



Published in final edited form as:

Int J Intercult Relat. 2015 November ; 49: 212–222. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.10.001.

Place of birth effects on self-reported discrimination: Variations by type of discrimination

Elizabeth Brondolo¹, Reanne Rahim¹, Stephanie Grimaldi¹, Amina Ashraf¹, Nini Bui¹, and Joseph Schwartz²

¹St. John's University

²Stony Brook University

Abstract

Researchers have suggested that perceptions of discrimination may vary depending on place of birth and the length of time spent living in the U.S., variables related to acculturation. However, the existing literature provides a mixed picture, with data suggesting that the effects of acculturation on perceptions of discrimination vary by race and other sociodemographic factors. This study evaluated the role of place of birth (POB: defined as U.S.-born vs. foreign-born), age at immigration, and length of residence in the U.S. on self-reported discrimination in a sample of urban-dwelling Asian and Black adults (n= 1454). Analyses examined POB effects on different types of discrimination including race-related stigmatization, exclusion, threat, and workplace discrimination. Sociodemographic variables (including age, gender, employment status and education level) were tested as potential moderators of the relationship between POB and discrimination. The results revealed a significant main effect for POB on discrimination, with U.S.-born individuals reporting significantly more discrimination than foreign-born individuals, although the effect was reduced when sociodemographic variables were controlled. Across the sample, POB effects were seen only for race-related stigmatization and exclusion, not for threat and workplace discrimination. With the exception of limited effects for gender, sociodemographic variables did not moderate these effects. Younger age at immigration and greater years of residence in the U.S. were also positively associated with higher levels of perceived discrimination. These findings suggest increasing acculturation may shape the experience and perception of racial and ethnic discrimination.

Keywords

Place of birth; discrimination; nativity; immigration; racism; stigmatization

Substantial data suggest that members of ethnic and racial minority groups are vulnerable to being targeted for racism and/or ethnic discrimination (Lauderdale, Wen, Jacobs, &

Corresponding Author: Elizabeth Brondolo, Ph.D., St. John's University, 8000 Utopia Parkway, Jamaica NY 11439, brondole@stjohns.edu, Phone: 718 990 6496, Fax: 718 990 6705.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Kandula, 2006; Lyles et al., 2011; Ro & Choi, 2009; Shariff-Marco, Klassen, & Bowie, 2010). The prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior may take many forms. On an interpersonal level, discrimination may be experienced as directly perceived episodes of social exclusion, workplace discrimination, and verbal or physical threat and harassment (Brondolo et al., 2005; Krieger, Kosheleva, Waterman, Chen, & Koenen, 2011; Kwok et al., 2011).

Theories of intersectionality suggest that the experiences of discrimination facing an ethnic or racial minority group member may depend on membership in or identification with other groups defined by ethnicity, gender or social class, among other variables. These different status groups may influence the social context in which an individual experiences discrimination. In addition, both membership in different status groups and the context in which the maltreatment occurs may change the perception or attributions of the causes for this maltreatment (Cole, 2009; Reisen, Brooks, Zea, Poppen, & Bianchi, 2013; Seng, Lopez, Sperlich, Hamama, & Reed Meldrum, 2012).

One social category that may influence the experience or perception of discrimination is immigration status or place of birth (POB)¹. The theory and evidence are unclear about the ways in which membership in a group based on POB influences the experiences and reports of discrimination among those who belong to racial or ethnic minority groups. Foreign-born individuals may be targeted for discrimination more than U.S.-born individuals not only because of existing stereotypes about the nature of their ethnic or racial group, but also because of characteristics associated with immigration itself (Deaux et al., 2007; Rosenbloom & Way, 2004). Foreign-born individuals may lack English language fluency, and barriers to communication may render them more vulnerable to discriminatory behavior (Goto, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2002; Perez, Sribney, & Rodríguez, 2009; Torres, Driscoll, & Voell, 2012). The dress, eating habits, and social communication of immigrant individuals may differ from those of U.S.-born individuals and lead others to exclude or reject them (Rosenbloom & Way, 2004; Waters, 1994; Ying, Lee, & Tsai, 2000). Immigration may increase contact with members of different racial or ethnic groups, and this increase in the frequency of cross-race interactions may potentiate the possibility of encountering discrimination (Goto et al., 2002; Pérez, Fortuna, & Alegria, 2008).

POB may also effect the attributions individuals make about the causes for episodes of maltreatment. Foreign-born individuals may have been raised in societies where their ethnic or racial group formed the majority, and therefore may be more likely to attribute discriminatory behavior to other causes (e.g., to social class or religion) (Waters, 1994). They may also believe that others hold more favorable opinions about their specific ethnic group than is actually the case, making them less likely to assume that racial or ethnic prejudice drives maltreatment (Deaux et al., 2007; Wiley, Perkins, & Deaux, 2008).

Foreign-born individuals in the U.S. may be less aware of the collective representations held by other U.S. residents about their group. Differences in collective representations, including negative stereotypes, associated with different ethnic or racial groups may influence the

¹POB: place of birth; defined as U.S.-born vs. foreign-born

types of discrimination members of these groups face. The awareness of these collective representations held about one's group can also modify the degree to which individuals attribute particular types of maltreatment to the perpetrator's prejudice. For example, when an individual is aware that he or she is a member of a racial/ethnic group that has been stereotyped as dishonest, the targeted individual may be more likely to view actions such as clutching a purse or being followed in a store as evidence of discrimination. The data suggest that over time, immigrants acquire an understanding of the collective representations of their group and the implications for their own experiences (Wiley et al., 2008).

POB may also influence individuals' perceptions of the salience of race-based maltreatment (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Goto et al., 2002; Perez et al., 2009; Rosenbloom & Way, 2004; Spencer, Chen, Gee, Fabian, & Takeuchi, 2010; Torres et al., 2012; Tummala-Narra, Inman, & Ettigi, 2011; Yoo & Lee, 2009). Racial bias as a cause of maltreatment may be more salient to those born in the U.S. Race is a salient social category in the U.S., and issues related to race-based discrimination are widely discussed. Qualitative studies have shown that U.S.-born youth identify egalitarianism (i.e., equal treatment of all) as an important part of American identity and are distressed when the norms of egalitarianism are violated (Deaux et al., 2007).

