data is 638. The mean age for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans is younger than the mean age for third- and higher generation African Americans. On the other hand, 1.5- and second-generation African Americans have a higher mean years of schooling than third- and higher generation African Americans. As indicated in Table II, both these differentials are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table II. Descriptive Statistics for Men

Variable	2000 Census				1994-2006 CPS			
	Black		White		Black		White	
	1.5 Gen.	2nd + Gen.	1.5 Gen.	2nd + Gen.	1.5-2nd Gen.	3rd + Gen.	1.5-2nd Gen.	3rd + Gen.
Age	34.74* a	40.79 a	39.95* a	42.02*	35.21* a	40.68 a	40.95* a	41.81*
Years of schooling	14.10* a	13.26 a	14.06* a	14.13*	14.21*	13.21 a	13.91* a	14.03*
Region								
Northeast	0.44* a	0.13 a	0.23* a	0.20*	0.48* a	0.12 a	0.28* a	0.18*
Midwest	0.08* a	0.19 a	0.14* a	0.27*	0.07* a	0.19 a	0.16* a	0.28*
South	0.36* a	0.58 a	0.35* a	0.34*	0.33* a	0.59 a	0.26* a	0.34*
West	0.12* a	0.10 a	0.27* a	0.19*	0.12 a	0.10 a	0.31* a	0.19*
Metropolitan area	0.96* a	0.85 a	0.88* a	0.75*	0.97* a	0.87 a	0.92* a	0.79*
With disability	0.16* a	0.17 a	0.11* a	0.09*	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Period								
Year 1994					0.08 a	0.11 a	0.12*	0.12*
Year 1996					0.08* a	0.11 a	0.13* a	0.13*
Year 1998					0.11	0.12 a	0.13* a	0.13*
Year 2000					0.1	0.13	0.13* a	0.13
Year 2002					0.2 a	0.18 a	0.15* a	0.16*
Year 2004					0.22	0.17 a	0.16* a	0.16*
Year 2006					0.21 a	0.18 a	0.18*	0.17*
Wage	18.54* a	16.56 a	23.30* a	22.83*	19.46* a	16.28 a	22.41* a	22.35*
Logged wage	2.72* a	2.62 a	2.89*	2.89*	2.75* a	2.59 a	2.85* a	2.87*
Sample size (n)	2,464	1,607,758	35,649	1,783,649	638	15,325	16,693	150,893

Notes: For the 2000 PUMS results, an "a" indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 2nd + generation whites while an asterisk indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 2nd + generation African Americans. For the CPS results, an "a" indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 3rd + generation whites while an asterisk indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 3rd + generation African Americans (two-tailed tests).

The mean age for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans in the CPS sample is also substantially younger relative to the mean age for third- and higher generation whites. Despite their younger age, the mean years of schooling for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans is slightly higher than for third- and higher generation whites (though the difference is not statistically significant). In terms of place of residence, third- and higher generation whites are more evenly distributed across the four regions. By contrast, almost half of 1.5- and second-generation African Americans reside in the Northeast.

Despite their younger average age, the mean wage and the mean log-wage for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans exceed those for third- and higher generation African Americans, as shown in Table II. However, the mean wage and the mean log-wage for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans are lower than for third- and higher generation whites. All these wage differentials are statistically significant.

Descriptive Statistics for Men in the PUMS

The left side of Table II shows the descriptive statistics for men using the 2000 PUMS sample. The most obvious difference compared to the results based on the CPS is the much larger sample size for the PUMS data, in which 1.5-generation African-American men number 2,464. As noted above, the second generation per se cannot be identified in the PUMS, and therefore the second and all higher generations are grouped together and shown as the second and higher generation in Table II.

Another difference is that, relative to the CPS, the proportion with a disability is substantially higher in the PUMS. This larger proportion is obtained because the PUMS refers to a disability of any sort, whereas the CPS identifies a disability only when it specifically limits the type of employment that the person is able to do. The means for the other variables are fairly consistent between the two data sets.

