

## **ABSTRACT**

Studies show that African American men report more personal experiences with discrimination than do African American women. According to the subordinate male target hypothesis, this gender difference reflects an underlying reality where African American men are the primary targets of anti-Black discrimination. From the perspective of intersectionality theory, African American women and men experience racial discrimination differently and therefore greater reports of discrimination among African American men might be a result of measurement bias that favors the experiences of African American men vis-à-vis African American women. In order to assess these perspectives, we analyze data from the 1995 *Detroit Area Study* and the 2001-3 *National Study of American Life*. We use multiple group confirmatory factor analytic models with latent means and categorical outcomes to observe the degree to which gender bias in measurement accounts for disparities in perceived discrimination among African American women and men. We show that gender bias in the measures most often used to assess unfair treatment in social surveys is responsible for the gender gap in certain kinds of perceived discrimination among African Americans. Measures of everyday discrimination are mostly gender balanced, but measurement bias is responsible for a large portion of the gap in perceptions of major life discrimination and the entire gap when major life discrimination is attributed to race. Our results highlight the importance of intersectionality theory for assessing discrimination, and we argue that revisions in the measurement of perceived discrimination are required in order to better reflect the experiences of African American women.

## An Explanation for the Gender Gap in Perceptions of Discrimination among African Americans: Considering the role of Gender Bias in Measurement

Social science research shows that perceptions of discrimination remain high in the United States, particularly among racial and ethnic minorities (Forman, Williams and Jackson 1997; Kessler, Mickelson and Williams 1999; Pérez, Fortuna and Alegria 2008). However, relative to the study of prejudice, there is a near absence of sociological research on perceived discrimination (Bobo and Fox 2003). Even still, recent studies of perceived discrimination among African Americans presents us with an underexplored finding. While African American women and men report comparable levels of ‘anti-Black’ group discrimination in American society (Kane and Kyyro 2001; Sigelman and Welch 1991), African American men report more personal experience with discrimination than African American women (Broman, Mavaddat and Hsu 2000; Forman et al. 1997; Sellers and Shelton 2003; Sigelman et al. 1991). This ‘gender gap’<sup>1</sup> exists when respondents are asked about their experiences with racial discrimination (e.g., Sellers et al. 2003) and when asked about discrimination more generally (e.g., Forman et al. 1997). However, as African American women are both Black and female, and therefore hold two stigmatized social statuses, many would expect that African American women would experience and report more discrimination than African American men.

This gender gap is often interpreted using a version of the ‘subordinate male target hypothesis’ which attributes the gap to an underlying reality where African American men are more often the targets of discrimination than are African American women (e.g., Anderson 2008; Ferguson 2001; Gary 1995; Navarrete et al. 2010; Pieterse and Carter 2007; Sidanius and Veniegas 2000). ‘Intersectionality theory’ offers an

alternative explanation, which centralizes the ways in which systems of inequality reinforce and mutually shape one another at all levels of society (Cho, Crenshaw and McCall 2013; Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1989; King 1988; May 2015; McCall 2005; Weber 2010; Zinn and Dill 1996). Those who favor an intersectional approach are therefore inclined to consider how gender might shape the way African American women and men experience and perceive mistreatment (Cho et al. 2013; Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1989; King 1988) and the way these experiences and perceptions are measured in social surveys (Harnois 2013; Harnois and Ifatunji 2011). As a result, gender bias in the measurement of perceived discrimination in social surveys may be responsible for the observed gender differences in perceived discrimination among African Americans.

In the present study we investigate the relative role of these two perspectives in explaining the gender gap in perceived discrimination among African Americans. After reviewing the conceptualization and measurement of perceived discrimination in social surveys, we review an array of studies, all of which show that African American men report more experiences with discrimination than do African American women. We then consider two competing explanations for this finding. The subordinate male target hypothesis argues that the gender gap in perceived discrimination reflects an underlying reality in which African American men are the primary targets of racial discrimination. If this view is correct, accounting for gender-related measurement bias will leave the gender gap largely intact. Intersectionality theory suggests that the measures social scientists use to study perceived discrimination in social surveys may be gendered in such a way as to inflate or wholly create the gender gap by more accurately assessing the experiences of African American men. To the extent that this view is correct, the gender gap in

perceived discrimination will be substantially reduced after accounting for gender-related measurement bias. We draw upon data from the 1995 *Detroit Area Study* and the 2001-3 *National Survey of American Life* and use multiple group confirmatory factor analysis with latent means (Bollen 1989) and categorical outcomes (Sass, Schmitt and Marsh 2014) to assess gendered measurement bias (or differences in model fit before and after items are allowed to load differently for women and men) in two widely used measures of perceived discrimination (i.e., ‘everyday’ and ‘major life’ discrimination; Harnois et al. 2011; Williams, Yu and Jackson 1997). We then examine the degree to which this measurement bias accounts for the gender gap in perceived discrimination among African Americans (by observing reductions in the gender gap that correspond with improvements in model fit associated with allowing items to load differently for women and men).

## **BACKGROUND ON PERCIEVED DISCRIMINATION**

Scholars have offered working definitions of racial discrimination (e.g., Jones 2000; Krieger 1999; Williams et al. 1997). According to the National Research Council of the National Academies, *racial discrimination* occurs when there is “differential treatment on the basis of race that disadvantages a racial group” or “treatment on the basis of inadequately justified factors other than race that disadvantages a racial group” (Blank, Dabady and Citro 2004: 39). That is, racial discrimination is present when there is either disparate treatment or disparate impact along particular racial lines. Given this definition of racial discrimination, we define two types of *perceived* discrimination. First, we define the general *perception of discrimination* as the perception or view that one has been treated unfairly personally, or the observation of unjust disparate impact for any

particular group in a given context. Second, we define the *perception of racial discrimination* as the perception of unfair treatment in one's personal experiences with the *attribution* of such treatment to one's (ascribed) racial (or ethnic) identity, or the observation of disparate impact along particular racial or ethnic lines. The distinction between our terms and the definitions cited is that our terms focus on *perception*. Our first definition concerns discrimination in general (without status attribution) and the second focuses on discrimination that individuals attribute to racial or ethnic factors.

Although there are a wide array of measures for assessing discrimination, including a growing literature on microaggressions (Pierce, Pierce-Gonzalez and Willis 1978; Sue et al. 2007), in this study we assess two widely used measures of perceived discrimination, each using multiple indicators: everyday and major life. *Everyday discrimination* is generally thought to assess, "the integration of racism into everyday situations through practices that activate underlying power relations" (Essed 1991: 50). Different from such 'daily hassles,' *major life discrimination* represents an encounter with discrimination at a time and place when it might restrict social mobility (e.g., Kessler et al. 1999). Although some conceptualize these major life experiences as isolated and event specific traumatic stressors (Williams et al. 1997), given the structural nature of race in the US (Bonilla-Silva 1997), we view them as cumulative (Reskin 2012). That is, we source anti-Black discrimination in the social structure of society which then systematically stigmatizes Black people (albeit in a gendered manner) across time/location-separated events. These events then share a common cause such that one event is correlated with the likelihood of exposure to another event. Therefore, experiencing unfair treatment by teachers in school *and* being treated unfairly by the

police have a shared genesis in white supremacy.

#### *The Gender Gap in Perceived Discrimination*

African American women and men are equally likely to believe that racial inequality in the US is due to anti-Black discrimination (Forman and Ifatunji 2006; Kane et al. 2001; Sigelman et al. 1991; Weitzer and Tuch 1999). According to a study which used data from the *General Social Survey*, 65 percent of African American men and 64 percent of African American women report that racial inequality is the result of discrimination against African Americans (Kane et al. 2001). Moreover, African American women and men do not differ on questions concerning: discriminatory treatment of ‘Black people’ by the criminal justice system and unequal neighborhood protection in African American neighborhoods (Weitzer et al. 1999). Findings like these, on anti-Black group discrimination, persist even after controlling for other social and demographic background factors (Forman et al. 2006; Sigelman et al. 1991).

Even though African American women and men are equally likely to believe that discrimination remains a problem for African Americans, African American men report more personal experiences with discrimination than African American women. (Barnes et al. 2004; Broman et al. 2000; Brown 2001; Din-Dzietham et al. 2004; Forman et al. 1997; Herring et al. 1998; Ifatunji and Forman 2006; Sigelman et al. 1991; Weitzer et al. 1999; Welch et al. 2001; Williams and Chung 1996). This pattern holds when African American respondents are asked about their personal experiences with racial discrimination in particular (i.e., without attribution; Broman et al. 2000; Brown 2001; Din-Dzietham et al. 2004; Hausmann et al. 2008; Weitzer et al. 1999; Welch et al. 2001; Williams et al. 1996), and when asked about personal discrimination more generally (Barnes et al. 2004;

Forman et al. 1997; Herring et al. 1998; Ifatunji et al. 2006; Sigelman et al. 1991).

Adjusting these estimates for relevant social background factors does not account for the pattern (Forman et al. 1997; Herring et al. 1998; Sigelman et al. 1991).

With respect to the measures of discrimination considered in this study, African American men report more perceived discrimination than do African American women on a range of indicators associated with major life discrimination. For instance, African American men are six times as likely as African American women to report racial discrimination by the police, even after controlling for social background characteristics (Broman et al. 2000; Weitzer et al. 1999). After considering the effects of education, age and family income, African American men are more than twice as likely to report job discrimination (Broman 1996). In addition to their encounters with police and in seeking employment, African American men report more racial discrimination than African American women in attaining fair wages, getting a quality education (Welch et al. 2001) and by the health care system (Hausmann et al. 2008). These findings also persist after adjusting for the effects of racial composition in several social contexts (Welch et al. 2001).

It appears that gender differences in everyday discrimination are not as stark as they are for major life discrimination. This is likely associated with the fact that these measures were inspired by the book *Everyday Racism*, which was a qualitative inquiry into the ways in which Black women in Canada experience racial discrimination in daily life (Essed 1991). Nevertheless, a study focusing on Detroit found scores that are about 9 percent greater for African American men than for African American women (Forman et al. 1997). Another study fielded in Miami puts the gap at about 16 percent (Taylor and

Turner 2002). However, results from factor analytic methods show that everyday discrimination is composed of two dimensions: ‘unfair treatment’ and ‘personal rejection’ (Barnes et al. 2004; Stucky et al. 2011). When the larger scale is subdivided in this way, African American women and men report similar levels of unfair treatment, but African American men report more personal rejection (Barnes et al. 2004).