Previous research on the relationship between POB and racial/ethnic discrimination presents a complex picture. To systematically review this literature we searched EBSCO databases including PsychInfo and Medline and the reference sections of available papers and found 24 studies which explicitly examined the effects of POB on perceived discrimination. Eleven of the 24 articles found that U.S.-born participants reported more perceived discrimination than did foreign-born (Brondolo et al., 2005, 2011; Cook, Alegria, Lin, & Guo, 2009; Dominguez, Strong, Krieger, Gillman, & Rich-Edwards, 2009; Krieger et al., 2011; Kuo, 1995; Mossakowski, 2007; Pérez et al., 2008; Perez et al., 2009; Tillman & Weiss, 2009; Yoo, Gee, Lowthrop, & Robertson, 2010). In contrast, eight studies found the reverse, with foreign-born participants reporting more discrimination than U.S.-born participants (Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Goto et al., 2002; Lauderdale et al., 2006; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010; Ying et al., 2000; Yip, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2008; Yoo, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2009; Zemore, Karriker-Jaffe, Keithly, & Mulia, 2011). Five studies found no difference between foreign-born and U.S.-born in reports of discrimination (Kim & Spencer, 2011; Lyles et al., 2011; Ro & Choi, 2009; Ryan, Gee, & Laflamme, 2006; Torres et al., 2012).

Reconciling conflicting findings on the effects of POB on perceptions of discrimination has been difficult. In part, the effects appear to vary depending on the racial/ethnic group being studied, although the pattern of effects is not completely clear. There is a consistent effect for Black individuals: U.S.-born Black individuals report more discrimination than foreign-born Black individuals (Dominguez et al., 2009; Krieger et al., 2011). The evidence is less clear for Asian and Latino(a) individuals. Of the seven studies which conducted analyses specifically on Latino(a) individuals, four found that U.S.-born Latino(a)s experienced more discrimination than foreign-born Latino(a)s (Cook et al., 2009; Pérez et al., 2008; Perez et al., 2009; Tillman & Weiss, 2009), two concluded that foreign-born report more discrimination than U.S.-born (Finch et al., 2000; Zemore et al., 2011), and one reported that the two groups did not differ (Torres et al., 2012). Of the eight papers which conducted

analyses separately for Asian individuals, three found that U.S.-born Asians experience more discrimination than foreign-born Asians (Kuo, 1995; Mossakowski, 2007; Yoo et al., 2010), four found the reverse pattern (Goto et al., 2002; Ying et al., 2000; Yip et al., 2008; Yoo et al., 2009), and one reported no difference (Kim & Spencer, 2011).

Few studies have examined differences in POB effects among ethnicities that belong to the same racial group (e.g., comparing Asians drawn from different nationality groups) (Dominguez et al., 2009; Kuo, 1995; Pérez et al., 2008). Examining ethnicity based differences in an Asian sample may be especially important since the Asian population in the U.S. grew more than four times faster than the U.S. population as a whole between 2000 and 2010 (Hoeffel, Rastogi, Kim, & Shahid, 2012). This is a diverse population with Chinese individuals representing 22.8% of the Asian population in the U.S. and Indian individuals representing 19.4% in 2010 (Hoeffel et al., 2012). It is valuable to examine differences between foreign and U.S.-born individuals in these different groups as the factors driving immigration and the experiences of acculturation may vary.

The mixed findings among studies also raise the possibility that membership in other status groups may modify the effects associated with POB (Cole, 2009). Studies examining the effects of POB on perceived racial discrimination in a particular minority group have not systematically examined the effects of other statuses that the individual may hold (e.g., related to language fluency, social class, or gender). These other characteristics may also influence exposure to and perceptions of discrimination (e.g., Brondolo et al., 2009; Gee, Spencer, Chen, Yip, & Takeuchi, 2007; Ro & Choi, 2009). Examination of these effects can help clarify the contextual variables which contribute to experiences of racism/discrimination (e.g., see Yip et al., 2008).

Further, the effects of place of birth may also depend on the length of time individuals have spent in the U.S. Those exposed to U.S. culture for longer durations may be more experienced in conceptualizing and recognizing discrimination, and therefore more likely to attribute interpersonal maltreatment to racial bias (Cook et al., 2009; Pérez et al., 2008). Some (Dominguez et al., 2009; Finch et al., 2000; Goto et al., 2002; Krieger et al., 2011; Mossakowski, 2007; Pérez et al., 2008; Tillman & Weiss, 2009), but not all data (Lauderdale et al., 2006; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010) suggests that longer duration in the U.S. or younger age at immigration is associated with more perceived discrimination.

Efforts to evaluate the effects of membership in multiple status groups have brought to light complex problems of analysis and interpretation. There have been concerns about the feasibility and appropriateness of quantitatively assessing the role of multiple identities when examining experiences of disadvantage or discrimination (Cole, 2009; Syed, 2010). However, when evaluating the predictors of one form of discrimination (e.g., racial discrimination), it can be meaningful to consider membership in other status groups as moderators of the effects (Penner & Saperstein, 2013). For example, race, ancestry group, gender, and SES can be conceptualized and quantitatively evaluated as potential moderators of the effect of POB on discrimination. Despite increasing recognition of the importance of considering the complex nature of all the status characteristics associated with individuals included in research (Cole, 2009), there has been limited research explicitly determining

whether POB differences in self-reported discrimination are modified by differences in other statuses, including those related to gender, ethnicity, and SES.

Recently, we examined sociodemographic differences in self-reported discrimination in a large population-based sample of Latino(a) individuals from many different backgrounds. In this study, POB was associated with discrimination, with U.S. born individuals reporting more discrimination than foreign born (Arellano-Morales et al., *in press*). The aim of the present study was to systematically investigate the effect of POB on perceived racial and ethnic discrimination in a sample of Asian and Black adults living in a large metropolitan area. To minimize the effects of language barriers on the experiences or perceptions of discrimination, we included only participants who were English-speaking. In the analyses, we assess the potential moderating roles of race, gender, age and SES (i.e., education level) on the relationship of POB to reports of discrimination. As the types of experiences of discrimination may vary depending on POB and other status variables, we examine effects on different types of discrimination, including race-based social exclusion, workplace discrimination, physical threat and harassment, and stigmatization. To further clarify the effects of exposure to U.S. culture, analyses examine the association of length of residency and age at immigration to variations in perceived discrimination. Clarifying the nature of the relationship of POB to experiences of racial and ethnic discrimination can help delineate factors affecting immigrant health.