Descriptive Statistics for Women in the CPS

The right side of Table III shows the descriptive statistics for women using the CPS sample. In general, the sample sizes for women are slightly larger than for men. As is the case for men, 1.5- and second-generation African-American women tend to be younger than third- and higher generation whites as well as third- and higher generation African-American women, and these differentials are statistically significant, as indicated in Table III. The mean years of schooling for 1.5- and second-generation African-American women significantly exceeds that of third- and higher generation African-American women and third- and higher generation white women. Half the 1.5- and

Table III. Descriptive Statistics for Women

Variable	2000 Census				1994-2006 CPS			
	Black		White		Black		White	
	1.5 Gen.	2nd+ Gen.	1.5 Gen.	2nd+ Gen.	1.5-2nd Gen.	3rd+ Gen.	1.5-2nd Gen.	3rd+ Gen.
Age	34.76* a	40.68 a	40.26* a	42.26*	36.33* a	41.01 a	41.01* a	41.93*
Years of schooling	14.54* a	13.70 a	14.24* a	14.19*	14.35* a	13.54 a	13.99* a	14.04*
Region								
Northeast	0.46* a	0.14 a	0.24* a	0.20*	0.50* a	0.13 a	0.29* a	0.19*
Midwest	0.06* a	0.19 a	0.14* a	0.28*	0.08* a	0.20 a	0.16* a	0.28*
South	0.38* a	0.58 a	0.35* a	0.34*	0.32*	0.59 a	0.25* a	0.34*
West	0.10* a	0.09 a	0.27* a	0.18*	0.10* a	0.08 a	0.30* a	0.19*
Metropolitan area	0.97* a	0.86 a	0.89* a	0.74*	0.98* a	0.87 a	0.92* a	0.79*
With disability	0.14* a	0.16 a	0.10* a	0.08*	0.02	0.03 a	0.03*	0.02*
Period								
Year 1994					0.07* a	0.10 a	0.12*	0.12*
Year 1996					0.08 a	0.11 a	0.12* a	0.13*
Year 1998					0.12*	0.12 a	0.13* a	0.13*
Year 2000					0.14*	0.13 a	0.13* a	0.13*
Year 2002					0.15	0.18 a	0.16* a	0.16*
Year 2004					0.17	0.18 a	0.17* a	0.16*
Year 2006					0.27* a	0.18 a	0.17* a	0.17*
Wage	16.79* a	14.58 a	17.32* a	16.04*	17.00* a	13.47 a	16.35* a	15.70*
Logged wage	2.66* a	2.50 a	2.66* a	2.60*	2.64* a	2.41 a	2.59* a	2.55*
Sample size (n)	3,017	193,108	28,270	1,458,668	848	19,892	13,998	127,559

Notes: For the 2000 PUMS results, an “a” indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 2nd+ generation whites while an asterisk indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 2nd+ generation African Americans. For the CPS results, an “a” indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 3rd+ generation whites while an asterisk indicates statistical significance at the .05 level relative to 3rd+ generation African Americans (two-tailed tests).

second-generation African-American women reside in the Northeast and they are overwhelming urban. These characteristics of 1.5- and second-generation African-American women are similar to those reported above for 1.5- and second-generation African-American men.

While 1.5- and second-generation African-American men have a lower mean wage and a lower mean log-wage than white men, 1.5- and second-generation African-American women are different in that their mean wage and mean log-wage exceed that for both third- and higher generation white women as well as third- and higher generation African-American women. These differentials are statistically significant.

Descriptive Statistics for Women in the PUMS

The left side of Table III shows the descriptive statistics for women using the PUMS sample. The sample sizes for women in the PUMS are clearly much larger than for the CPS. Table III also shows that the proportion with a disability is much higher in the PUMS given its broader definition. As is the case with the CPS data, the mean wage and the mean log-wage for 1.5-generation African-American women are both higher and statistically significant relative to second- and higher generation white women as well as second- and higher generation African-American women.

OLS Regression Results for Men Using the CPS

OLS regression results for the CPS are shown in Table IV. The estimates for the model for men indicate that the net effects of each of the control variables—including age, age squared, years of schooling, years of schooling squared, region of residence, metropolitan status, and disability status—are statistically significant. Their estimated effects are generally consistent with prior results from previous labor market studies. The period effects in this model are also all statistically significant and their coefficients indicate rising wages (as well as inflation) over this decade.