## **EXPLANATIONS FOR THE GENDER GAP**

### *Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis*

Much of the research that documents the gender gap in perceived discrimination interprets this gap as reflecting the underlying experiences of African Americans – i.e., men are the primary targets of anti-Black discrimination (e.g., Ferguson 2001; Gary 1995; Navarrete et al. 2010; Pieterse et al. 2007; Veenstra 2013). Social psychologists argue that prejudice and discrimination are largely driven by the perception of ‘group threat,’ as opposed to intergroup animosity or negative affect (Blumer 1958; Bobo and Tuan 2006). By extension, members of the dominant group are more likely to target males in the subordinate group because males are viewed as more threatening than females (Sidanius and Pratto 1999). From this perspective, the gender gap in perceived discrimination stems from the fact that whites perceive African American men as posing a greater threat to their group position than African American women (Navarrete et al. 2010; Sidanius et al. 2000). The ‘subordinate male target hypothesis’ therefore expects the disproportionate targeting of African American men vis-à-vis women and is unsurprised by the greater rates of perceived discrimination found among African American men in social surveys. According to this perspective, since African American men are targeted at greater rates than African American women, no amount of

measurement bias in the scales used to assess perceived discrimination can account for the underlying reality that African American men experience more discrimination than African American women. For our analysis of the gender gap in perceived discrimination, this perspective yields our first hypothesis:

H1: Group mean differences between African American women and men remain *intact* after accounting for gender related-measurement bias in scales that assess perceived discrimination.

### *The Intersection of Race and Gender*

Intersectionality theory is a perspective that centralizes the intersections of multiple inequalities, as they occur within and across multiple levels of society (Cole 2009; Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1989; King 1988; May 2015; Weber 2010). Early articulations of intersectionality argued that, due to their experiences with both racism and sexism, African American women faced ‘double disadvantage’ or ‘double jeopardy’ because they are both Black and female (e.g., Beale 1970). In decades since, intersectional scholars have revised these ‘additive models,’ arguing that it is not possible to disentangle and then add up the separate contributions of race and gender, as they are mutually constitutive – i.e., notions of race are gendered and notions of gender are shaped by race (Bowleg 2008; Crenshaw 1989; Hancock 2007; King 1988; Zinn et al. 1996). Therefore, while African American women and men may share experiences and perspectives as a result of being in the same racial group, intersectionality asserts that the ways in which they experience and perceive unfair- and/or mistreatment are likely to be different (Bowleg 2008; Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1989; Harnois et al. 2011; Wingfield 2007).

According to this perspective, the ‘racial experience’ of African Americans might be quantitatively similar (in terms of prevalence) and yet qualitatively different (in terms

of the nature of any given experience) for women and men. In fact, several studies show that African American women and men are stereotyped in qualitatively different ways (Collins 2004; Dill 1988; Shih 2002; Slatton and Spates 2014; Timberlake and Estes 2007) and are often subjected to different types of mistreatment. For instance, Patricia Hill Collins (2000; Collins 2004) has argued that the dominant cultural stereotypes of African American women and men are not only based on race, but also on gender, class and sexuality. These ‘controlling images’ result in portrayals of African American men in the media that range from the lower class, “authentically” Black, hypersexual “thug” or “pimp” to the de-sexualized, “white-washed” (i.e., inauthentic) upper-middle class “Black Buddy” or “sidekick.” In short, many equate male “Blackness” with poverty, criminality, violence, and hyper-sexuality. Racial stereotypes for African American women are somewhat different and include the de-sexualized lower-class mammy, the lower-class “Welfare-Queen,” the hyper-sexualized (and frequently animalistic) jezebel, and the “white-washed,” upper-middle class “Black Lady” (e.g., Claire Huxtable or Oprah Winfrey).

Given the gendered nature of racial stereotypes, it comes as little surprise that the measures social scientists use to study perceived discrimination are also gendered (Harnois 2013; Harnois et al. 2011). However, these measures are not evenly gendered. At least one study shows that the measures often used to assess the perception of discrimination in social surveys are gendered in ways that favor the experiences of African American men (Harnois et al. 2011). The present study builds upon this by analyzing the extent to which this measurement bias explains the gender gap in perceived discrimination. Given the perspective offered by intersectionality theory, we develop our

second hypothesis:

H2: Accounting for gender-related measurement bias in scales that assess perceived discrimination results in *meaningful reductions* in mean differences between African American women and men.

To test these hypotheses, we analyze data from two social surveys that include the measures of everyday and major life discrimination. Our analysis begins by assessing gendered measurement bias in these measures. We then examine the degree to which this measurement bias accounts for the gender gap in perceived discrimination among African Americans.

## **DATA AND METHODS**

The data for this study come from two social surveys: the Detroit Area Study (Jackson and Williams 1995: DAS) and the National Survey of American Life (Jackson et al. 2004: NSAL). The DAS is representative of the Detroit metropolitan area<sup>2</sup> and the NSAL contains a nationally representative sample of African Americans.<sup>3</sup> The DAS was the first study to include measures of major life and everyday discrimination and therefore provides an important ‘baseline’ sample (Williams et al. 1997). Each assessed perceived discrimination with multiple questions and both use a similar set of questions. The analytic samples for the DAS are 180 men and 393 women for both everyday and major life discrimination; and 152 men and 347 women for the assessment of major life discrimination attributed to race. The analytic sample for the NSAL includes 1120 men and 2073 women (for all three operationalizations of perceived discrimination).<sup>4</sup> All analytic samples only include those respondents who self-identified as Black or African American and who answered all of the questions regarding perceived discrimination.

In this study we employ retrospective accounts of respondents' perceptions to assess their experiences with both everyday and major life discrimination (Forman et al. 1997; Harnois et al. 2011; Ifatunji et al. 2006; Kessler et al. 1999; Taylor et al. 2002; Williams et al. 1997). Although retrospective accounts are less than ideal (Hardt and Rutter 2004; Maughan and Rutter 1997) as it is often difficult to assess the intent or impetus of discrimination (Blank et al. 2004; Phinney, Madden and Santos 1998), there is an established body of research that connects retrospective reports of the perception of discrimination to various life outcomes, including mental and physical health (Amaro, Russo and Johnson 1987; Brown 2001; Kessler et al. 1999; Krieger and Sidney 1996; Krieger et al. 2005; Lewis et al. 2009; Lewis, Cogburn and Williams 2015; Pager and Shepherd 2008; Paradies 2006; Pascoe and Richman 2009; Schulz et al. 2006; Williams et al. 1997). Therefore while retrospective reports of perceived discrimination are not ideal, they remain an important tool for estimating trends in the national population.

The three measures of discrimination examined in this study are increasingly becoming the standard for measuring perceived discrimination in social survey research (Forman et al. 1997; Harnois et al. 2011; Ifatunji et al. 2006; Kessler et al. 1999; Taylor et al. 2002; Williams et al. 1997). These are: everyday, major life and 'major life attributed to race.' Following others, we parse everyday discrimination into two dimensions but retain it as a single *kind* of discrimination (Barnes et al. 2004; Stucky et al. 2011).

Similar to previous work, we theorize two dimensions of everyday discrimination: implicit and explicit (Barnes et al. 2004). *Implicit discrimination* reflects the daily hassles that people experience in more subtle ways. We create this latent factor using five

variables: “...treated with less courtesy than other people?” “... you are treated with less respect than other people?” “... receive poor service compared with other people at restaurants or stores?” “... people act as if they think you are not smart?” and “...people act as if they're better than you are”). *Explicit discrimination* refers to the less than subtle or slightly more overt ways in which people encounter daily hassles. We create this latent factor using four variables: “...people act as if they are afraid of you?” “...people act as if they think you are dishonest?” “... you are called names or insulted?” and “...you are threatened or harassed?” We then correlate these two latent factors to compose a single measurement model. There are five response options for all of the above questions: less than once a year, a few times a year, a few times a month, at least once a week and almost every day. The more frequent the experience the greater the level of everyday discrimination. The DAS and NSAL measure this construct in about the same way, except that the NSAL uses one additional question, which we include in the explicit dimension: “You are followed around in stores” (*see* Table 1 to compare questions in the DAS and NSAL). The single group confirmatory factor analytic model (*see* Figure 1) fits the data well in both the DAS (RMSEA = .052; CFI = .994) and the NSAL (RMSEA = .062; CFI = .992).<sup>5</sup>

*Major life discrimination* refers to encountering discrimination that could potentially result in blocks to social mobility. We assess this form of discrimination with six questions in the DAS and nine questions in the NSAL (*see* Table 2 to compare questions in the DAS and NSAL). In the DAS, we used: “Do you think you have ever been unfairly fired or denied a promotion?” “For unfair reasons, do you think you have ever not been hired for a job?” “Have you been unfairly stopped ... or abused by the

police?” “Do you think you have ever been unfairly discouraged by a teacher or advisor from continuing your education?” “Do you think you have ever been unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood?” and “Do you think that neighbors have made life difficult for you and your family?” Respondents answer each of these questions with a “yes” or “no.” The more experiences a respondent has had, the greater their experiences with major life discrimination. The single group confirmatory factor analytic model (*see* Figure 2) fits the data in both the DAS (RMSEA = .019; CFI = .993) and the NSAL (RMSEA = .024; CFI = .983).<sup>6</sup>

To capture *major life discrimination attributed to race*, we developed a second operationalization of major life discrimination from respondents who attributed their treatment to race or ethnicity (following, Brown 2001). That is, after answering each of the above questions (for major life discrimination), interviewers then asked respondents a follow-up question: “What was the main reason [for this mistreatment]?” For this second operationalization of major life discrimination (i.e., ‘major life discrimination attributed to race’) if a respondent reported no experience with a particular instance of discrimination or if they did not attribute the cause of that experience to race or ethnicity,<sup>7</sup> we coded them as not having experienced major life discrimination attributed to race. If they reported experiencing discrimination *and* attributed it to their race or ethnicity, we coded them as having experienced major life discrimination attributed to race. The single group confirmatory factor analytic model (*see* Figure 2) fits the data in both the DAS (RMSEA = .000; CFI = 1.000) and the NSAL (RMSEA = .024; CFI = .980).<sup>8</sup>