2. Method

Participants and Procedure

Table 1 displays demographic characteristics of the amalgamated sample as a whole and by POB. Participants included English-speaking individuals eighteen years of age or older who self-identified as Asian or Black or African American and participated in any one of seven studies on discrimination conducted by our laboratory. The sample included a total of 1454 individuals of whom 948 were U.S.-born and 506 were foreign-born. There were 538 Asian and 916 Black participants. A total of 889 were women and 565 were men. Overall the mean age of the sample was 29.40 years ($sd = 12.42$, range = 18–77 years). Participants were recruited from a variety of locations in New York City, including a large urban university, community health facilities, community recreational centers, community health fairs, and religious organizations. All participants were informed they were participating in studies of social stress, ethnic discrimination and health. Black participants were drawn from studies assessing the relationship of perceived ethnic discrimination to several mental and physical health outcomes (Brondolo et al., 2009, 2011; Brondolo, Brady, et al., 2008; Brondolo, Libby, et al., 2008). Asian participants were drawn from a study designed to validate the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire—Community Version (PEDQ-CV) in an Asian sample and to examine the relationship of discrimination to health (Kwok et al., 2011). The same types of recruitment sites and recruitment strategies were used for all ethnic groups. No participant was included in more than one study. All studies were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of St. John's University. Most studies were also reviewed by additional institutional review boards including those of Jamaica Hospital Medical Center, Flushing Hospital Medical Center, and Clinical Directors

Network. For all Asian participants no exclusionary criteria were employed with the exception that participants were asked if they were able to read and write English at a level that would permit them to complete the survey, which was written at an eighth grade reading level. Some of the U.S.-born Black participants were recruited from studies in which they were not eligible to participate if they were foreign-born or if they were taking medication likely to affect blood pressure.

After providing written consent, participants completed a questionnaire packet that contained measures of socio-demographic variables and self-reported perceived discrimination. Other measures were also included, but are not the focus of the current analysis. Depending on the study, participants received compensation ranging from \$10–\$25 and a mug.

2.1 Measures

2.1.1 Sociodemographic variables—Participants were asked to respond to items regarding their gender; age (in years); student status (yes or no); highest level of education completed (less than high school diploma, high school diploma or GED, or college degree); marital status (single or not); employment status (not working vs. working full-time or part-time); and POB (U.S.-born or foreign-born). If participants were foreign-born, they were asked to indicate the age at which they immigrated to the U.S. The number of years in which they lived in the U.S. was calculated by subtracting age at immigration from current age. We used the race categories employed by the U.S. census (2000). Participants also answered an open-ended question about the specific racial or ethnic group with which they most identified, and these responses were used to identify the specific ancestry groups that comprised the larger groups of Asians and Black/African Americans.

2.1.2 Perceived racial or ethnic discrimination—Perceived discrimination was assessed with the Brief PEDQ-CV Lifetime Exposure to Discrimination Scale (Brondolo et al., 2005). This scale consists of seventeen items that can be combined into a total score assessing lifetime exposure to discrimination. The Brief PEDQ-CV Lifetime Exposure Scale also includes four subscales that assess different dimensions of discrimination, including experiences of social exclusion, stigmatization, discrimination at work/school, and threat/harassment. Participants are asked how often they have had the experiences described in the items because of their ethnicity or race. Response options are presented on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). The measure used in this study has been used previously to assess discrimination in different ethnic minority samples, including Blacks, Asians, and Latino(a)s of different ancestries (see Brondolo et al., 2005, 2011; Kwok et al., 2011). The Brief PEDQ-CV, has also been used in a large (5000 participant) population based study of Latino(a) individuals from different ethnic backgrounds (Arellano-Morales et al., *in press*) and demonstrated very good reliability. For the full sample, the Cronbach's alpha for the Brief PEDQ-CV Lifetime Exposure Scale was 0.92 and exceeded 0.90 for every group (i.e., Asians, Blacks, and Latino(a)s). Sample items (and alphas across the full sample for each subscale) include: "How often have you been kept out of a public place or group?" (Social Exclusion, four items, $\alpha=0.77$); "How often have you been treated unfairly by co-workers or classmates?" (Workplace/School Discrimination, four

items, $\alpha=0.77$); “How often have others hinted that you must be violent or dangerous?” (Stigmatization, five items, $\alpha=0.81$); “How often have others threatened to damage your property?” (Threat, four items, $\alpha=0.81$). Alphas for all subscales exceeded 0.73 when examined by ethnic group. The Full PEDQ-CV and the Brief PEDQ-CV have yielded evidence of reliability and validity in samples of Black and Latino(a) adults, and the validity of the full PEDQ-CV has been tested in multi-ethnic samples of Asians as well (Brondolo et al., 2005; Kwok et al., 2011).

2.2 Analytic Plan

Analyses of POB differences in all demographic variables (i.e., age, gender, race, education level, employment status) were performed to identify potential covariates for further analyses. We used ANOVA to examine POB differences in age and Chi-square analyses to examine POB differences in gender, race, education and employment level. Education level was dummy coded to form two variables, one reflecting less than high school education (vs. all other levels) and another reflecting completion of a minimum of an undergraduate degree (vs. all other levels).

Next, an ANOVA was performed to investigate POB differences in perceived racism with appropriate covariates. MANOVA was employed to test POB differences in discrimination subscales. To examine socio-demographic moderators of the relationship of POB to perceived discrimination, we conducted a series of ANOVAs (or MANOVAs for subscale analyses) including the main effects of POB as well as the socio-demographic variable investigated (e.g., gender) and the interaction of these two terms. To determine if the effects of POB varied by ancestry group, we examined POB effects in Chinese and Indian participants. These were the two ancestry groups within the same larger race/ethnicity group (i.e., Asian) for which we had sufficient sample sizes.

To examine effects of exposure to U.S. culture on perceived discrimination, we conducted regression analyses using only the foreign-born sample. Length of time in the U.S. in years served as the predictor and perceived discrimination as the outcome. All covariates were included in this analysis.

We also compared perceived discrimination scores of individuals who immigrated to the U.S. at different ages. The existing literature reports many different strategies for classifying age at immigration. We divided individuals into two groups. Early-age immigrants included individuals who immigrated early in life (at or below 6 years of age). This group was likely to have had all their formal education in the U.S. Later-age immigrants included individuals who immigrated at eighteen years of age or older, and they were likely to have completed most of their formal schooling in their home country. We based the group classification on completion of education, as school is a primary source of socialization to the dominant culture.

3. Results

Participants were drawn from many different ancestry groups. Within the sample there were individuals who identified as Chinese ($n = 140$), Indian ($n = 142$), African American ($n = 415$) and Jamaican ($n = 53$), among other ancestry groups.