The regression results for men using the CPS as shown in Table IV furthermore indicate that the coefficient for each of the demographic groups is statistically significant at the .05 level relative to third- and higher generation African Americans. Net of the control variables, the wages of 1.5- and second-generation African Americans are about 5% higher (i.e., $\exp(.0457) - 1 = 5\%$) than third- and higher generation African Americans, while wages are about 18% higher (i.e., $\exp(.1697) - 1 = 18\%$) for 1.5- and second-generation whites and 21% higher for third- and higher generation whites (i.e., $\exp(.1932) - 1 = 21\%$). Thus, third- and higher generation African Americans are significantly disadvantaged relative to each of these groups, including 1.5- and second-generation African Americans. At the same time, however, the wages of

Table IV. Estimates of Regression Models of Log-Wage Using 1994–2006 CPS

Variable	Men Coefficient	Women Coefficient
Race by generation (3rd + generation black)		
2nd or 1.5 generation black	0.0457* ^a	0.0780***
2nd or 1.5 generation white	0.1697*** ^a	0.0819***
3rd + generation white	0.1932***	0.0757***
Age	0.0705***	0.0437***
Age squared	-0.0007***	-0.0004***
Years of schooling	0.0413***	0.0502***
Years of schooling squared	0.0019***	0.0021***
Region (Northeast)		
Midwest	-0.0636***	-0.0865***
South	-0.0825***	-0.1047***
West	-0.0386***	-0.0554***
Area type (nonmetropolitan area)		
Metropolitan area	0.1783***	0.2061***
Disability status (without disability)		
With disability	-0.3069***	-0.1986***
Period effect (year 1994)		
Year 1996	0.0449***	0.0361***
Year 1998	0.1232***	0.1056***
Year 2000	0.1917***	0.1764***
Year 2002	0.2844***	0.2710***
Year 2004	0.3182***	0.3220***
Year 2006	0.3673***	0.3580***
Intercept	-0.2399***	0.0411
R ²	0.2715	0.2738

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Notes: ^a indicates statistical significance with respect to 3rd+ generation whites at .05 or less (two-tailed tests). Groups in parentheses refer to the reference categories.

the latter group are closer to those of third- and higher generation African Americans than to those of either of the white groups. Five percent subtracted from 21% implies that 1.5- and second-generation African Americans earn about 16% less than third- and higher generation whites who have the same levels of schooling and other demographic characteristics.

OLS Regression Results for Men Using the PUMS

The OLS regression results for men using the PUMS are shown on the left side of Table V. Two different specifications are reported. In Model 1, the 1.5 generation is identified as an overall group in the regression. In Model 2, the 1.5 generation is broken down by region of birth, including Africa, Europe/North America, Central America (i.e., Mexico, Costa Rica, etc.), South America (i.e., Argentina, Chile, etc.), British Caribbean (i.e., Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, etc.), U.S. Caribbean (i.e., Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands), other Caribbean (i.e., Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic), and Asia/other.

Table V. Estimates of Regression Models of Log-Wage Using 2000 Census

Variable	Men		Women	
	Model 1 Coefficient	Model 2 Coefficient	Model 1 Coefficient	Model 2 Coefficient
Race by generation (2nd + generation black)				
1.5 generation black	0.0585***		0.0861***	
1.5 generation white	0.1739***		0.0692***	
2nd + generation white	0.1795***	0.1794***	0.0428***	0.0428***
1.5 generation black				
Africa		-0.0118		-0.0048
Europe or North America		0.0880**		0.0518*
Central America		0.0532		0.0921**
South America		0.0897		0.1738***
British Caribbean		0.0863***		0.1079***
U.S. Caribbean		-0.0376		0.0541
Other Caribbean		0.0407		0.1020***
Asia or others		0.0094		0.0525
1.5 generation White				
Africa		0.2026***		0.0915***
Europe or North America		0.1972***		0.0726***
Central America		0.0860***		0.0098
South America		0.1829***		0.0995***
British Caribbean		0.2195**		0.1604**
U.S. Caribbean		0.0743***		0.0528***
Other Caribbean		0.2301***		0.1475***
Asia or others		0.2028***		0.0682***
Age	0.0649***	0.0648***	0.0444***	0.0443***
Age squared	-0.0006***	-0.0006***	-0.0004***	-0.0004***
Years of schooling	0.0270***	0.0264***	0.0255***	0.0252***
Years of schooling squared	0.0021***	0.0021***	0.0027***	0.0027***
Region (Northeast)				
Midwest	-0.0585***	-0.0584***	-0.0952***	-0.0951***
South	-0.0934***	-0.0933***	-0.1114***	-0.1114***
West	-0.0235***	-0.0229***	-0.0223***	-0.0218***
Metropolitan area (nonmetropolitan area)	0.1796***	0.1798***	0.1991***	0.1990***
With disability (without disability)	-0.0731***	-0.0729***	-0.0539***	-0.0539***
Intercept	0.2655***	0.2728***	0.5209***	0.5246***
R ²	0.2170	0.2171	0.2462	0.2462