An implicit assumption in nearly all of the studies that use these scales is that the indicators relate to the latent variables in the same way for African American women and men (Harnois et al. 2011; Stucky et al. 2011). That is, the same increase in the underlying latent variable of perceived discrimination leads to identical changes in any given item for African American women and men. If this is not true, any comparison of these measures is flawed because the items respond differently for African American women and men. Therefore, we use multiple group confirmatory factor analysis with latent means (Bollen 1989) and categorical outcomes (Sass et al. 2014) to test for measurement invariance (Cheung and Rensvold 2002) in perceived discrimination between African American women and men (Harnois et al. 2011). If African American women and men experience discrimination differently, items that are designed to assess discrimination will indicate the underlying factor differently for women and men (Molenaar and Nesselroade 2012). For example, the factor loading for discrimination by the police might be larger for African American men if this more accurately reflects the way in which African American men experience major life discrimination. We determine this differential factor loading by allowing women and men having different factor loadings and assessing whether or not this allowance results in improved model fit. Our index variables were selected because they loaded least differently between genders. In order to account for the dichotomous and ordinal nature of the response options, we estimate our models using threshold cut points instead of estimating intercepts (Bollen 1989; Muthén and Muthén 2012; Sass et al. 2014).<sup>9</sup>

After assessing model fit, we then test for the extent to which gender differences in the underlying factor means (or the means for the unobserved latent variables) are due

to variance between African American women and men in the association between the observed items and the unobserved latent factors. For example, let us assume that mistreatment by the police better reflects the experience of major life discrimination for African American men (i.e., allowing different factor loadings results in improved model fit). In a standard regression model, women and men are forced to have the same ‘factor loading’ or beta coefficient for this item. If we relax this assumption of sameness, and allow women and men to have different factor loadings for this item, we are able to observe any corresponding reductions in the underlying factor mean difference between women and men, because women and men would be allowed to have their own covariance structures (i.e., adjusting for measurement error), thus allowing for a more accurate assessment of the underlying means and the associated gender gap (Molenaar et al. 2012).

This measurement strategy has several advantages relative to the use of other strategies to assess measurement, including Cronbach alpha scores and summed or averaged indexes. First, it provides for a more accurate assessment of construct validity, as Cronbach alpha scores do not account for the dichotomous nature of the response options. This limitation might lead to underestimation of the shared variance of items used to measure a given construct. Second, unlike summed or averaged index scores, it allows for a targeted assessment of the relative contribution that each item makes to measurement error between groups. Third, it allows for an assessment of whether or not observed differences in validity are statistically different between groups. Finally, it allows the investigator to observe mean differences between groups (i.e., differences in

the unobserved latent factor mean) before and after accounting for between group specific errors in measurement.

## RESULTS

Tables 1 and 2 replicate findings from previous studies, which also show that African American men report more personal experiences with discrimination than do African American women (Broman et al. 2000; Forman et al. 1997; Ifatunji et al. 2006; Sellers et al. 2003; Sigelman et al. 1991). In all cases where gender differences are statistically significant, men report more discrimination than women. This is true for everyday, major life and major life discrimination attributed to race. According to *t*-scores, the largest differences between women and men for everyday discrimination are within the explicit dimension. The two items with the biggest gender differences are, “people act as if they are afraid of you” and “people act as if you are dishonest.” The largest differences for items assessing major life discrimination and major life discrimination attributed to race involved experiences with the police and in the labor market.

[ Tables 1 and 2 ]

*Do measures of perceived discrimination contain gender bias?*

Tables 3a and 3b present findings from a series of multiple group confirmatory factor analytic models of everyday discrimination, for women and men, using the DAS and NSAL. Allowing women and men to have different factor loadings does not improve overall model fit in the DAS but substantially improves model fit in the NSAL ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 168.18, p = .000$ ). Findings from the DAS show that women and men have different factor loadings for the question assessing “poor service” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 8.44, p = .004$ ). Findings

from the NSAL show that women and men have different factor loadings for three types of mistreatment: people acting as if they are afraid of you ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 114.87, p = .000$ ), being called names or insulted ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 132.55, p = .000$ ), and being threatened or harassed ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 97.43, p = .000$ ). Since Chi-Square tests rely heavily on sample size, the difference in significance levels across samples may stem, in part, from different sample sizes.

[ Tables 3a and 3b ]

Tables 4a and 4b show that model fit is significantly improved when women and men are allowed to have different factor loadings for major life discrimination (*without attribution to race*) in both the DAS ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 19.66, p = .000$ ) and NSAL ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 36.93, p = .000$ ). The specific items associated with improved model fit in the DAS are “unfairly fired” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 3.92, p = .048$ ), “not been hired” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 8.64, p = .003$ ) and being “stopped … or abused by the police” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 17.45, p = .000$ ). The items associated with improved model fit for the NSAL are “not been hired” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 23.64, p = .000$ ) and “stopped … or abused by the police” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 31.71, p = .000$ ). In both cases, questions assessing the perception of discrimination in employment and with the police are primarily responsible for improved model fit, suggesting that these experiences are the most gendered.

[ Table 4a and 4b ]

Tables 5a and 5b, assess improvements in model fit for major life discrimination *attributed to race*. Results show that allowing select items to have different factor loadings for women and men improves the overall model fit for both the DAS ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 7.81, p = .020$ ) and the NSAL ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 45.72, p = .000$ ). Specifically, findings from the DAS show that allowing the factor loading to differ between women and men for “unfairly fired” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 3.62, p = .057$ ) and being “stopped … or abused by the police”

$(\Delta\chi^2 = 7.49, p = .006)$  significantly improved model fit. Findings from the NSAL show that more than half of the questions suffer from gender-related measurement error, including “not been hired” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 28.23, p = .000$ ), “stopped … or abused by the police” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 27.54, p = .000$ ), “prevented from moving into a neighborhood” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 10.21, p = .001$ ), “denied a bank loan” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 3.34, p = .068$ ) and “worse repair service” ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 7.00, p = .008$ ). These findings suggest that the experience of discrimination is more gendered when it is attributed to race, as model improvements are associated with a wider range of questions than when compared to major life discrimination without the race attribution. In addition, overall model fit is best when perceived discrimination is operationalized as major life discrimination attributed to race.

[ Table 5a and 5b ]

*Does gendered measurement bias account for the gender gap?*

We now focus on our primary and previously unexplored research question: *the degree to which gendered differences in model fit – or gender bias in measurement – is responsible for the gender gap in perceived discrimination*. We find mixed evidence depending upon the dataset analyzed, and the type of discrimination considered. In the DAS, adjusting the model for gender-related measurement error results in a complete reduction of the gender gap in implicit discrimination (from  $m\Delta = -2.04, p < .100$  in model 1, to  $m\Delta = -1.57, p = ns$  in model 9). Measurement error is also responsible for 25 percent of the gap in explicit discrimination in the DAS (from  $m\Delta = -.862, p < .001$  in model 1, to  $m\Delta = -.644, p < .010$  in Model 9). These reductions in the factor mean difference are supported by five of eight items, excluding “treated with less courtesy” and “treated with less respect.” For the NSAL, there are no reductions in either implicit or

explicit discrimination when the base model and full models are compared. There is, however, a 5 percent reduction associated with allowing women and men to have different factor loadings for “people act as if they are afraid of you.” Since reductions found in the DAS are not replicated in the NSAL, the role that gender-related measurement error plays in the gender gap in perceived everyday discrimination is not clear. Since findings are weaker in the national sample, our results suggest that measurement differences likely do not explain gender differences in perceived everyday discrimination. Although this observation is not strictly in line with the subordinate male target hypothesis, on its face, it is more in line with this hypothesis than it is with intersectionality theory. We reflect more on this finding below.

In line with expectations set forth in intersectionality theory, gender-related measurement error is responsible for a significant portion of the gap in major life discrimination (Tables 4a and 4b). For major life discrimination without attribution to race, gender-related measurement error fully accounts for the gender gap in the DAS, and accounts for 53 percent of the gender gap in the NSAL. In both cases, reductions in the gender gap – or factor mean difference – are driven by measurement error associated with the question that references unfair treatment by the police. Allowing for women and men to have different factor loadings for this item alone is associated with a 67 percent reduction in the gender gap in both the DAS and the NSAL. Intersectionality theory and the expectation that measurement error is largely responsible for gender differences in perceived discrimination is most strongly supported by our operationalization of major life discrimination attributed to race (Tables 5a and 5b). Measurement error associated

with the indicator for being “stopped … or abused by the police” *fully* accounts for the gender gap in major life discrimination attributed to race in the NSAL.

Taken together, these findings suggests that while differences in everyday discrimination are generally not due to gender-related measurement error, the way we measure major life discrimination (particularly when attributed to race) has important implications for our understanding of differential rates between women and men.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Previous research shows that, while African American women and men perceive similar levels of group discrimination, African American men report having more experiences with discrimination than do African American women. In this study we tested for the role of gender-related measurement bias in explaining some or all gender differences in reports of perceived discrimination among African Americans. This study provides mixed and domain specific support for our expectations regarding the gendered nature of perceived (racial) discrimination. Findings for major life discrimination are most consistent with the view provided by intersectionality theory (Cho et al. 2013; Collins 2000; Collins 2004; Crenshaw 1989; King 1988; Weber 2010; Zinn et al. 1996). However, findings for everyday discrimination are somewhat mixed but appear to lean toward ideas found in the targeted male hypothesis, particularly in the national sample (e.g., Ferguson 2001; Navarrete et al. 2010).

Adjusting for gender-related measurement error provides for a *partial* explanation of the gender gap in major life discrimination and a *full* explanation for the gender gap in major life discrimination attributed to race. In both cases, discrimination in employment and unfair or mistreatment by the police played a central role in the production of gender-

related measurement error. That is, discrimination in employment and mistreatment by the police better reflect the ways in which African American men perceive their experiences with (racial) discrimination. Adjusting measures of everyday discrimination for gender-related measurement error did not result in an improved model fit or any appreciable reduction in the gender gap. This suggests that, as currently measured, the ways in which scholars currently conceptualize the experience of discrimination in the form of daily-hassles appears to be more “gender balanced.” This is likely associated with the fact that this scale was informed by a study which focused on the experiences of Black women (Essed 1991).

#### *Limitations*

Our analysis is limited and caution should be taken when interpreting these results. As noted previously, we have relied on retrospective accounts of perceived discrimination, and there is a potential discrepancy between subjective self-reports of perceived discrimination and objective experiences with discrimination. Importantly, research shows that this relationship is itself influenced by gender (Essed 1991; King 2003). Our study is also restricted to African Americans so our findings may or may not apply to other racial or ethnic groups. Finally, while we think considering the intersection of race and gender is a key contribution of the current study, we also recognize that sexuality, social class, age, (dis)ability and other social inequalities are likely to also influence experiences with discrimination.