In this English-speaking sample, those who were foreign-born (vs. U.S.-born) were older ($F(1,1452) = 36.62, p < .0001, d' = 0.33$), were more likely to be women (vs. men) ($\chi^2(1) = 19.03, p < .001$), Asian (vs. Black) ($\chi^2(1) = 272.54, p < .001$), to have a college degree (vs. a high school diploma or less education) ($\chi^2(1) = 180.69, p < .001$), and to be employed full time ($\chi^2(2) = 29.38, p < .001$). Therefore, in all subsequent analyses in which POB served as a main effect, age, gender, race, education level and employment status were used as covariates.

Table 2 displays mean total lifetime and subscale scores for the Brief PEDQ-CV separately for foreign-born and U.S.-born samples. There was a significant main effect of POB on Brief Lifetime Discrimination scores ($F(1,1452) = 74.43, p < .0001$). U.S.-born individuals (mean = 2.04, $sd = 0.70$) reported more discrimination than did foreign-born individuals (mean = 1.72, $sd = 0.61; d' = 0.49$). Differences between U.S.-born (adjusted mean = 1.95) and foreign-born (adjusted mean = 1.84) remained significant but were substantially reduced after controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and work status ($F(1, 1446) = 7.03, p = .008, d' = 0.16$).

A MANOVA with POB as the independent variable and the four subscales as the outcome variables revealed a significant main effect of POB (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.93, (F(4,1449) = 26.8, p < 0.0001)$) as well as a significant interaction of POB by Subscale (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.97, (F(3,1450) = 14.44, p < 0.001)$). As shown in Table 2, follow-up univariate analyses revealed that controlling for age, gender, race, education, and work status, U.S.-born individuals reported significantly more Exclusion ($F(1, 1446) = 7.36, p = 0.007, d' = 0.16$) and Stigmatization ($F(1, 1446) = 12.26, p = 0.0005, d' = 0.21$) than did foreign-born individuals. There were no POB differences for Workplace Discrimination and Threat.

Tests of moderation revealed a significant interaction of POB with gender on lifetime discrimination ($F(1,1445) = 4.93, p < 0.03$). U.S. born men reported more discrimination than foreign-born men ($F(1,558) = 4.91, p < .03, d' = .25$). POB effects were not significant for women ($p < .12$). No significant interactions of POB with race ($p < .99$), age ($p = 0.77$), education level ($p = 0.50$) or employment status ($p = 0.82$) on perceived discrimination were found. We also tested for moderators of the relationships between POB and the subscales of Exclusion and Stigmatization. There was a significant Gender x POB interaction for race-related Stigmatization ($F(1,1445) = 5.87, p < 0.02$), but not for Exclusion. Post-hoc analyses with Bonferroni adjustment indicated that the POB effects were significant for men ($p < .002$) but not for women ($p = 0.67$). There were no significant interactions of POB with age, race, education level and work status.

Next, we examined whether the effects of place of birth on discrimination varied for the two largest ancestry groups within the major race/ethnicity groups. The sample sizes for the ancestry groups varied considerably, and the groups which contained participants of Indian

($n = 142$) vs. Chinese ($n = 140$) descent were of sufficient size to warrant analysis. More Indian participants (62.14%) than Chinese participants had a college degree ($p < 0.003$). The two groups were significantly different in the number of years in which they resided in the U.S. (Indian = 10.17 years, Chinese 16.32 years; ($F(1,140) = 17.06, p < .001$)).

As shown in Table 3, there were significant Ancestry Group (Indian vs. Chinese) X POB interactions for the full PEDQ-CV Lifetime exposure scale ($F(1,273) = 6.22, p < .02$), as well as for the subscales of Exclusion ($F(1,273) = 5.60, p < .02$), Stigmatization ($F(1,273) = 6.01, p < .02$), and Threat ($F(1,273) = 6.68, p = .01$). Post-hoc comparisons revealed that for individuals of Indian descent, there were significant differences between foreign-born and U.S.-born individuals in reports of Stigmatization and Threat, and marginal differences in reports of Exclusion. For each analysis, U.S.-born individuals of Indian descent reported more discrimination than foreign individuals of Indian descent. There were no significant differences between foreign- and U.S.-born individuals of Chinese descent. In addition, foreign-born individuals of Chinese descent reported significantly more Lifetime Total Discrimination and more Exclusion than did foreign-born individuals of Indian descent.

The final set of hierarchical multiple regression analyses examined effects of length of residence and age of immigration. Controlling for age, race, gender, education level, and work status there was a significant association of number of years living in the U.S. to the Brief PEDQ Lifetime Discrimination score ($B = 0.007, SE = 0.004, b = .11, t = 1.99, p < .05$). Four additional regression analyses revealed significant associations of number of years living in the U.S. to the Brief PEDQ subscale of Threat ($B = 0.01, SE = 0.004, b = 0.15, t(423) = 2.69, p < .008$), but not to any of the remaining subscales ($ps > 0.07$). Controlling for age, gender, race, education and work status, there were significant age at immigration differences in lifetime total Brief PEDQ ($F(1,299) = 12.95, p < .004, d' = 0.53$). Early-age immigrants ($n = 93$) had substantially higher PEDQ scores (adjusted mean = 1.96) than did later-age immigrants ($n = 214$, adjusted mean = 1.59). The same pattern was seen on every subscale except Exclusion as shown in Table 4.

4. Discussion

Changes over time in the health of those who are foreign-born and migrate to the U.S. are likely to be multi-determined; a function of economic access, housing patterns, and dietary and cultural changes, among other factors (Alegria et al., 2004; Chung & Epstein, 2014; Cook et al., 2009; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010; Yoo et al., 2010). Research has suggested that for ethnic minority immigrants, increasing exposure to discrimination may also contribute to changes in health status (Paradies, 2006; Williams & Mohammed, 2009). To clarify the mixed findings in the literature on POB and discrimination, we systematically assessed race/ethnicity and ancestry group differences in the relationship between POB and reports of discriminatory treatment and tested the potential moderating effects of other sociodemographic variables. Our sample included only those who could speak and read English, reducing the degree to which discriminatory treatment could be a function of or attributed to limitations in language fluency versus racial/ethnic bias.

We found foreign-born individuals reported significantly less discrimination overall than did U.S.-born individuals. Those who immigrated earlier reported more discrimination than those arriving later in life. The effects of POB were seen primarily for race-related social exclusion and stigmatization. POB differences in perceived discrimination were not significant for the subscales measuring race-related discrimination at work/school and race-related threat and harassment.