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Notes: Groups in parentheses refer to the reference categories.

Although the results using the PUMS are only able to identify the 1.5 generation (rather than the 1.5 and second generation combined together as in the CPS analyses), the results for Model 1 in Table V are nonetheless fairly similar to the results for men in Table IV for the CPS. 1.5-generation African Americans earn slightly higher wages than second- and higher generation African Americans (i.e., about 6% higher in Table V vs. the 5% premium based on the slightly different categorization used for the CPS in Table IV). 1.5-generation whites and second- and higher generation whites earn about 19% and 20% more than second- and higher generation African Americans (which are

quite similar to the results for men in Table IV). These findings generally corroborate the earlier regression results regarding the racial and generational differentials for men as estimated using the CPS.

The estimates of the effects of the control variables in Model 1 for men in Table V are all statistically significant, and these estimates are fairly consistent with the coefficients reported in Table IV using the CPS. The one coefficient that does appreciably differ, however, between the two data sets is disability. The effect of having a disability is much more negative in the CPS results (i.e., Table IV) than in the PUMS results (i.e., Table V). This difference is undoubtedly related to the narrower definition of a disability in the CPS as referring to a condition that specifically impinges on employment, whereas disability in the PUMS refers to the presence of any physical limitation even when it does not affect employment.

After breaking down the 1.5 generation by region of origin in Model 2 for men in Table V, the estimates indicate some variation among 1.5-generation whites. For 1.5-generation white men born in Central America (e.g., Mexico) or the U.S. Caribbean (e.g., Puerto Rico), wages are lower than for 1.5-generation white men born in other regions. Model 2 in Table V also shows some differentials by region of birth for 1.5-generation African-American men. Those who were born in Africa have wages that are not different from second- and higher generation African Americans. However, consistent with the results of Kalmijn (1996), Model 2 indicates that 1.5-generation African Americans who were born in the British Caribbean or Europe/North America have higher wages (i.e., by 9%) than second- and higher generation African Americans.

These differentials indicate significant variation across 1.5-generation African Americans, but the commonality among them is that they all have lower wages than whites. In particular, 6% subtracted from 20% (based on Model 1 in Table V) implies that 1.5-generation African Americans as an overall group earn about 14% less than second- and higher generation whites who have the same levels of schooling and other basic demographic characteristics. This finding is close to that for the CPS reported above in regard to the wage differential between 1.5- and second-generation African Americans and third- and higher generation whites in Table IV.

OLS Regression Results for Women Using the CPS

The estimates of the regression model for women using the CPS are presented in Table IV. The coefficients for all the independent variables are each statistically significant. Most of the coefficients are fairly similar to those for men except that age has a lower return among women (probably in part reflecting their lower level of labor market participation) and their wages are less penalized by the presence of a disability.

Other results in Table IV for women show that each of the three demographic groups (i.e., 1.5- and second-generation African Americans, 1.5- and

second-generation whites, and third- and higher generation whites) has higher wages than third- and higher generation African Americans. Relative to the latter group and net of the control variables, wages are about 8% higher than among 1.5- and second-generation whites, third- and higher generation whites, and 1.5- and second-generation African Americans. Each of these net effects is statistically significant relative to third- and higher generation African Americans.

OLS Regression Results for Women Using the PUMS

The OLS regression results for women using the PUMS are shown on the right side of Table V. With the exception of the lower penalty for having a disability, the effects of the control variables for women in Model 1 using the PUMS as shown in Table V are generally similar to the effects for women reported in Table IV using the CPS. Regarding the coefficient that is our main theoretical interest—the effect of having an immigrant background among African Americans—the basic result using the PUMS is quite consistent with the estimate using the CPS. In particular, the results for Model 1 for women in Table V indicate that 1.5-generation African Americans have about 9% higher wages than other African Americans. The figure just noted above for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans using the CPS was 8%.