Despite these limitations, the current study clearly demonstrates the value of analyzing discrimination within an intersectional framework. Although our conceptualization and measurement of everyday discrimination appears to be less

affected by gender-related measurement bias than are measures of major life discrimination, these measures may still be incomplete in ways that marginalize the experiences of (African American) women. Future studies should consider the social and institutional contexts in which (African American) women may be more likely to experience discrimination than (African American) men. For instance, given that women often function as primary caregivers, the potential for discrimination in social services and healthcare might uniquely shape the lives of (African American) women. Future research might also consider the inclusion of additional items that concern sexual harassment. For instance, “cat calling,” or unwanted sexual comments and/or advances made by men toward women represents a potential source of gendered discrimination. Finally, we note that measures of discrimination tend to emphasize active forms of discrimination – such as being called names or insulted or being fired from a job. Experiences with more passive forms of discrimination, such as being ignored, overlooked, dismissed, or not taken seriously, are generally not included in measures of discrimination. These omissions likely produce downward bias in the prevalence of discrimination among women.

Intersectionality theorizes the interplay between race, gender and other social statuses, and our analysis shows that African American women and men may experience or at least perceive discrimination at levels that are more similar to one another than previous studies suggest. Therefore, studies which neglect to account for gendered measurement bias risk presenting an inaccurate view, where the gender gap in perceived discrimination is appreciably inflated – if not wholly created – by the gendered nature of survey questions.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> We use the term ‘gender gap’ to refer to greater reports of perceived discrimination among African American men than among African American women.

<sup>2</sup> For a complete description of the Detroit Area Study visit:

<http://www.tcaup.umich.edu/workfolio/DAS2001/stdescript.html>.

<sup>3</sup> We did not include the sample of Afro Caribbeans also available in the study because African Americans and Afro Caribbeans are different Black populations with known differences in their thinking about and experiences with discrimination (*see*, Waters 1999, Rogers 2001). These differences would confound our assessment of the relative construct validity of perceived discrimination among African Americans and make the two survey samples less comparable.

<sup>4</sup> The reason why there are two analytic samples for the DAS and only one for the NSAL is because the two surveys use different skip patterns for major life discrimination attributed to race.

<sup>5</sup> When considered separately in single group confirmatory factor analytic models, our conceptualization of everyday discrimination (see Figure 1) fit the data reasonably well for men (RMSEA = .109; CFI = .978) and good for women (RMSEA = .053; CFI = .995) in the DAS and; well for men (RMSEA = .071; CFI = .990) and good for women (RMSEA = .058; CFI = .992) in the NSAL.

<sup>6</sup> We find that separate single group confirmatory factor analytic models for major life discrimination fit near perfectly for both men (RMSEA = .000; CFI = 1.000) and women (RMSEA = .000; CFI = 1.000) in the DAS; and very well for men (RMSEA = .019; CFI = .993) and women (RMSEA = .026; CFI = .974).

<sup>7</sup> After each question concerning major life discrimination, the respondent was asked to attribute their experience with unfair treatment to one of nine different reasons, presented in the following order: ethnicity, gender, race, age, religion, physical appearance, sexual orientation, your income level/social class or a combination of two or more reasons. We did not include physical appearance because it captures all aspects of the appearance including non-phenotypic features. In analysis not shown, we explored the frequency of respondents attributing their unfair treatment to gender. In no case did more than 3 percent of respondents attribute their unfair treatment to gender. The DAS allows for multiple mentions. In no case did more than 3 percent of respondents attribute multiple causes. Race was the modal attributional category for all questions in both surveys.

<sup>8</sup> The model fits the data well for men (RMSEA = .039; CFI = .978) and near perfectly for women (RMSEA = .000; CFI = 1.000) in the DAS and well for men (RMSEA = .023; CFI = .989) and women (RMSEA = .023; CFI = .970) in the NSAL.

<sup>9</sup> This technique is equivalent to tests of Differential Item Functioning within the Item Response Theory framework (*see* equation 9; Sass et al. 2014). However, the Categorical Confirmatory Factor Analytic method is more flexible and allows for a more nuanced test of measurement invariance (Cheung and Rensvold 2002).

## REFERENCES

- Amaro, Hortensia, Nancy Felipe Russo and Julie Johnson. 1987. "Family and Work Predictors of Psychological Well-Being among Hispanic Women Professionals." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 11(4):505-521.
- Anderson, Elijah. 2008. *Against the Wall: Poor, Young, Black, and Male*. The City in the Twenty-First Century: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Barnes, Lisa L., Carlos F. Menendez-DeLeon, Robert S. Wilson, David A. Bennett and Denis A. Evans. 2004. "Racial Differences in Perceived Discrimination in a Community Population of Older Blacks and Whites." *Journal of Aging & Health* 16(3):315-337.
- Beale, Frances. 1970. "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female." Pp. 90-100 in *The Black Woman: An Anthology*, edited by Toni Cade Bambara. New York, New York: New American Library.
- Blank, Rebecca M., Marilyn Dabady and Constance Citro, eds. 2004. *Measuring Racial Discrimination*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *The Pacific Sociological Review* 1(1):3-7.
- Bobo, Lawrence D. and Cybelle Fox. 2003. "Race, Racism and Discrimination: Bridging Problems, Methods and Theory in Social Psychological Research." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66(4):319-332.
- Bobo, Lawrence D. and Mia Tuan. 2006. *Prejudice in Politics: Group Position, Public Opinion, and the Wisconsin Treaty Rights Dispute*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bollen, Kenneth A. 1989. *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62(3):465-480.
- Bowleg, Lisa. 2008. "When Black + Lesbian + Woman ≠ Black Lesbian Woman: The Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectionality Research." *Sex Roles* 59(5-6):312-325.
- Broman, Clifford L. 1996. "The Health Consequences of Racial Discrimination: A Study of African Americans." *Ethnicity and Disease* 6:148-153.
- Broman, Clifford L., Roya Mavaddat and Shu-yao Hsu. 2000. "The Experience and Consequences of Perceived Racial Discrimination: A Study of African Americans." *Journal of Black Psychology* 26(2):165-180.
- Brown, Tony N. 2001. "Measuring Self-Perceived Racial and Ethnic Discrimination in Social Surveys." *Sociological Spectrum* 21(3):377-392.
- Calabrese, Edward J., Kenneth A Bachmann, A John Bailer, P Michael Bolger, Jonathan Borak, Lu Cai, Nina Cedergreen, M George Cherian, Chuang C Chiueh and Thomas W Clarkson. 2007. "Biological Stress Response Terminology: Integrating the Concepts of Adaptive Response and Preconditioning Stress within a Hormetic Dose-Response Framework." *Toxicology and applied pharmacology* 222(1):122-128.

- Cheung, Gordon W. and Roger B. Rensvold. 2002. "Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing Measurement Invariance." *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 9:233-255. doi: 10.1207/S15328007SEM0902\_5.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs* 38(4):785-810.
- Cole, Elizabeth R. 2009. "Intersectionality and Research in Psychology." *American Psychologist* 64(3):170-180. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2004. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender and the New Racism*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989:139-168.
- Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 1988. "Our Mothers' Grief: Racial Ethnic Women and the Maintenance of Families." *Journal of Family History* 13(4):415-431. doi: 10.1177/036319908801300404.
- Din-Dzietham, Rebecca, Wendy N. Nembhard, Rakale Collins and Sharon K. Davis. 2004. "Perceived Stress Following Race-Based Discrimination at Work Is Associated with Hypertension in African Americans. The Metro Atlanta Heart Disease Study, 1999-2001." *Social Science and Medicine* 58(3):449-461.
- Essed, Philomena. 1991. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Ferguson, Ann Arnett. 2001. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Forman, Tyrone A., David R. Williams and James S. Jackson. 1997. "Race, Place and Discrimination." *Perspectives on Social Problems* 9:231-261.
- Forman, Tyrone A. and Mosi A. Ifatunji. 2006. "Cohorts, Discrimination and Causal Attributions: System Blame Ideology among African Americans." in *Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association*. Montreal, Canada.
- Gary, Lawrence E. 1995. "African American Men's Perceptions of Racial Discrimination: A Sociocultural Analysis." *Social Work Research* 19(4):207-217.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(1):63-79.
- Hardt, Jochen and Michael Rutter. 2004. "Validity of Adult Retrospective Reports of Adverse Childhood Experiences: Review of the Evidence." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 45(2):260-273. doi: DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00218.x.
- Harnois, Catherine E. and Mosi Ifatunji. 2011. "Gendered Measures, Gendered Models: Toward an Intersectional Analysis of Interpersonal Racial Discrimination." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34:1006-1028. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2010.516836.
- Harnois, Catherine E. 2013. *Feminist Measures in Survey Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

- Hausmann, Leslie R. M., Kwonho BA Jeong, James E. MS Bost and Said A. Ibrahim. 2008. "Perceived Discrimination in Health Care and Health Status in a Racially Diverse Sample." *Medical Care* 46(9):905-914.
- Herring, Cedric, Melvin E. Thomas, Marlese Durr and Hayward D. Horton. 1998. "Does Race Matter? The Determinants and Consequences of Self-Reports of Discrimination Victimization." *Race & Society* 1(2):109-123.
- Ifatunji, Mosi A. and Tyrone A. Forman. 2006. "Education and Discrimination: A Test of Some Mediating Mechanisms." in *Annual Meeting for the Association of Black Sociologists*. Montreal, Canada.
- Jackson, James S. and David R. Williams. 1995. "Detroit Area Study: Social Influences on Health (Stress, Racism and Health Protective Services)." Vol.: University of Michigan.
- Jackson, James S., Myriam Torres, Cleopatra H. Caldwell, Harold W. Neighbors, Randolph M. Nesse, Robert Joseph Taylor, Steven J. Trierweiler and David R. Williams. 2004. "The National Survey of American Life: A Study of Racial, Ethnic and Cultural Influences on Mental Disorders and Mental Health." *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 13(4):196-207.
- Jones, Camara. 2000. "Levels of Racism: A Theoretic Framework and a Gardener's Tale." *American Journal of Public Health* 90(8):1212-1215.
- Kane, Emily W. and Elise K. Kyyro. 2001. "For Whom Does Education Enlighten: Race, Gender, Education and Beliefs About Social Inequality." *Gender & Society* 15(5):710-733.
- Kessler, Ronald C., Kristin D. Mickelson and David R. Williams. 1999. "The Prevalence, Distribution and Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination in the United States." *Journal of Health & Social Behavior* 40(3):208-230.
- King, Deborah K. 1988. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." *Signs* 14(1):42.
- King, Kimberly R. 2003. "Do You See What I See? Effects of Group Consciousness on African American Women's Attributions to Prejudice." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 27(1):17-30.
- Krieger, Nancy and Stephan Sidney. 1996. "Racial Discrimination and Blood Pressure: The Cardia Study of Black and White Adults." *American Journal of Public Health* 86(10):1370-1378.
- Krieger, Nancy. 1999. "Embodying Inequality: A Review of Concepts, Measures and Methods for Studying Health Consequences of Discrimination." *International Journal of Health Services* 29(2):295-352.
- Krieger, Nancy, Kevin Smith, Deepa Naishadham, Cathy Hartman and Elizabeth M Barbeau. 2005. "Experiences of Discrimination : Validity and Reliability of a Self-Report Measure for Population Health Research on Racism and Health." 61:1576-1596. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.03.006.
- Lewis, Tené T, Lisa L Barnes, Julia L Bienias, Daniel T Lackland, Denis A Evans and Carlos F Mendes De Leon. 2009. "Perceived Discrimination and Blood Pressure in Older African American and White Adults." *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*:glp062.
- Lewis, Tené T, Courtney D Cogburn and David R Williams. 2015. "Self-Reported Experiences of Discrimination and Health: Scientific Advances, Ongoing