The pattern of differences between U.S.-born and foreign-born individuals in their exposure to and reports of discrimination did not vary across Asian or Black groups defined broadly. In contrast, reports of discrimination appear to vary across ancestry groups defined more narrowly. POB effects were seen for Indian but not Chinese individuals.

In this sample, POB was significantly associated with all sociodemographic variables, including age, gender, and SES. The POB effect on discrimination was still significant but substantially reduced after controlling for these sociodemographic variables. The POB effects were stronger for men than women. U.S. born men were more likely than women and more likely than foreign-born men to report being stigmatized because of their race. However, POB effects were not moderated by race or measures of SES. This suggests that POB represents an important social status that influences some perceptions and experiences of discrimination, independent of some other social statuses.

To our knowledge, this is the first report that indicates that POB effects are specific to the type of discrimination experienced. The lack of POB effects for race-related discrimination at work/school and race-related threat and harassment may be a function of the potentially overt nature of these forms of discrimination. Individuals may have clearer ideas about treatment in the workplace or school and can directly observe how non-minority individuals in a comparable role (i.e., as employees or students) are treated. Race-related threat and harassment is another overt form of discrimination and clearly violates social norms in all cultures (Brondolo et al., 2005, 2011).

In contrast, the interpretation of experiences of social exclusion and stigmatization may be less clear for foreign-born individuals. Foreign-born individuals may be less aware of the role of race in social relations in the U.S. (Cook et al., 2009; Torres & Ong, 2010; Waters, 1994; Ying et al., 2000; Yip et al., 2008; Yoo & Lee, 2009). Foreign-born individuals may lack experience with standards of behavior in U.S. social contexts or may be unfamiliar with the cues that yield information about the perpetrators' motivation for maltreatment (Oppin, Nugier, Chekroun, & Guimond, 2015). Foreign-born individuals may not automatically regard themselves as belonging to those racial groups routinely targeted for race-based maltreatment in the U.S. (Deaux et al., 2007; Waters, 1994; Wiley et al., 2008). They may attribute maltreatment to "being foreign" rather than to their race or ethnicity.

The language proficiency of our sample may account for differences between our findings, and those of others who report foreign-born individuals endorsing exposure to more discrimination than U.S.-born individuals (Goto et al., 2002; Lauderdale et al., 2006; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010). In these studies, both foreign-born and U.S.-born individuals

who were bilingual or who spoke a language other than English at home reported more discrimination than did monolingual English speakers.

Recognizing discrimination may be a product of the process of acculturation. We found that the level of reported discrimination was positively associated with length of time residing in the U.S. We also found that those who immigrated to the U.S. before six years of age reported more discrimination than those who came after 18 years of age. Over time, foreign-born individuals may have more opportunities for interaction with individuals outside of their own culture, and these interactions may expose them to more race-based maltreatment. Additionally, through the process of acculturation, foreign-born individuals may develop a greater awareness or understanding of the causes for maltreatment and begin to attribute more instances of maltreatment to racial bias. Consistent with this notion, as Wiley and colleagues (2008) report, over the course of time individuals become aware of collective negative representations of their group. Similarly, Oppin et al. (2015) report that second generation North Africans living in France were less likely to perceive accusations of violating social norms as legitimate. They correctly viewed themselves as belonging to French culture, having been born and raised in France, and regarded attempts to cast their behavior as discrepant with cultural norms to be illegitimate and discriminatory.

Our findings suggest that the immigration histories of specific ancestry groups may play a pivotal role in the experience of maltreatment. In our sample, there were POB effects for Indian, but not Chinese participants; however, foreign-born Chinese participants reported more discrimination than did foreign-born Indian participants. It is possible that Indians individuals may not be racialized in the same manner as are Chinese individuals, even those who are fluent in English. The racial socialization of Indian and Chinese individuals may also differ, influencing their interpretation of maltreatment.

On average, the Indian participants in our study were more recent immigrants than the Chinese immigrants. The shorter period of residence in the U.S. may partially explain lower levels of perceived discrimination. Differences in discrimination perceived by Indian and Chinese individuals may be partly a function of English proficiency. Qualitative studies suggest that use of Chinese-language and speaking with an accent in Chinese-American youth was a trigger for discriminatory behavior by peers (Qin, Way, & Rana, 2008). Indian individuals typically have higher English proficiency, and this may account for lower reports of maltreatment among foreign-born born Indians than foreign-born Chinese.

Furthermore, the idea of the perpetual foreigner may explain why U.S.- and foreign-born Chinese individuals experience similar rates of discrimination. One study conducted in a sample of Chinese and Filipino students found that 98% reported discrimination in the form of micro-aggression (Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006). Huynh and colleagues (2011) define racially motivated micro-aggressions as racism “disguised in supposedly benign behaviors and comments” (2). These comments include “Where are you from?” and “You speak English very well”. This treatment of Chinese individuals as foreigners regardless of birthplace, residency status and English proficiency may explain why U.S.-born and foreign-born Chinese individuals report similar levels of discriminatory behavior.

4.1 Limitations

The generalizability of our results may have been compromised by the use of a convenience-based sample drawn from the metro New York area instead of a population-based sample. The foreign-born and U.S.-born groups were not comparable across a variety of sociodemographic factors. This may be a function of the sampling method or a function of migration patterns. However, POB effects on perceived discrimination remained significant, although reduced in size when these linked socio-demographic variables were controlled. Despite these limitations, the effects we found were consistent, and they pinpoint the specific types of discrimination that may be affected by acculturation. Further research will need to examine the interaction between POB and English fluency to understand the role of communication ability on exposure to and perceptions of discrimination.

Furthermore, it is important to note that this paper only explores the effect of place of birth in the U.S. context. In the U.S., citizenship is granted according to the principle of *jus soli*, rendering those individuals who were born in the U.S. citizens, regardless of their parents' place of birth or citizenship status. The principle of *jus soli*, granting official inclusion in American society may change the dynamic of discrimination, solidifying expectations about egalitarian treatment and justice. The relationship of place of birth to these expectations may be very different in countries that follow the principle of *jus sanguinis*, in which the children of immigrants are not automatically granted citizenship (Goldston, 2011). Further research should investigate the effects of these different principles of citizenship rights on the perception of discrimination among ethnic minority individuals.