The results for women in Model 1 using the PUMS as shown in Table V indicate positive effects for 1.5-generation whites and second- and higher generation whites relative to second- and higher generation African Americans, but consistent with prior research, these effects are not especially large. In Model 1 of Table V, 1.5-generation whites have 7% higher wages than second- and higher generation African Americans, while the advantage of second- and higher generation whites is only 4%. Thus, the point estimate for 1.5-generation African Americans noted above (i.e., 9%) slightly exceeds that for 1.5-generation whites and second- and higher generation whites.

Model 2 for women as shown in Table V differentiates the 1.5 generation by region of birth. As was the case among 1.5-generation African-American men, 1.5-generation African-American women from Europe/North America and the British Caribbean have higher wages than second- and higher generation African Americans. In contrast to men, however, higher wages are also evident among 1.5-generation African-American women from Central America, South America, and other Caribbean nations. Indeed, the coefficients for these regions are greater than for Europe/North America, with the largest effect being for 1.5-generation African-American women from South America (i.e., 19% higher wages than second- and higher generation African Americans). By contrast, the coefficient for 1.5-generation African-American men from South America is smaller and not statistically significant.

CONCLUSIONS

Using the 2000 PUMS and the CPS from 1994 to 2006, we have investigated the socioeconomic attainments of African Americans with an immigrant parental background, including the 1.5 and second generations. For the CPS analyses we combined the 1.5 and second generations and compared them to the third and higher generation. For the PUMS analyses we identified the 1.5 generation and compared it to the second and higher generation (which numerically mainly reflects the third and higher generation).

For both data sets and for both genders, the results consistently show that 1.5- and second-generation African Americans have larger mean years of schooling than higher generation African Americans. These advantages are statistically significant. In the case of men, the mean years of schooling among 1.5- and second-generation African Americans tend to be similar to higher generation whites. In the case of women, the mean years of schooling among 1.5- and second-generation African Americans significantly exceeds higher generation whites. This achievement of at least parity in schooling with mainstream whites and the advantage relative to higher generation African Americans are important characteristics of 1.5- and second-generation African Americans.

Our other results indicate, however, that higher levels of schooling do not always translate into equally higher wages. In this regard, the findings differ greatly by gender. In the case of women, 1.5- and second-generation African-American women have higher wages given their schooling and other characteristics relative to higher generation African-American women. In addition, given their characteristics, the wages of 1.5- and second-generation African-American women are at least as large if not greater than those of white women. Thus, racial disadvantage is probably not the major generic liability for the wages of 1.5- and second-generation African-American women. Their labor market concerns may be more associated with gender (i.e., relative to men) rather than with race per se (i.e., relative to white women).

By contrast, 1.5- and second-generation African-American men consistently have lower wages (given their schooling and other characteristics) than mainstream white men. Although 1.5- and second-generation African-American men clearly have higher wages than other African-American men, the results from both our data sets nonetheless also indicate that 1.5- and second-generation African-American men face a systematic racial disadvantage in wage determination (i.e., the racial disadvantage of 1.5- and second-generation African-American men is simply less than the racial disadvantage for higher generation African-American men). Even among 1.5- and second-generation African-American men from Europe/North America—who may tend to have somewhat higher socioeconomic backgrounds (Bratsberg and Ragan, 2002)—parity in wages with mainstream whites is not evident.

Regarding the theoretical implications of these findings, we do not doubt that for some individual 1.5- and second-generation African Americans, poor

socioeconomic outcomes do sometimes occur as predicted by lower-class vulnerability views of Gans (1992) and Portes and Zhou (1993). Our results indicate, however, that this description is probably not the typical pattern. As noted above, 1.5- and second-generation African Americans have higher levels of schooling, which is a key resource in the contemporary labor market. Furthermore, 1.5- and second-generation African Americans have wages that tend to be slightly advantaged over higher generation African Americans with the same level of schooling. Thus, lower-class vulnerability for 1.5- and second-generation African Americans is probably not the dominant pattern.