- Controversies, and Emerging Issues." *Annual review of clinical psychology* 11:407-440.
- Maughan, Barbara and Michael Rutter. 1997. "Retrospective Reporting of Childhood Adversity: Issues in Assessing Long-Term Recall." *Journal of Personality Disorders* 11(1):19-33. doi: doi: 10.1521/pedi.1997.11.1.19.
- May, Vivian. 2015. *Pursuing Intersectionality*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30(3):1771-1800.
- Molenaar, Peter C. M. and John R. Nesselroade. 2012. "Merging the Idiographic Filter with Dynamic Factor Analysis to Model Process." *Applied Developmental Science* 16(4):210-219. doi: 10.1080/10888691.2012.722884.
- Muthén, Linda K. and Bengt O. Muthén. 2012. *Mplus User's Guide*. Los Angeles, California: Muthén & Muthén Press.
- Navarrete, Carlos David, Melissa M. McDonald, Ludwin E. Molina and Jim Sidanius. 2010. "Prejudice at the Nexus of Race and Gender: An Outgroup Male Target Hypothesis." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 98(6):933-945.
- Pager, Devah and Hana Shepherd. 2008. "The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets and Minorities." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:181-209. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131740.
- Paradies, Yin. 2006. "A Systematic Review of Empirical Research on Self-Reported Racism and Health." *International Journal of Epidemiology* 35:888-901. doi: doi:10.1093/ije/dyl056.
- Pascoe, Elizabeth A. and Laura Smart Richman. 2009. "Perceived Discrimination and Health: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Psychological Bulletin* 135(4):531-554. doi: 10.1037/a0016059.
- Pérez, Debra Joy, Lisa Fortuna and Margarita Alegria. 2008. "Prevalence and Correlates of Everyday Discrimination among Us Latinos." *Journal of Community Psychology* 36(4):421.
- Phinney, Jean S., Tanya Madden and Lorena J. Santos. 1998. "Psychological Variables as Predictors of Perceived Ethnic Discrimination among Minority and Immigrant Adolescents." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 28(11):937-953.
- Pierce, Chester M., D. Pierce-Gonzalez and D. Willis. 1978. "An Experiment in Racism: Tv Commercials." Pp. 62-88 in *Television and Education*, edited by Chester M. Pierce. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Pieterse, Alex L. and Robert T. Carter. 2007. "An Examination of the Relationship between General Life Stress, Racism-Related Stress, and Psychological Health among Black Men." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 54(1):101-109.
- Reskin, Barbara F. 2012. "The Race Discrimination System." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38:17-35.
- Sass, Daniel a., Thomas a. Schmitt and Herbert W. Marsh. 2014. "Evaluating Model Fit with Ordered Categorical Data within a Measurement Invariance Framework: A Comparison of Estimators." *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 21:167-180. doi: 10.1080/10705511.2014.882658.
- Schulz, Amy J, Clarence C Gravlee, David R Williams, Barbara A Israel, Graciela Mentz and Zachary Rowe. 2006. "Discrimination, Symptoms of Depression, and Self-

- Rated Health among African American Women in Detroit: Results from a Longitudinal Analysis." *American Journal of Public Health* 96(7):1265-1270.
- Sellers, Robert M. and J. Nicole Shelton. 2003. "The Role of Racial Identity in Perceived Racial Discrimination." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 84(5):1079-1092.
- Shih, Johanna. 2002. "...Yeah, I Could Hire This One, but I Know It's Gonna Be a Problem": How Race, Nativity and Gender Affect Employers' Perceptions of the Manageability of Job Seekers." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(1):99-119. doi: 10.1080/01419870120112076.
- Sidanius, Jim and Felicia Pratto. 1999. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, Jim and Rosemary C. Veniegas. 2000. "Gender and Race Discrimination: The Interactive Nature of Disadvantage." Pp. 47-69 in *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*, edited by Stuart Oskamp. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Sigelman, Lee and Susan Welch. 1991. "The Sources of Blacks' Perceptions of Racial Inequality." Pp. 67-84 in *Black Americans' Views of Racial Inequality: The Dream Differed*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Slatton, Brittany and Kamesha Spates. 2014. *Hyper Sexual, Hyper Masculine? Gender, Race and Sexuality in the Identities of Contemporary Black Men*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Stucky, Brian D, Nisha C Gottfredson, a T Panter, Charles E Daye, Walter R Allen and Linda F Wightman. 2011. "An Item Factor Analysis and Item Response Theory-Based Revision of the Everyday Discrimination Scale.". *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology* 17:175-185. doi: 10.1037/a0023356.
- Sue, Derald Wing, Christina M Capodilupo, Gina C Torino, Jennifer M Bucceri, Aisha Holder, Kevin L Nadal and Marta Esquilin. 2007. "Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice." *American Psychologist* 62(4):271.
- Taylor, John and R. Jay Turner. 2002. "Perceived Discrimination, Social Stress, and Depression in the Transition to Adulthood: Racial Contrasts." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65(3):213-225.
- Timberlake, Jeffrey M and Sarah Beth Estes. 2007. "Do Racial and Ethnic Stereotypes Depend on the Sex of Target Group Members? Evidence from a Survey-Based Experiment." *The Sociological Quarterly* 48(3):399-433.
- Veenstra, Gerry. 2013. "The Gendered Nature of Discriminatory Experiences by Race, Class, and Sexuality: A Comparison of Intersectionality Theory and the Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis." *Sex Roles* 68(11-12):646-659.
- Weber, Lynn. 2010. *Understanding Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality : A Conceptual Framework*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weitzer, Ronald and Steven A. Tuch. 1999. "Race, Class and Perceptions of Discrimination by the Police." *Crime & Delinquency* 45(4):494-507.
- Welch, Susan, Lee Sigelman, Timothy Bledsoe and Michael Combs. 2001. "Perceptions of Racial Discrimination." Pp. 71-93 in *Race and Place: Race Relations in an American City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

- Williams, David R. and An-Me Chung. 1996. "Racism and Health." in *Health in Black America*, edited by Harold W. Neighbors and James S. Jackson. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Williams, David R., Yan Yu and James S. Jackson. 1997. "Racial Differences in Physical and Mental Health: Socioeconomic Status, Stress and Discrimination." *Journal of Health Psychology* 2(3):1359-1053.
- Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2007. "The Modern Mammy and the Angry Black Man: African American Professionals' Experiences with Gendered Racism in the Workplace." *Race, Gender & Class*:196-212.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism." *Feminist Studies* 22(2):321-331.

Table 1.

Means and Standard Deviations for Items Measuring Everyday Discrimination, by Gender.

	Detroit 1995 <sup>1</sup>			National 2001-3 <sup>2</sup>		
	Male	Female	t	Male	Female	t
All items <sup>3</sup>	2.17 (.776)	1.99 (.727)	2.72 **	2.32 (.945)	2.14 (.851)	5.75 ***
Implicit Items <sup>4</sup>	2.39 (.887)	2.27 (.877)	1.63	2.60 (1.12)	2.47 (1.05)	3.37 ***
You are treated with courtesy than other people.	2.38 (1.04)	2.21 (1.03)	1.81 *	2.60 (1.32)	2.43 (1.21)	3.72 ***
You are treated with less respect than other people.	2.26 (.992)	2.10 (1.02)	1.67 *	2.47 (1.27)	2.32 (1.19)	3.29 ***
You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores.	2.39 (1.06)	2.21 (1.01)	1.92 *	2.36 (1.19)	2.25 (1.14)	2.52 *
People act as if they think you are not smart.	2.36 (1.19)	2.27 (1.28)	.76	2.59 (1.50)	2.49 (1.43)	1.82 *
People act as if they're better than you are.	2.59 (1.27)	2.53 (1.26)	.53	2.98 (1.64)	2.84 (1.61)	2.39 *
Explicit Items <sup>5</sup>	1.89 (.789)	1.65 (.712)	3.74 ***	2.05 (.921)	1.81 (.821)	7.66 ***
People act as if they are afraid of you.	2.30 (1.25)	1.85 (1.10)	4.30 ***	2.38 (1.46)	1.83 (1.14)	11.67 ***
People act as if they think you are dishonest.	1.92 (1.09)	1.62 (.910)	3.36 ***	2.22 (1.35)	1.85 (1.12)	8.23 ***
You are called names or insulted.	1.76 (1.00)	1.63 (.960)	1.42	1.89 (1.17)	1.81 (1.15)	1.81 *
You are threatened or harassed.	1.60 (.850)	1.47 (.875)	1.66 *	1.62 (.865)	1.54 (.852)	2.50 *
You are followed in stores.	-	-	-	2.15 (1.33)	2.00 (1.22)	3.11 **

<sup>1</sup> Results in the below three columns are from the Detroit Area Study, 1995. The columns include 180 men and 393 women.<sup>2</sup> Results in the below three columns are from the National Study of American Life, 2001-3. The columns include 1120 men and 2073 women.<sup>3</sup> A multiplicative index of all nine items concerning 'everyday discrimination.'<sup>4</sup> A multiplicative index of the five items below that comprise the 'implicit dimension' of the 'everyday discrimination' index.<sup>5</sup> A multiplicative index of the four items below that comprise the 'explicit dimension' of the 'everyday discrimination' index.<sup>6</sup> The preamble for these questions was: "In your day-to-day life how often have any of the following things happened to you? First, ..."Statistical tests for t-scores are two-tailed,  $diff > 0$ . Statistical significance:  $p < .10 = a$ ,  $p < .05 = *$ ,  $p < .01 = **$  and  $p < .001 = ***$ .