Variations among studies in the effects of place of birth on reports of discrimination may reflect differences in the types of discrimination assessed. Some scales not only assessed experiences of discrimination based on race, but also those due to the individual's spoken language or accent (Goto et al., 2002; Mossakowski, 2007; Yoo et al., 2009). Furthermore, some assessed discrimination in only one setting (e.g. healthcare) (Lyles et al., 2011; Perez et al., 2009; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010; Yoo et al., 2009), others "in general" (Dominguez et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2009; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010), and still others in a variety of different situations. The Brief-PEDQ-CV does not measure all forms of discrimination, but it does permit investigators to capture major types of interpersonal discrimination ranging from social exclusion to physical threat.

We do not explicitly assess acculturation, and length of stay does not have perfect concordance with acculturation. Acculturation is a multidimensional, complex process that is determined by multiple causes. Assessing length of stay in the United States does not ensure a complete understanding of acculturation processes, although many studies employ POB as a proxy for an individual's understanding of U.S. culture (Finch et al., 2000; Goto et al., 2002; Krieger et al., 2011; Lauderdale et al., 2006; Shariff-Marco et al., 2010). In a prior population-based study of Latino(a)s, acculturation was assessed using multiple measures, including POB, language preference, years in the US, and the SASH (Arellano-Morales et al., *in press*). In the Arellano study lower levels of acculturation on all measures were associated with lower levels of perceived discrimination. Additional research should address this issue more explicitly.

The expectation of equal treatment may play a role in perception of discrimination, and more highly educated or affluent individuals may expect better treatment. We did not assess expectations of equal treatment in this study. However, in this sample, although foreign-born individuals were more likely to have a college degree than U.S.-born individuals, effects of POB were not explained by education nor did education moderate the effects of place of birth on any type of discrimination.

The effects of POB on discrimination and the consequences of discrimination may also vary depending on the degree to which individuals identify with their group. In this study, we were unable to systematically assess participants' level of identification with membership for each status. Future studies will need to consider levels of identification with these different status variables.

Our findings highlight the importance of status groups sometimes neglected in intersectionality research: those defined by POB status and ancestry. Future research in the area of intersectionality may benefit from considering POB as a variable that effects both perceptions and experiences of disadvantage. Furthermore, while much of the research on intersectionality considers the role of race in discrimination/disadvantage, researchers might consider that the broad categories of race are inadequate to capture the variations in immigration history and social status associated with ancestry group.

4.2 Conclusion

Efforts to identify buffers of the effects of discrimination on health may be particularly important as individuals become acculturated. Future interventions aimed at minorities, U.S.- or foreign-born, may find it helpful to encourage the development of multiple identities. Drawing on the values affirmation literature (Sherman & Hartson, 2011), interventions could strengthen the individuals' awareness of and commitment to values and capacities associated with different aspects of their identities. For example, individuals may develop identities linked to membership in groups based on demographic characteristics (i.e. gender, race, ethnicity, immigration status) as well as membership in groups based on interests and goals. These interventions may explicitly strengthen the individual's capacity to develop a complex self-identity independent of current discriminatory stereotypes (Oyserman & Destin, 2010). In addition, it can help to make individuals more explicitly aware of group-related stereotypes and the effects of these stereotypes on the development of their self-concept, motivation and interpersonal relationships. This awareness can permit individuals to mitigate the negative effects of these stereotypes on health (for examples, see Brondolo & Jean-Pierre, 2014).

The findings highlight the importance of considering POB status when investigating the effects of discrimination on health and other outcomes. We may be over- or under-estimating the true effects of discrimination in models of racial disparities that fail to adjust for POB. Further, the findings suggest that although the process of "becoming an American" brings many benefits, it may also come with increased exposure to discrimination. These data suggest that it may be helpful to assist foreign-born individuals to understand the subtext of discrimination to enable them to develop effective coping strategies to moderate deleterious effects of acculturation on health (Brondolo & Jean-Pierre, 2014).

Acknowledgments

Some of the research included was funded by a grant from NHLBI (R01HL068590m E. Brondolo, PI) and seed grants from St. John's University. We would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Clinical Directors Network and all the members of the Social Stress and Health Research Unit of St. John's University.

References

- Alegria M, Takeuchi D, Canino G, Duan N, Shrout P, Meng XL, ... Gong F. Considering context, place and culture: the National Latino and Asian American Study. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*. 2004; 13(4):208–20. [PubMed: 15719529]
- Alvarez AN, Juang L, Liang CTH. Asian Americans and racism: When bad things happen to “model minorities”. 2006
- Arellano-Morales L, Roesch SC, Gallo LC, Emory KT, Molina KM, Gonzalez P, ... Brondolo E. Prevalence and correlates of perceived ethnic discrimination in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos Sociocultural Ancillary Study. n.d
- Brondolo E, Beatty DL, Cubbin C, Pencille M, Saegert S, Wellington R, ... Schwartz J. Sociodemographic variations in self-reported racism in a community sample of Blacks and Latino(a)s. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2009; 39(2):407–429. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00444.x>.
- Brondolo E, Brady N, Thompson S, Tobin JN, Cassells A, Sweeney M, ... Contrada RJ. Perceived racism and negative affect: Analyses of trait and state measures of affect in a community sample. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 2008; 27(2):150–173. <http://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.2.150>. [PubMed: 19079772]
- Brondolo E, Hausmann LLRM, Jhalani J, Pencille M, Atencio-Bacayon J, Kumar A, ... Schwartz J. Dimensions of perceived racism and self-reported health: examination of racial/ethnic differences and potential mediators. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 2011; 42(1):14–28. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-011-9265-1>. [PubMed: 21374099]
- Brondolo, E.; Jean-Pierre, KL. “You Said, I Heard”: Speaking the subtext in interracial conversations. In: Kalet, A.; Chou, CL., editors. *Remediation in Medical Education*. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2014. p. 131-156. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9025-8>
- Brondolo E, Kelly KKP, Coakley V, Gordon T, Thompson S, Levy E, ... Contrada RJ. The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire: Development and preliminary validation of a community version. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2005; 35:335–365. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02124.x>.
- Brondolo E, Libby DJ, Denton EG, Thompson S, Beatty DL, Schwartz J, ... Gerin W. Racism and ambulatory blood pressure in a community sample. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. 2008; 70(1):49–56. <http://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e31815ff3bd>. [PubMed: 18158368]
- Chung H, Epstein NB. Perceived racial discrimination, acculturative stress, and psychological distress among Asian immigrants: The moderating effects of support and interpersonal strain from a partner. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2014; 42:129–139. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.04.003>.
- Clark R, Anderson NB, Clark VR, Williams DR. Racism as a stressor for African Americans. A biopsychosocial model. *The American Psychologist*. 1999; 54(10):805–16. [PubMed: 10540593]
- Cole ER. Intersectionality and research in psychology. *The American Psychologist*. 2009; 64(3):170–80. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>. [PubMed: 19348518]
- Cook B, Alegria M, Lin JY, Guo J. Pathways and correlates connecting Latinos' mental health with exposure to the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2009; 99(12):2247–2254. <http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.137091>. [PubMed: 19834004]
- Deaux K, Bikmen N, Gilkes A, Ventuneac A, Joseph Y, Payne YA, Steele CM. Becoming American: Stereotype threat effects in Afro-Caribbean immigrant groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 2007; 70(4):384–404. <http://doi.org/10.1177/019027250707000408>.
- Dominguez TP, Strong EF, Krieger N, Gillman MW, Rich-Edwards JW. Differences in the self-reported racism experiences of US-born and foreign-born Black pregnant women. *Social Science*