For 1.5- and second-generation African-American women, the foregoing results suggest the relevance of the new second-generation perspective (Farley and Alba, 2002). In the post-civil rights era with greater opportunities for minorities and females, 1.5- and second-generation African-American women have higher levels of schooling than mainstream white women. According to our CPS results, 1.5-generation African-American women have higher wages than white women even after taking into account schooling and other demographic characteristics. The PUMS results further indicate that 1.5-generation African-American women from several (though not all) regions have higher wages than comparable mainstream white women. Thus, many of our findings are consistent with Farley and Alba's new second-generation perspective, which implies that, given their higher levels of motivation in the post civil rights era, 1.5- and second-generation African-American women actually often have higher socioeconomic outcomes than higher generation white women.

As we have suggested, the socioeconomic disadvantages of 1.5- and second-generation African-American women may therefore stem less from race *per se* than with gender. Prior research has argued that women face reduced advancement opportunities and lower wages due to gender segregation in the workforce, the devaluation of female-dominated occupations, employment discrimination, and a negative ranking in labor market queuing (England et al., 2001; Jacobs, 2001; Kaufman, 2001; Reskin, 2001), while at the same time being burdened with greater responsibilities in terms of childcare and housework (Bianchi, 1995). For these reasons, viewed in the context of our findings, we suggest that gender rather than race may be the more significant disadvantage for 1.5- and second-generation African-American women.

As for 1.5- and second-generation African-American men, our results seem most consistent with the predictions of the segmented assimilation view of Waters (1994), the immigrant optimism perspective of Kao and Tienda (1995), and Ogbu's (1978) voluntary immigrant view. 1.5- and second-generation African-American men have achieved years of schooling that are on par with mainstream white men, perhaps reflecting a certain degree of optimism as well as strategic posturing as ambitious (and voluntary) "immigrants" outside of the mainstream African-American community. At the same time, however, the schooling of 1.5- and second-generation African-American men does not result in as high a level of wages as among whites. Although they have higher wages than higher generation African Americans, 1.5- and

second-generation African-American men have lower wages than comparably educated whites.

As a group, 1.5- and second-generation African-American men have wages that are about 5% to 6% greater than higher generation African-American men with similar levels of schooling and demographic characteristics, but 14% to 16% less than comparable mainstream white men. Overall, 1.5- and second-generation African-American men are therefore closer to white men in terms of levels of schooling, but 1.5- and second-generation African-American men are closer to higher generation African-American men in terms of how the labor market determines wages. Our PUMS results for the 1.5 generation suggest that this persistence of a racial disadvantage may vary slightly by region of birth, but even among those who may have higher socioeconomic origins (i.e., those from Europe/North America), a substantial racial disadvantage is still evident in the labor market.

In sum, these results overall indicate that an immigrant background can partially ameliorate but cannot fully overcome the racial disadvantage for African-American men in the contemporary labor market. For 1.5- and second-generation African-American men, race remains a significant liability in the determination of wages. Though somewhat less disadvantaged than mainstream African-American men, the persistence of a racial disadvantage for 1.5- and second-generation African-American men suggests the continuing significance of racial disadvantage.

REFERENCES

- Bianchi, Suzanne M. 1995. "The Changing Economic Roles of Women and Men," in Reynolds Farley (ed.), *State of the Union: America in the 1990s, Volume 1*: pp. 107–154. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bratsberg, Bernt, and James F. Ragan Jr. 2002. "The Impact of Host-Country Schooling on Earnings: A Study of Male Immigrants in the United States," *Journal of Human Resources* 37: 63–105.
- Choi, Kate H., Arthur Sakamoto, and Daniel A. Powers. 2008. "Who Is Hispanic? Hispanic Identity Among African Americans, Asian Americans, Others, and Whites," *Sociological Inquiry* 78: 335–371.
- Damaske, Sarah. 2009. "Brown Suits Need Not Apply: The Intersection of Race, Gender, and Class in Institutional Network Building," *Sociological Forum* 24(2): 402–424.
- Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo. 1997. "Assimilation Differences Among Africans in America," *Social Forces* 76: 527–546.
- Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo, and Baffour K. Takyi. 2002. "Africans in the Diaspora: Black-White Earnings Differences Among America's Africans," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25: 913–941.
- England, Paula, Jennifer Thompson, and Carolyn Aman. 2001. "The Sex Gap in Pay and Comparable Worth: An Update," in Ivar Berg and Arne L. Kalleberg (eds.), *Sourcebook of Labor Markets*: pp. 551–565. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Farley, Reynolds, and Richard Alba. 2002. "The New Second Generation in the United States," *International Migration Review* 36: 669–701.
- Gans, Herbert H. 1992. "Second Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15: 173–192.
- Goyette, Kimberly, and Yu Xie. 1999. "Educational Expectations of Asian American Youths: Determinants and Ethnic Differences," *Sociology of Education* 72: 22–36.
- Grodsky, Eric, and Devah Pager. 2001. "The Structure of Disadvantage: Individual and Occupational Determinants of the Black-White Wage Gap," *American Sociological Review* 66: 542–567.