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Items Measuring Major Life Discrimination (Attributed to Race), by Gender.

	Detroit 1995 <sup>1,3</sup>			National 2001-3 <sup>2</sup>		
	Male	Female	t	Male	Female	t
No Specific Attribution (General) <sup>4</sup>	.325 (.243)	.212 (.222)	5.48 ***	.196 (.203)	.121 (.161)	11.49 ***
Do you think you have ever been unfairly fired or denied a promotion?	.483 (.501)	.318 (.466)	3.85 ***	-	-	-
For unfair reasons, do you think you have ever not been hired for a job?	.361 (.482)	.282 (.451)	1.90 *	.263 (.441)	.180 (.385)	5.52 ***
Do you think you have ever been unfairly stopped, searched, questioned, physically threatened or abused by the police?	.606 (.490)	.198 (.399)	10.52 ***	.442 (.497)	.118 (.322)	22.28 ***
Do you think you have ever been unfairly discouraged by a teacher or advisor from continuing your education?	.211 (.409)	.142 (.350)	2.06 *	.103 (.304)	.092 (.289)	1.01
Do you think you have ever been unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood because the landlord or a realtor refused to sell or rent you a house or apartment?	.133 (.341)	.160 (.367)	-.83	.079 (.271)	.075 (.264)	.43
Have you ever moved into a neighborhood where neighbors made life difficult for you or your family?	.156 (.363)	.170 (.377)	-.45	.066 (.249)	.077 (.267)	-1.15
At any time in your life, have you ever been unfairly fired?	-	-	-	.280 (.449)	.194 (.395)	5.61 ***
Have you ever been unfairly denied a promotion?	-	-	-	.247 (.432)	.152 (.360)	6.62 ***
Have you ever been unfairly denied a bank loan?	-	-	-	.122 (.328)	.094 (.291)	2.54 *
Have you ever received service from someone such as a plumber or car mechanic that was worse than what other people get?	-	-	-	.161 (.367)	.105 (.306)	4.593 ***
Attributed to Race or Ethnicity <sup>5</sup>	.181 (.210)	.097 (.154)	5.01 ***	.121 (.170)	.056 (.114)	12.83 ***
Do you think you have ever been unfairly fired or denied a promotion?	.257 (.438)	.141 (.349)	3.14 **	-	-	-
For unfair reasons, do you think you have ever not been hired for a job?	.191 (.394)	.161 (.368)	.80	.163 (.370)	.096 (.295)	5.58 ***
Do you think you have ever been unfairly stopped, searched, questioned, physically threatened or abused by the police?	.408 (.493)	.095 (.294)	8.79 ***	.342 (.475)	.078 (.268)	20.06 ***
Do you think you have ever been unfairly discouraged by a teacher or advisor from continuing your education?	.086 (.281)	.061 (.239)	1.02	.057 (.232)	.044 (.206)	1.60
Do you think you have ever been unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood because the landlord or a realtor refused to sell or rent you a house or apartment?	.086 (.281)	.084 (.277)	.07	.067 (.250)	.055 (.228)	1.37
Have you ever moved into a neighborhood where neighbors made life difficult for you or your family?	.059 (.237)	.037 (.190)	1.09	.039 (.194)	.028 (.166)	1.65 *
At any time in your life, have you ever been unfairly fired?	-	-	-	.129 (.336)	.074 (.262)	5.13 ***
Have you ever been unfairly denied a promotion?	-	-	-	.163 (.369)	.072 (.259)	8.04 ***
Have you ever been unfairly denied a bank loan?	-	-	-	.072 (.259)	.050 (.218)	2.56 *
Have you ever received service from someone such as a plumber or car mechanic that was worse than what other people get?	-	-	-	.062 (.241)	.021 (.144)	5.92 ***

<sup>1</sup> Results in the below three columns are from the Detroit Area Study, 1995.<sup>2</sup> Results in the below three columns are from the National Study of American Life, 2001-3. The columns include 1120 men and 2073 women.<sup>3</sup> There are 180 men and 393 women in the rows for 'no specific attribution (general)' and 152 men and 347 women in the rows for 'attributed to race or ethnicity.'<sup>4</sup> A multiplicative index of items concerning 'major life discrimination.' Dashes note that this question was not asked in the given survey.<sup>5</sup> A multiplicative index of items concerning 'major life discrimination, attributed to race.' Dashes note that this question was not asked in the given survey.<sup>6</sup> The preamble for these questions was: "In the following questions, we are interested in the way other people have treated you or your beliefs about how other people have treated you. Can you tell me if any of the following has ever happened to you..."

Statistical tests for t-scores are two-tailed, diff &gt; 0. Statistical significance: p &lt; .10 = a, p &lt; .05 = \*, p &lt; .01 = \*\* and p &lt; .001 = \*\*\*

Table 3a.

Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Everyday Discrimination, Detroit 1995<sup>1</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>IMPLICIT<sup>2</sup></b>									
People act as if they are better than you are?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Treated with less courtesy than other people?	.858 *** (.103)	.854 *** (.108)	.850 *** (.101)	.860 *** (.102)	.874 *** (.107)	.859 *** (.103)	.860 *** (.103)	.861 *** (.103)	.876 *** (.105)
	-	.937 *** (.107)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Treated with less respect than other people?	1.20 *** (.140)	1.21 *** (.139)	1.14 *** (.141)	1.21 *** (.140)	1.24 *** (.148)	1.20 *** (.139)	1.20 *** (.139)	1.21 *** (.140)	1.24 *** (.145)
	-	-	1.04 *** (.123)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poorer service ... at restaurants or stores?	1.05 *** (.115)	1.05 *** (.116)	1.04 *** (.114)	1.15 *** (.136)	1.07 *** (.120)	1.05 *** (.115)	1.05 *** (.115)	1.05 *** (.115)	1.17 *** (.139)
	-	-	-	.912 *** (.109)	-	-	-	-	.932 *** (.111)
People act as if they think you are not smart?	1.37 *** (.175)	1.37 *** (.176)	1.37 *** (.176)	1.36 *** (.170)	1.17 *** (.151)	1.37 *** (.174)	1.36 *** (.174)	1.36 *** (.173)	1.19 *** (.153)
	-	-	-	-	1.19 *** (.141)	-	-	-	1.17 *** (.137)
<b>EXPLICIT<sup>2</sup></b>									
People act as if they think you are dishonest?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
People act as if they are afraid of you?	.639 *** (.090)	.639 *** (.090)	.640 *** (.090)	.639 *** (.090)	.633 *** (.090)	.688 *** (.103)	.640 *** (.090)	.638 *** (.090)	.671 *** (.106)
	-	-	-	-	-	.576 (.090)	-	-	.624 *** (.091)
You are called names or insulted?	.562 *** (.099)	.562 *** (.099)	.563 *** (.099)	.562 *** (.099)	.556 *** (.099)	.568 *** (.097)	.509 *** (.101)	.562 *** (.099)	.509 *** (.110)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	.512 *** (.079)	-	.547 *** (.084)
You are threatened or harassed?	.435 *** (.070)	.435 *** (.070)	.436 *** (.070)	.434 *** (.070)	.429 *** (.069)	.439 *** (.068)	.435 *** (.070)	.389 *** (.075)	.386 *** (.080)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.421 *** (.063)	.436 *** (.063)
<b>IMPLICIT</b>									
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>3</sup>	-.204	-.201	-.177	-.194	-.173	-.203	-.203	-.203	-.157
Standard Deviation	(.113)	(.111)	(.115)	(.115)	(.113)	(.113)	(.113)	(.113)	(.115)
t-score	-1.80 *	-1.81 *	-1.55	-1.69 *	-1.54	-1.80 *	-1.80 *	-1.80 *	-1.37
<b>EXPLICIT</b>									
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>4</sup>	-.862	-.862	-.860	-.863	-.869	-.818	-.838	-.721	-.644
Standard Deviation	(.239)	(.239)	(.239)	(.240)	(.242)	(.238)	(.223)	(.217)	(.213)
t-score	-3.60 ***	-3.60 ***	-3.60 ***	-3.60 ***	-3.59 ***	-3.44 ***	-3.76 ***	-3.32 ***	-3.02 **
Chi-Square	127.34	127.53	128.45	122.43	133.99	127.75	130.81	132.81	139.52
df	76	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	71
RMSEA	.049	.049	.050	.047	.052	.050	.051	.052	.058
CFI	.992	.992	.992	.993	.991	.992	.992	.991	.990

<sup>1</sup> Results in this table are from the Detroit Area Study, 1995. The table includes 180 men and 393 women.<sup>2</sup> For all comparisons, the top row presents the factor loading for men and the bottom row presents the factor loading for women.<sup>3</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'everyday implicit discrimination.'<sup>4</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'everyday explicit discrimination.'

This table reflects the following order on the releasing constraints between men and women: (1) factor means, factor variances, correlations between observed errors and errors for observed terms are allowed to vary, (2) unconstrain the factor loading for "treated with less courtesy", (3) unconstrain factor loading for "treated with less respect", (4) unconstrain factor loading for "poor service", (5) unconstrain factor loading for "think you are not smart", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "afraid of you", (7) unconstrain factor loading for "called names or insulted", (8) unconstrain factor loading for "threatened or harassed", (9) unconstrain factor loadings for "poor service," "not smart," "afraid of you," "called names or insulted," and "threatened or harassed."

Statistical tests are two-tailed, diff &gt; 0. Statistical significance: p &lt; .10 = a, p &lt; .05 = \*, p &lt; .01 = \*\* and p &lt; .001 = \*\*\*.

Table 3b.

Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Everyday Discrimination, National 2001-3<sup>1</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>IMPLICIT<sup>2</sup></b>										
People act as if they are better than you are?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Treated with less courtesy than other people?	.703 *** (.036)	.750 *** (.042)	.705 *** (.036)	.703 *** (.036)	.704 *** (.037)	.703 *** (.036)	.704 *** (.036)	.704 *** (.036)	.703 *** (.036)	.705 *** (.036)
	-	.702 *** (.036)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Treated with less respect than other people?	.797 *** (.039)	.801 *** (.039)	.822 *** (.044)	.797 *** (.039)	.799 *** (.040)	.797 *** (.039)	.798 *** (.039)	.797 *** (.039)	.797 *** (.039)	.799 *** (.039)
	-	-	.827 *** (.041)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poorer service ... at restaurants or stores?	.841 *** (.043)	.846 *** (.043)	.844 *** (.043)	.841 *** (.046)	.843 *** (.043)	.841 *** (.043)	.842 *** (.043)	.841 *** (.043)	.841 *** (.043)	.843 *** (.043)
	-	-	-	.841 *** (.044)	-	-	-	-	-	-
People act as if they think you are not smart?	1.11 *** (.058)	1.10 *** (.057)	1.10 *** (.057)	1.11 *** (.058)	1.09 *** (.060)	1.11 *** (.058)				
	-	-	-	-	1.16 *** (.060)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPLICIT<sup>2</sup></b>										
People act as if they think you are dishonest?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
People act as if they are afraid of you?	.729 *** (.038)	.728 *** (.038)	.729 *** (.038)	.729 *** (.038)	.729 *** (.038)	.923 *** (.052)	.726 *** (.039)	.724 *** (.039)	.730 *** (.038)	.839 *** (.050)
	-	-	-	-	-	.691 *** (.035)	-	-	-	.736 *** (.039)
You are called names or insulted?	.550 *** (.032)	.549 *** (.032)	.550 *** (.032)	.550 *** (.032)	.550 *** (.032)	.562 *** (.031)	.475 *** (.032)	.547 *** (.033)	.549 *** (.032)	.474 *** (.032)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	.654 *** (.036)	-	-	.681 *** (.039)
You are threatened or harassed?	.542 *** (.032)	.541 *** (.032)	.542 *** (.032)	.542 *** (.032)	.542 *** (.032)	.554 *** (.031)	.539 *** (.032)	.481 *** (.032)	.541 *** (.032)	.477 *** (.033)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	.626 *** (.035)	-	-	.657 *** (.038)
You are followed?	.617 *** (.033)	.617 *** (.033)	.617 *** (.033)	.618 *** (.033)	.617 *** (.033)	.634 *** (.032)	.616 *** (.033)	.615 *** (.033)	.607 *** (.035)	.624 *** (.033)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.549 (.030)	-
<b>IMPLICIT</b>										
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>3</sup>	-.164	-.165	-.168	-.158	-.176	-.164	-.164	-.163	-.164	-.163
Standard Deviation	(.057)	(.057)	(.057)	(.058)	(.057)	(.057)	(.057)	(.057)	(.057)	(.057)
t-Score	-2.85 **	-2.90 **	-2.94 **	-2.74 **	-3.08 **	-2.85 **	-2.85 **	-2.85 **	-2.85 **	-2.85 **
<b>EXPLICIT</b>										
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>4</sup>	-.599	-.599	-.599	-.599	-.599	-.570	-.617	-.599	-.612	-.609
Standard Deviation	(.085)	(.085)	(.085)	(.085)	(.085)	(.085)	(.083)	(.080)	(.081)	(.084)
t-Score	-7.08 ***	-7.08 ***	-7.08 ***	-7.08 ***	-7.08 ***	-6.87 ***	-7.76 ***	-7.37 ***	-7.31 ***	-7.91 ***
Chi-Square	603.10	607.87	614.13	612.51	610.12	544.07	529.48	568.92	617.54	445.90
df	106	105	105	105	105	105	105	105	105	103
RMSEA	.054	.055	.055	.055	.055	.051	.050	.053	.055	.046
CFI	.989	.989	.989	.989	.989	.990	.991	.990	.989	.992

<sup>1</sup> Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3. The table includes 1120 men and 2073 women.<sup>2</sup> For all comparisons, the top row presents the factor loading for men and the bottom row presents the factor loading for women.<sup>3</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'everyday implicit discrimination.'<sup>4</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'everyday explicit discrimination.'

This table reflects the following order on the releasing constraints between men and women: (1) factor means, factor variances, correlations between observed errors and errors for observed terms are allowed to vary, (2) unconstrain the factor loading for "treated with less courtesy", (3) unconstrain factor loading for "treated with less respect", (4) unconstrain factor loading for "poor service", (5) unconstrain factor loading for "think you are not smart", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "afraid of you", (7) unconstrain factor loading for "called names or insulted", (8) unconstrain factor loading for "threatened or harassed", (9) unconstrain factor loadings for "are you followed," (10) unconstrain factor loadings for "afraid of you," "called names or insulted," and "threatened or harassed."

Statistical tests are two-tailed, diff &gt; 0. Statistical significance: p &lt; .10 = a, p &lt;.05 = \*, p &lt;.01 = \*\* and p &lt;.001 = \*\*\*.

Table 4a.

Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Major Life Discrimination, Detroit 1995<sup>1</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Neighbors made life difficult for you and your family?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unfairly fired or denied a promotion? <sup>2</sup>	2.11 *	2.15 *	2.01 *	1.98 *	2.29 *	2.16 *	1.80 *
	(.910)	(.953)	(.875)	(.818)	(1.03)	(.961)	(.774)
	-	.865 *	-	-	-	-	3.05
	-	(.397)	-	-	-	-	(3.20)
Not been hired for unfair reasons?	3.95 *	4.00 *	3.21 *	3.50 *	4.22 *	3.77 *	2.81 *
	(1.98)	(2.04)	(1.45)	(1.59)	(2.14)	(1.84)	(1.23)
	-	-	1.16 *	-	-	-	3.81
	-	-	(.525)	-	-	-	(4.00)
Unfairly stopped by the police?	1.56 *	1.55 *	1.46 *	1.33 *	1.67 *	1.56 *	1.18 *
	(.672)	(.683)	(.634)	(.550)	(.745)	(.690)	(.504)
	-	-	-	1.68 **	-	-	3.00
	-	-	-	(.651)	-	-	(3.08)
Unfairly discouraged from continuing education?	.984 *	1.02 *	1.00 *	1.04 **	1.21 <sup>a</sup>	.979 *	.963 **
	(.433)	(.472)	(.455)	(.401)	(.625)	(.432)	(.321)
	-	-	-	-	.586 *	-	-
	-	-	-	-	(.281)	-	-
Unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood?	2.32 *	2.39 *	2.36 *	2.35 **	2.41 *	2.35 *	1.96 *
	(.969)	(1.05)	(1.04)	(.902)	(1.02)	(1.09)	(.927)
	-	-	-	-	-	.790 *	-
	-	-	-	-	-	(.326)	-
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>3</sup>	-.818	-1.09	-1.00	-.273	-.892	-.830	.277
Standard Deviation	(.334)	(.480)	(.422)	(.148)	(.385)	(.341)	(.747)
t-Score	-2.45 *	-2.27 *	-2.37 *	-1.85 <sup>a</sup>	-2.32 *	-2.43 *	.37
Chi-Square	32.76	28.45	24.82	13.65	32.89	32.88	12.00
df	22	21	21	21	21	21	19
RMSEA	.041	.035	.025	.000	.044	.044	.000
CFI	.957	.970	.985	1.000	.953	.953	1.000

<sup>1</sup> Results in this table are from the Detroit Area Study, 1995. The table includes 180 men and 383 women.<sup>2</sup> For all comparisons, the top row presents the factor loading for men and the bottom row presents the factor loading for women.<sup>3</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'major life discrimination' (not attributed to any particular personal attribute).

This table reflects the following order on the releasing constraints between men and women: (1) factor means, factor variances, correlations between observed errors and errors for observed terms are allowed to vary, (2) unconstrain the factor loading for "denied promotion", (3) unconstrain factor loading for "not hired", (4) unconstrain factor loading for "the police", (5) unconstrain factor loading for "continuing education", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "moving into neighborhood", (7) unconstrain factor loadings for "denied promotion," "not hired," and "the police."

Statistical tests are two-tailed, diff > 0. Statistical significance: p < .10 = a, p <.05 = \*, p <.01 = \*\* and p <.001 = \*\*\*.

Table 4b. Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Major Life Discrimination, National 2001-3<sup>1</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Neighbors made life difficult for you and your family?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Have you ever been unfairly fired? <sup>2</sup>	.101 *** (.172)	.984 *** (.170)	1.00 *** (.174)	1.00 *** (.172)	.923 *** (.149)	1.00 *** (.173)	1.01 *** (.172)	1.01 *** (.174)	1.02 *** (.174)	.952 *** (.159)
	-	.374 *** (.084)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ever not been hired for a job?	1.64 *** (.274)	1.64 *** (.275)	1.54 *** (.259)	1.60 *** (.267)	1.54 *** (.249)	1.60 *** (.268)	1.65 *** (.276)	1.65 *** (.277)	1.64 *** (.275)	1.51 *** (.244)
	-	-	.472 *** (.120)	-	-	-	-	-	-	.882 *** (.198)
Unfairly fired or denied a promotion?	1.61 *** (.265)	1.62 *** (.267)	1.55 *** (.257)	1.56 *** (.255)	1.44 *** (.222)	1.57 *** (.259)	1.61 *** (.265)	1.63 *** (.268)	1.62 *** (.266)	1.50 *** (.241)
	-	-	-	.469 *** (.109)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unfairly stopped by the police?	1.10 *** (.189)	1.10 *** (.190)	1.09 *** (.191)	1.09 *** (.189)	1.07 *** (.178)	1.09 *** (.189)	1.09 *** (.188)	1.11 *** (.192)	1.10 *** (.190)	1.08 *** (.182)
	-	-	-	-	.819 *** (.158)	-	-	-	-	.713 *** (.165)
Unfairly discouraged from continuing education?	1.09 *** (.180)	1.09 *** (.181)	1.09 *** (.185)	1.09 *** (.181)	1.05 *** (.159)	1.11 *** (.193)	1.09 *** (.179)	1.09 *** (.181)	1.10 *** (.182)	1.06 *** (.165)
	-	-	-	-	-	.376 *** (.091)	-	-	-	-
Unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood?	1.36 *** (.234)	1.36 *** (.236)	1.33 *** (.235)	1.33 *** (.231)	1.35 *** (.215)	1.32 *** (.229)	1.33 *** (.239)	1.36 *** (.235)	1.36 *** (.235)	1.35 *** (.222)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	.559 *** (.127)	-	-	-
Unfairly denied a bank loan?	.964 *** (.169)	.962 *** (.169)	.950 *** (.171)	.954 *** (.168)	.934 *** (.149)	.950 *** (.168)	.963 *** (.169)	1.00 *** (.184)	.967 *** (.169)	.941 *** (.154)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.381 *** (.089)	-	-
Worse repair service than other people get?	1.17 *** (.198)	1.18 *** (.200)	1.17 *** (.203)	1.17 *** (.199)	1.10 *** (.169)	1.17 *** (.199)	1.17 *** (.197)	1.18 *** (.200)	1.18 *** (.205)	1.12 *** (.180)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.475 *** (.099)	-
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>3</sup>	-2.23	-2.34	-3.09	-2.38	-7.19	-2.39	-2.15	-2.36	-2.21	-1.04
Standard Deviation	(.562)	(.601)	(.928)	(.604)	(.246)	(.642)	(.557)	(.619)	(.553)	(.417)
t-Score	-3.97 ***	-3.90 ***	-3.33 ***	-3.95 ***	-2.92 **	-3.72 ***	-3.85 ***	-3.82 ***	-4.00 ***	-2.50 *
Chi Square	146.59	145.92	118.43	146.36	99.02	147.98	147.77	148.24	148.07	95.80
df	61	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	59
RMSEA	.030	.030	.025	.030	.020	.030	.030	.030	.030	.020
CFI	.970	.970	.980	.970	.986	.970	.970	.969	.970	.987