- and Medicine. 2009; 69(2):258–265. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.03.022>. [PubMed: 19386406]
- Finch BK, Kolody B, Vega WA. Perceived discrimination and depression among Mexican-origin adults in California. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 2000; 41(3):295–313. [PubMed: 11011506]
- Gee GC, Spencer M, Chen J, Yip T, Takeuchi DT. The association between self-reported racial discrimination and 12-month DSM-IV mental disorders among Asian Americans nationwide. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2007; 64(10):1984–1996. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.02.013>. [PubMed: 17374553]
- Goldston JA. Holes in the rights framework: Racial discrimination, citizenship, and the rights of noncitizens. *Ethics & International Affairs*. 2011; 20(03):321–347. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00029.x>.
- Goto SG, Gee GC, Takeuchi DT. Strangers still? The experience of discrimination among Chinese Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2002; 30(2):211–224. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.9998>.
- Hoeffel, EM.; Rastogi, S.; Kim, MO.; Shahid, H. The Asian Population: 2010. 2012. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf>
- Huynh QL, Devos T, Smalarz L. Perpetual foreigner in one's own land: Potential implications for identity and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 2011; 30(2): 133–162. [PubMed: 21572896]
- Kim I, Spencer MS. Heavy drinking, perceived discrimination, and immigration status among Filipino Americans. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2011; 46(10):1256–64. <http://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2011.570844>. [PubMed: 21619444]
- Krieger N, Kosheleva A, Waterman PD, Chen JT, Koenen K. Racial discrimination, psychological distress, and self-rated health among US-born and foreign-born Black Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2011; 101(9):1704–13. <http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300168>. [PubMed: 21778504]
- Kuo WH. Coping with racial discrimination: The case of Asian Americans. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 1995; 18(1):109–127. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1995.9993856>.
- Kwok J, Atencio J, Ullah J, Crupi R, Chen D, Roth AR, ... Brondolo E. The perceived ethnic discrimination questionnaire--community version: validation in a multiethnic Asian sample. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2011; 17(3):271–82. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024034>. [PubMed: 21787059]
- Lauderdale DS, Wen M, Jacobs EA, Kandula NR. Immigrant perceptions of discrimination in health care: the California Health Interview Survey 2003. *Medical Care*. 2006; 44(10):914–20. <http://doi.org/10.1097/01.mlr.0000220829.87073.f7>. [PubMed: 17001262]
- Lyles CR, Karter AJ, Young BA, Spigner C, Grembowski D, Schillinger D, Adler NE. Correlates of patient-reported racial/ethnic health care discrimination in the Diabetes Study of Northern California (DISTANCE). *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*. 2011; 22(1):211–25. <http://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2011.0033>. [PubMed: 21317516]
- Mossakowski KN. Are immigrants healthier? The case of depression among Filipino Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 2007; 70(3):290–304. <http://doi.org/10.1177/019027250707000307>.
- Oppin M, Nugier A, Chekroun P, Guimond S. Immigrants' generational status affects emotional reactions to informal social control : The role of perceived legitimacy of the source of control. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2015; 45:1–10. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.12.008>.
- Oyserman D, Destin M. Identity-based motivation: Implications for intervention. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 2010; 38(7):1001–1043. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010374775>. [PubMed: 21516204]
- Paradies Y. A systematic review of empirical research on self-reported racism and health. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2006; 35(4):888–901. <http://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyl056>. [PubMed: 16585055]
- Penner, aM; Saperstein, a. Engendering racial perceptions: An intersectional analysis of how social status shapes race. *Gender & Society*. 2013; 27(3):319–344. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213480262>.

- Pérez DJ, Fortuna L, Alegria M. Prevalence and correlates of everyday discrimination among U.S. Latinos. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2008; 36(4):421–433. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20221>. [PubMed: 19960098]
- Perez D, Sribney WM, Rodríguez Ma. Perceived discrimination and self-reported quality of care among Latinos in the United States. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009; 24(3 SUPPL): 548–54. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-009-1097-3>. [PubMed: 19842005]
- Qin DB, Way N, Rana M. The “model minority” and their discontent: Examining peer discrimination and harassment of Chinese American immigrant youth. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*. 2008; 2008(121):27–42. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cd.221>. [PubMed: 18792949]
- Reisen CA, Brooks KD, Zea MC, Poppen PJ, Bianchi FT. Can additive measures add to an intersectional understanding? Experiences of gay and ethnic discrimination among HIV-positive Latino gay men. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2013; 19(2):208–17. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0031906>. [PubMed: 23647331]
- Ro AE, Choi KH. Social status correlates of reporting gender discrimination and racial discrimination among racially diverse women. *Women & Health*. 2009; 49(1):1–15. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03630240802694756>. [PubMed: 19485231]
- Rosenbloom SR, Way N. Experiences of discrimination among African American, Asian American, and Latino Adolescents in an urban high school. *Youth & Society*. 2004; 35(4):420–451. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X03261479>.
- Ryan AM, Gee GC, Laflamme DF. The Association between self-reported discrimination, physical health and blood pressure: findings from African Americans, Black immigrants, and Latino immigrants in New Hampshire. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*. 2006; 17(2 Suppl):116–32. <http://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2006.0092>. [PubMed: 16809879]
- Seng JS, Lopez WD, Sperlich M, Hamama L, Reed Meldrum CD. Marginalized identities, discrimination burden, and mental health: Empirical exploration of an interpersonal-level approach to modeling intersectionality. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2012; 75(12):2437–45. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.09.023>. [PubMed: 23089613]
- Shariff-Marco S, Klassen AC, Bowie JV. Racial/ethnic differences in self-reported racism and its association with cancer-related health behaviors. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2010; 100(2): 364–74. <http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.163899>. [PubMed: 20019302]
- Sherman, DK.; Hartson, KA. *Handbook of Self-Enhancement and Self-Protection*. Guilford Press; 2011. Reconciling self-protection with self-improvement; p. 128-151.
- Spencer M, Chen J, Gee GC, Fabian CG, Takeuchi DT. Discrimination and mental health-related service use in a national study of Asian Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2010; 100(12):2410–2417. <http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.176321>. [PubMed: 20299649]
- Syed M. Disciplinarity and methodology in intersectionality theory and research. *The American Psychologist*. 2010; 65(1):61–2. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0017495>. [PubMed: 20063919]
- Tillman KH, Weiss UK. Nativity status and depressive symptoms among Hispanic young adults: The role of stress exposure. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2009; 90(5):1228–1250. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00655.x>. [PubMed: 21743751]
- Torres L, Driscoll MW, Voell M. Discrimination, acculturation, acculturative stress, and Latino psychological distress: A moderated mediational model. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2012; 18(1):17–25. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0026710>. [PubMed: 22250895]
- Torres L, Ong AD. A daily diary investigation of Latino ethnic identity, discrimination, and depression. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2010; 16(4):561–568. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0020652>. [PubMed: 21058819]
- Tummala-Narra P, Inman AG, Ettigi SP. Asian Indians’ responses to discrimination: A mixed-method examination of identity, coping, and self-esteem. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*. 2011; 2(3):205–218. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0025555>.
- Waters MC. Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation Black immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review*. 1994; 28(4):795. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2547158>.
- Wiley S, Perkins K, Deaux K. Through the looking glass: Ethnic and generational patterns of immigrant identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2008; 32(5):385–398. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.04.002>.