- Jacobs, Jerry A. 2001. "Evolving Patterns of Sex Segregation," in Ivar Berg and Arne L. Kalleberg (eds.), *Sourcebook of Labor Markets*: pp. 535–550. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1996. "The Socioeconomic Assimilation of Caribbean American Blacks," *Social Forces* 74: 911–930.
- Kao, Grace, and Martha Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth," *Social Science Quarterly* 76: 1–19.
- Kasinitz, Philip. 1992. *Caribbean New York: Black Immigrants and the Politics of Race*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Kasinitz, Philip. 2008. "Robin Williams, Race, and American Sociology," *Sociological Forum* 23(2): 373–376.
- Kaufman, Robert L. 2001. "Race and Labor Market Segmentation," in Ivar Berg and Arne L. Kalleberg (eds.), *Sourcebook of Labor Markets*: pp. 645–668. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Kim, Dae Young. 2009. "The Role of Father's Occupation on Intergenerational Educational and Occupational Mobility: The Case of Second-Generation Chinese Americans in New York," *Sociological Forum* 24(1): 104–134.
- Lopez, Nancy. 2003. *Hopeful Girls, Troubled Boys*. New York: Dewey.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, Douglas S., Margarita Mooney, Kimberly C. Torres, and Camille Z. Charles. 2007. "Black Immigrants and Black Natives Attending Selective Colleges and Universities in the United States," *American Journal of Education* 113: 243–272.
- Maume, David J. 2004. "Wage Discrimination Over the Life Course: A Comparison of Explanations," *Social Problems* 5: 505–527.
- McCall, Leslie. 2001. "Sources of Racial Wage Inequality in Metropolitan Labor Markets: Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences," *American Sociological Review* 66: 520–541.
- McKinnon, Jesse. 2001. *The Black Population: 2000 U.S. Census Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Ogbu, John U. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. 1995. *Black Wealth/White Wealth*. New York: Routledge.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2005. "Introduction: The Second Generation and the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28: 983–999.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74–96.
- Reskin, Barbara F. 2001. "Employment Discrimination and Its Remedies," in Ivar Berg and Arne L. Kalleberg (eds.), *Sourcebook of Labor Markets*: pp. 567–599. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Roxburgh, Susan. 2009. "Untangling Inequalities: Gender, Race, and Socioeconomic Differences in Depression," *Sociological Forum* 24(2): 357–381.
- Saenz, Rogelio, and M. Cristina Morales. 2005. "Demography of Race and Ethnicity," in Dudley L. Poston and Michael Micklin (eds.), *Handbook of Population*: pp. 169–208. New York: Springer.
- Suarez-Orozco, Carola, and Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco. 1995. *Transformations: Immigration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation Among Latino Adolescents*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Tam, Tony. 1997. "Sex Segregation and Occupational Gender Inequality in the United States: Devaluation or Specialized Training?" *American Journal of Sociology* 102: 1652–1692.
- Waters, Mary C. 1994. "Ethnic and Racial Identities of Second Generation Black Immigrants in New York City," *International Migration Review* 28: 795–820.
- Western, Bruce, and Becky Pettit. 2005. "Black-White Wage Inequality, Employment Rates, and Incarceration," *American Journal of Sociology* 111: 553–578.
- Wilson, William J., and Kathryn Neckerman. 1986. "Poverty and Family Structure: The Widening Gap Between Evidence and Public Policy Issues," in Sheldon H. Danziger and Daniel H. Weinberg (eds.), *Fighting Poverty*: pp. 232–259. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Xie, Yu, and Kimberly Goyette. 2004. *A Demographic Portrait of Asian Americans*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Population Reference Bureau.

Zeng, Zheng, and Yu Xie. 2004. "Asian-Americans' Earnings Disadvantage Reexamined: The Role of Place of Education," *American Journal of Sociology* 109: 1075–1108.
 Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation," *International Migration Review* 31: 975–1008.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF PREDICTIONS FROM PRIOR LITERATURE REGARDING THE SOCIOECONOMIC ATTAINMENTS OF SECOND-GENERATION AFRICAN AMERICANS

Literature	Relative to 3+ Generation African-American Men	Relative to 3+ Generation White Men
Men		
Lower-class vulnerability (Gans, 1992; Portes and Zhou, 1993)	Less than	Less than
Segmented assimilation (Waters, 1994)	Greater than	Less than
Immigrant optimism (Kao and Tienda, 1995; Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco, 1995)	Greater than	Less than
Voluntary immigrant view (Ogbu, 1978)	Greater than	Less than
New second generation (Farley and Alba, 2002)	Greater than	Equal to or greater than
Women		
Lower-class vulnerability (Gans, 1992; Portes and Zhou, 1993)	Less than	Less than
Segmented assimilation (Waters, 1994)	Greater than	Equal to
Immigrant optimism (Kao and Tienda, 1995; Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco, 1995)	Greater than	Equal to
Voluntary immigrant view (Ogbu, 1978)	Greater than	Equal to
New second generation (Farley and Alba, 2002)	Greater than	Greater than

APPENDIX B: PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PLACE OF BIRTH AMONG IMMIGRANTS^a

	2000 Census				1994–2006 CPS			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
<i>Place of Birth</i>								
Africa	7.2	1.7	5.5	1.7	5.4	0.5	6.5	0.4
Europe or North America	17.8	55.2	18.1	56.4	7.9	51.3	5.9	51.2
Central America	8.4	17.1	9	14.9	13.4	26.1	14.9	24.3
South America	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.7	3.0	4.8	3.0
British Caribbean	36.1	0.3	38.6	0.3	29.7	0.2	30.2	0.3
U.S. Caribbean	7	5.7	6.3	6.1	9.6	6.9	11.4	8.2
Other Caribbean	15.4	7	13.7	8	19.9	4.4	17.7	4.6
Asia or elsewhere	3.7	8.6	4.7	8.4	9.6	7.6	8.7	7.9

APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)

	2000 Census				1994–2006 CPS			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample size (<i>n</i>)	2,464	35,649	3,017	28,270	638	16,693	848	13,998

^aImmigrants refer to persons who are 1.5 generation for the 2000 Census and 1.5 or second generation for the 1994–2006 CPS. For second-generation persons in the CPS, region is determined by father’s place of birth.

APPENDIX C: DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Variable	Description
African American	Whether respondent identifies as African American or black (excludes persons who state that they are multiracial and also identify as white or other racial groups)
Generation	
1.5 generation	Was born outside of the U.S. but immigrated to the U.S. before the age of 13
Second generation	Was born in the U.S. but has at least one parent who was born outside of the U.S.
3rd+ generation	Was born in the U.S. and both parents were also born in the U.S.
Income	
Wage	Total earnings during the year divided by the total number of hours worked during that year
Demographic Information	
Age	Total years of age at the time of the survey
Age squared	The square of age
Educational Attainment	
Years of schooling	Total number of years of schooling completed
Years of schooling squared	The square of years of schooling
Physical Limitation	
Disability status (PUMS)	Whether the respondent indicates having a disability of any sort
Disability status (CPS)	Whether the respondent indicates having a disability that limits work
Geographical Information	
Metropolitan status	Whether resides in a metropolitan area
Region	
Northeast	Whether resides in any of the following states: ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT, NY, NJ, or PA
Midwest	Whether resides in any of the following states: OH, IN, IL, MI, WI, MN, IA, MO, ND, SD, NE, or KS
South	Whether resides in any of the following states: DE, MD, DC, VA, WV, NC, SC, GA, FL, KY, TN, AL, MS, AR, LA, OK, or TX
West	Whether resides in any of the following states: MT, ID, WY, CO, NM, AZ, UT, NV, WA, OR, CA, AK, or HI