<sup>1</sup> Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3. The table includes 1120 men and 2073 women.<sup>2</sup> For all comparisons, the top row presents the factor loading for men and the bottom row presents the factor loading for women.<sup>3</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'major life discrimination' (not attributed to any particular personal attribute).

This table reflects the following order on the releasing constraints between men and women: (1) factor means, factor variances, correlations between observed errors and errors for observed terms are allowed to vary, (2) unconstrain the factor loading for "unfairly fired", (3) unconstrain factor loading for "not hired", (4) unconstrain factor loading for "denied a promotion", (5) unconstrain factor loading for "the police", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "continuing education", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "moving into neighborhood", (7) unconstrain factor loading for "denied loan" (8) unconstrain factor loading for "worse repairs", (9) unconstrain factor loadings for "not hired" and "the police".

Statistical tests are two-tailed, diff &gt; 0. Statistical significance: p &lt; .10 = a, p &lt; .05 = \*, p &lt; .01 = \*\* and p &lt; .001 = \*\*\*.

**Table 5a.** Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Major Life Discrimination, Attributed to Race, Detroit 1995<sup>1</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Neighbors made life difficult for you and your family?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unfairly fired or denied a promotion? <sup>2</sup>	1.85 *	1.63 *	1.79 *	1.63 *	1.85 *	1.77 *	1.63 *
	(.898)	(.795)	(.870)	(.716)	(.923)	(.850)	(.719)
	-	.705	-	-	-	-	1.97
	-	(.606)	-	-	-	-	(1.32)
Not been hired for unfair reasons?	2.20 *	2.02 *	2.11 *	2.03 *	2.21 *	2.36 *	2.02 *
	(1.06)	(.984)	(1.01)	(.884)	(1.09)	(2.00)	(.905)
	-	-	.577	-	-	-	-
	-	-	(.412)	-	-	-	-
Unfairly stopped by the police?	2.24 *	2.45 *	2.23 *	2.32 *	2.25 *	2.09 *	2.32 *
	(1.17)	(1.38)	(1.18)	(1.20)	(1.21)	(1.06)	(1.20)
	-	-	-	1.13 *	-	-	1.14 *
	-	-	-	(.626)	-	-	(.682)
Unfairly discouraged from continuing education?	1.15 *	1.14	1.15 *	1.18 *	1.16	1.11 *	1.18 *
	(.674)	(.707)	(.683)	(.571)	(.756)	(.648)	(.569)
	-	-	-	-	.550	-	-
	-	-	-	-	(.411)	-	-
Unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood?	1.39 *	1.38 *	1.38 *	1.42 *	1.39 *	1.32 *	1.41 *
	(.672)	(.697)	(.672)	(.597)	(.683)	(.656)	(.599)
	-	-	-	-	-	.571	-
	-	-	-	-	-	(.382)	-
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>3</sup>	-1.97	-2.78	-2.18	-.275	-1.99	-1.87	-.253
Standard Deviation	(1.52)	(2.50)	(1.80)	(.483)	(1.70)	(1.47)	(.638)
t-Score	-1.29	-1.11	-1.21	-.57	-1.17	-1.27	-.40
Chi-Square	25.38	22.09	24.34	17.31	25.78	25.36	17.32
df	22	21	21	21	21	21	20
RMSEA	.025	.014	.025	.000	.030	.029	.000
CFI	.979	.993	.979	1.000	.970	.973	1.000

<sup>1</sup> Results in this table are from the Detroit Area Study, 1995. The table includes 152 men and 347 women.

<sup>2</sup> For all comparisons, the top row presents the factor loading for men and the bottom row presents the factor loading for women.

<sup>3</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'major life discrimination' (not attributed to any particular personal attribute).

This table reflects the following order on the releasing constraints between men and women: (1) factor means, factor variances, correlations between observed errors and errors for observed terms are allowed to vary, (2) unconstrain the factor loading for "denied promotion", (3) unconstrain factor loading for "not hired", (4) unconstrain factor loading for "the police", (5) unconstrain factor loading for "continuing education", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "moving into neighborhood", (7) unconstrain factor loadings for "not hired," and "the police."

Statistical tests are two-tailed, diff > 0. Statistical significance: p < .10 = a, p <.05 = \*, p <.01 = \*\* and p <.001 = \*\*\*.

Table 5b. Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Major Life Discrimination, Attributed to Race, National 2001-3<sup>1</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Neighbors made life difficult for you and your family?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Have you ever been unfairly fired? <sup>2</sup>	.797 *** (.139)	.847 *** (.155)	.811 *** (.148)	.795 *** (.138)	.739 *** (.118)	.798 *** (.140)	.786 *** (.137)	.792 *** (.138)	.808 *** (.142)	.775 *** (.136)
	-	.466 *** (.132)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ever not been hired for a job?	1.37 *** (.276)	1.38 *** (.277)	1.19 *** (.238)	1.38 *** (.278)	1.17 *** (.223)	1.37 *** (.277)	1.36 *** (.277)	1.37 *** (.277)	1.38 *** (.276)	1.12 *** (.224)
	-	-	.835 *** (.277)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.63 ** (.568)
Unfairly fired or denied a promotion?	1.31 *** (.233)	1.33 *** (.236)	1.36 *** (.251)	1.33 *** (.239)	1.05 *** (.170)	1.32 *** (.236)	1.28 *** (.227)	1.29 *** (.230)	1.34 *** (.240)	1.25 *** (.235)
	-	-	-	.807 *** (.214)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unfairly stopped by the police?	.729 *** (.141)	.744 *** (.145)	.786 *** (.157)	.721 *** (.140)	.748 *** (.142)	.739 *** (.144)	.689 *** (.133)	.703 *** (.137)	.768 *** (.150)	.749 *** (.149)
	-	-	-	-	1.407 *** (.334)	-	-	-	-	.992 ** (.352)
Unfairly discouraged from continuing education?	1.28 *** (.234)	1.28 *** (.235)	1.30 *** (.252)	1.27 *** (.232)	1.22 *** (.204)	1.33 *** (.260)	1.27 *** (.234)	1.27 *** (.234)	1.28 *** (.235)	1.26 *** (.235)
	-	-	-	-	-	.605 *** (.159)	-	-	-	-
Unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood?	1.29 *** (.233)	1.28 *** (.232)	1.25 *** (.236)	1.29 *** (.233)	1.30 *** (.218)	1.27 *** (.230)	1.09 *** (.201)	1.30 *** (.237)	1.27 *** (.229)	1.05 *** (.198)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.10 *** (.273)	-	-	1.28 ** (.433)
Unfairly denied a bank loan?	1.20 *** (.236)	1.20 *** (.236)	1.18 *** (.245)	1.20 *** (.236)	1.18 *** (.205)	1.20 *** (.237)	1.20 *** (.237)	1.09 *** (.225)	1.20 *** (.237)	1.03 *** (.220)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.954 *** (.231)	-	1.16 ** (.394)
Worse repair service than other people get?	1.20 *** (.224)	1.21 *** (.226)	1.24 *** (.241)	1.19 *** (.220)	1.10 *** (.190)	1.19 *** (.222)	1.18 *** (.220)	1.19 *** (.222)	1.39 *** (.279)	1.26 (.258)
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.485 *** (.151)	.801 (.304)
Factor Mean Disparity <sup>3</sup>	-1.22	-1.39	-2.63	-1.15	.275	-1.35	-.91	-.98	-1.72	-.56
Standard Deviation	(.510)	(.582)	(1.18)	(.482)	(.271)	(.557)	(.436)	(.448)	(.698)	(.686)
t-Score	-2.40 *	-2.39 *	-2.23 *	-2.38 *	1.02	-2.42 *	-2.08 *	-2.19 *	-2.46 *	-.82
Chi Square	157.80	159.12	126.96	159.20	121.98	159.89	146.44	154.69	147.98	95.44
df	61	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	56
RMSEA	.032	.032	.026	.032	.025	.032	.030	.031	.030	.021
CFI	.959	.958	.972	.958	.974	.958	.964	.960	.963	.983

<sup>1</sup> Results in this table are from the National Survey of American Life, 2001-3. The table includes 1120 men and 2073 women.<sup>2</sup> For all comparisons, the top row presents the factor loading for men and the bottom row presents the factor loading for women.<sup>3</sup> This is the disparity for the latent factor mean, between men and women, for 'major life discrimination' (not attributed to any particular personal attribute).

This table reflects the following order on the releasing constraints between men and women: (1) factor means, factor variances, correlations between observed errors and errors for observed terms are allowed to vary, (2) unconstrain the factor loading for "unfairly fired", (3) unconstrain factor loading for "not hired", (4) unconstrain factor loading for "denied a promotion", (5) unconstrain factor loading for "the police", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "continuing education", (6) unconstrain factor loading for "moving into neighborhood", (7) unconstrain factor loading for "denied loan" (8) unconstrain factor loading for "worse repairs", (9) unconstrain factor loadings for "not hired" and "the police".

Statistical tests are two-tailed, diff &gt; 0. Statistical significance: p &lt; .10 = a, p &lt; .05 = \*, p &lt; .01 = \*\* and p &lt; .001 = \*\*\*.