- Williams DR, Mohammed SA. Discrimination and racial disparities in health: evidence and needed research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*. 2009; 32(1):20–47. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-008-9185-0>. [PubMed: 19030981]
- Ying YW, Lee Pa, Tsai JL. Cultural orientation and racial discrimination: Predictors of coherence in Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2000; 28(4):427–441.
- Yip T, Gee GC, Takeuchi DT. Racial discrimination and psychological distress: the impact of ethnic identity and age among immigrant and United States-born Asian adults. *Developmental Psychology*. 2008; 44(3):787–800. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.787>. [PubMed: 18473644]
- Yoo HC, Gee GC, Lowthrop CK, Robertson J. Self-reported racial discrimination and substance use among Asian Americans in Arizona. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2010; 12(5):683–690. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-009-9306-z>. [PubMed: 20012204]
- Yoo HC, Gee GC, Takeuchi D. Discrimination and health among Asian American immigrants: Disentangling racial from language discrimination. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2009; 68(4): 726–732. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.11.013>. [PubMed: 19095340]
- Yoo HC, Lee RM. Does ethnic identity buffer or exacerbate the effects of frequent racial discrimination on situational well-being of Asian Americans? *Asian American Journal of Psychology*. 2009; S(1):70–87. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.63>.
- Zemore SE, Karriker-Jaffe KJ, Keithly S, Mulia N. Racial prejudice and unfair treatment: interactive effects with poverty and foreign nativity on problem drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2011; 72(3):361–70. [PubMed: 21513672]

Table 1

Sample Demographics

	Immigration Status		
	Total	US Born	Foreign Born
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)
Immigration Status	1454	948 (65.20)	506 (34.80)
Age	29.40 (SD=12.42)	27.98 (SD= 11.63)	32.07 (SD=13.39)
Gender			
Male	565 (38.86)	407 (42.93)	158 (31.23)
Female	889 (61.14)	541 (57.07)	348 (68.77)
Race			
Black	916 (63.00)	742 (78.27)	174 (34.39)
Asian	538 (37.00)	206 (21.73)	332 (65.61)
Work Status			
Full-Time	461 (31.71)	257 (27.11)	204 (40.32)
Part-Time	439 (30.19)	293 (30.91)	146 (28.85)
Not-Working	554 (38.10)	398 (41.93)	156 (30.83)
Education			
Less than high school	90 (6.19)	70 (7.38)	20 (3.95)
High School/Some College	1001 (68.84)	747 (72.67)	254 (50.20)
College Grad	363 (24.97)	131 (13.82)	232 (45.85)
Major Ethnicity			
African American	415 (52.53)	406 (71.35)	9 (4.07)
Chinese Descent	140 (17.72)	82 (14.4)	58 (26.24)
Haitian Descent	37 (4.68)	25 (4.39)	12 (5.43)
Indian Descent	142 (17.97)	37 (6.50)	105 (47.51)
Jamaican Descent	53 (6.71)	16 (2.81)	37 (16.74)

Mean Total Lifetime and Subscale Scores for the Brief PEDQ-CV, adjusted for age, gender, education level, race, and employment

Table 2

Immigration Status	Adjusted means			
	PEDQ TOT	Exclusion	Stigma	Work Threat
US Born	1.95**	2.28*	1.83***	1.63
Foreign Born	1.84**	2.14*	1.67***	1.55

Note

* p<0.01,

** p=0.008,

*** p<0.001

Adjusted Means for Lifetime Perceived Discrimination and Select Subscales for Asian Participants

Table 3

	Adjusted means (standard dev.)				
	BPEDQ-Total	Exclusion	Stigma	Work	Threat
Chinese					
US Born	1.70	2.02	1.49	1.76	1.50
Foreign Born	1.77 ^a	2.09 ^a	1.55	1.86	1.56
Indian					
US Born	1.75	2.13	1.63 ^b	1.71	1.68 ^b
Foreign Born	1.52 ^a	1.77 ^a	1.35 ^b	1.63	1.34 ^b

^aComparison between foreign-born Chinese participants and foreign-born Indian participants, $p < .04$.

^bComparison between foreign-born Indian participants and U.S.-born Indian participants, $p \leq .05$.

Table 4

Perceived Discrimination Means for Early and Later Immigrants

Scales	Adjusted Means	
	Early Immigrants	Later Immigrants
Exclusion	2.23	1.99
Stigma	1.78	1.39 ^{**}
Workplace Discrimination	2.12	1.76 [*]
Threat	1.75	1.28 ^{**}
Total PEDQ	1.96	1.59 ^{**}

Note

*
p=0.01,**
p= 0.001

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript