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Introduction

My first introduction to sociology was through William Julius Wilson's work on urban poverty among native blacks in Chicago and Mary Waters's work on West Indian immigrants in New York. I quickly realized that these scholars were talking about two very different ethnoracial groups, even though I found it difficult to distinguish between them with my then relatively untrained eyes. Later, I also learned that these groups often lived in very similar, if not adjacent, neighborhoods and were often portrayed by the media as simply "black." Yet for the most part, urban poverty scholars were happy to delegate the study of West Indians and other immigrant groups to the sociologists of immigration, despite the increasingly foreign sounds, sights, and smells permeating many inner-city neighborhoods. Immigration scholars, meanwhile, were too preoccupied by the focus on coethic community to pay adequate attention to how neighborhood context, independent of the coethic setting, shapes the ways in which ethnic groups function and conduct their daily lives.¹

And yet, everywhere I looked in New York City, I saw how these immigrants and their children were reshaping and remaking neighborhoods, often with vivid imagination and tenacity (Kasinitz 1992; Waldinger 1996; Smith 2006; Iceland 2009). Though neighborhoods were often mentioned in the major studies of the post–1965 second generation, with the theory of spatial assimilation being a key component of both classical and contemporary accounts of immigrant incorporation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993; Kasinitz et al. 2008), neighborhood as an object of study is often secondary in this research to the more immediate concerns of identity choices, socioeconomic mobility, and educational achievement (but see Brown 2007). At the same time, urban scholars have focused on the problems of the inner city, most notably the disadvantages facing native blacks, which significantly worsened in the 1970s and 1980s, coinciding with the rise of immigration in these same cities and neighborhoods.

Over the last decades, a large literature on urban poverty has explored the challenging experiences of growing up black and poor in inner-city neighborhoods (Anderson 1999, 2008; Edin and Kefalas 2005; Patterson 2006; Sampson 2012; Venkatesh 2000, 2006; Wilson 1987, 2009). And yet, there has been a dearth of research examining the neighborhood experiences of second-generation West Indians who grew up in similar neighborhoods and often live in close proximity to native blacks. This chapter seeks to bring both "neighborhood" and "culture" back into the immigration research agenda by exploring how different ethnic groups navigate disadvantaged, inner-city contexts. More specifically, I will compare and contrast the experience of second-generation West Indians to that of native blacks. Drawing on geocoded survey and qualitative data from the Immigrant Second Generation in Metropolitan New York study, I will examine how neighborhood context and ethnic-specific cultural strategies interact in shaping divergent socioeconomic outcomes for both groups.

By examining two different ethnic groups in a similar structural context, this chapter contributes to the ongoing debate on the relative importance of ethnic culture and social structure in shaping one's life chances (Lee and Zhou 2014; Patterson 2000, 2004; Wilson 2009; Waters 1999; Kasinitz et al. 2008; Lamont and Small 2008; Tran 2011). On the one hand, the reality of enduring racial segregation and discrimination means that both groups continue to live in highly segregated neighborhoods, with similar structural constraints and physical environments. On the other hand, many studies documented a clear advantage for West Indians over native blacks in the labor market, even after adjusting for relevant background factors, with immigrant selectivity among West Indians playing a central role in this debate (Model 2008; Waters 1999). As the sociologist Suzanne Model (2008) has pointed out, attempts to compare foreign-born (i.e., first-generation) West Indians and native blacks cannot fully rule out the immigrant selectivity factor.
By comparing native West Indians (i.e., second-generation) to native blacks, this analysis explicitly deals with the selectivity issue in several ways. First, because second-generation West Indians were born and raised in the American context, they did not make the decision to migrate to the U.S. and are not selective in the same ways that their first-generation parents might be. Second, many speak English without an accent and are virtually indistinguishable from African Americans, suggesting that native whites' preference for West Indians over native blacks (i.e., white favoritism) is unlikely to be an explanation for their relative advantage. Third, because second-generation West Indians were raised in mostly immigrant households, their experiences are often shaped by the cultural understandings and expectations from their immigrant parents. As a result, this provides a unique opportunity to observe how ethnic-specific cultural elements might contribute to their relative advantage in socioeconomic outcomes. Taking both immigrant selectivity and cultural differences seriously, I then ask how selectivity in the West Indian first generation shapes the social mobility of the second generation. More importantly, I explore the specific cultural mechanisms that contribute to differences in socioeconomic attainment between second-generation West Indians and native blacks.

My results generally confirm the advantage in both educational and labor market outcomes among second-generation West Indians over native blacks, though I found no difference between the two groups on arrest and incarceration rates. On the one hand, I find that both native blacks and West Indians grew up in neighborhoods that are segregated from native whites, though West Indians lived in areas that are relatively more advantaged compared to native blacks. These findings confirm the importance of race as the "master status" in shaping residential patterns (Foner 2001), suggesting that West Indians have not fully achieved spatial assimilation across immigrant generations by moving into areas in closer proximity with native whites. On the other hand, I also document the different ways in which second-generation West Indians and native blacks navigate their neighborhood environments, with the former reporting stricter parenting, lower levels of unsupervised playtime in the streets, different reactions to drug use and dealing, and fewer neighborhood-based social ties. As a result, West Indians are less connected to their local peer network compared to native blacks. In turn, this has the unintended consequence of sheltering them from neighborhood gangs, drugs, and crime as well as facilitating their social mobility.

West Indians and African Americans in New York City

This chapter draws on data from the Immigrant Second Generation in Metropolitan New York (ISGMNY) study which was conducted by Philip Kasinitz, John Mollenkopf, and Mary Waters (Mollenkopf et al. 1999). The ISGMNY study includes a multi-staged stratified random survey of 3,415 respondents living in New York City and the inner suburbs of New Jersey, Westchester, and Long Island. The study focuses on the experiences of young adults (aged eighteen to thirty-two) from both native and second-generation background. In this chapter, my analysis focuses on the comparison between second-generation West Indians and native blacks, with data from native whites also being used as a reference point.

The ISGMNY study is one of only three major studies in the U.S. that focus on the post-1965 second generation and the only major study that includes a substantial number of second-generation West Indians. In addition to information on family background and educational and occupational trajectories, ISGMNY gathered detailed information about the neighborhoods where the respondents grew up. For this chapter, I use questions about the neighborhoods where respondents were born, where they lived the longest between the ages of six and eighteen and where they resided at the time of the survey. Specifically, the survey asked for the name, location, cross streets, and other pertinent details of the respondents' birth, childhood, and current neighborhood at the time of the survey. This information made it possible to geocode respondents' addresses to identify the census tracts and block groups in which they lived. The qualitative data provides detailed information on the respondents' experiences growing up in the neighborhood and the decisions that shape their mobility process. Overall, the data set contains 408 native whites, 421 native blacks, and 407 West Indian respondents.

Comparing the experiences of native blacks and West Indians is important for four reasons. First, both groups are racially "black" (Waters 1999; Foner 2001; Reid 1939) and tend to live in very similar, and often adjacent, neighborhoods from each other (Crowder and Tedrow 2001). Second, this comparison takes into account the increase in intraracial heterogeneity among blacks as well as the emergence of the black middle class (Pattillo 2013; Lacy 2007). Third, by comparing two culturally distinct groups living in similar types of neighborhoods, this analysis reveals the relative importance of ethnic culture and social structure in shaping life
chances (Patterson 2000, 2004; Wilson 2009; Waters 1999; Kasinitz et al. 2008; Lee and Zhou 2014). Fourth, this comparison contributes directly to the ongoing debate on the underlying causes of the West Indian advantage over native blacks (Waters 1999; Model 2008).

New York City provides a unique context for this comparison. Whereas the West Indian population in other states such as Florida and Maryland is relatively small and more selective, New York City has long been the favored destination for West Indian immigrants in the United States (Kasinitz 1992; Patterson 1995; Foner 2001). Furthermore, the West Indian population is as large as the native black population, comprising a substantial portion of the city’s black working class (Kasinitz 1992). In their daily life, they are also as likely as blacks to experience discrimination and prejudice from native whites and others, because internal ethnic distinctions among blacks often elude many native whites (Vickerman 1999). The sociologist Mary Waters (1999, 3) referred to this as “the invisibility of the Caribbean immigrants as immigrants and their visibility as blacks.”

As many incidents that involved violence against black immigrants in New York City made clear, West Indians’ invisibility continues to persist, despite significant research over the last two decades on this ethnic group (Kasinitz 2001). As the anthropologist Nancy Foner (2001, 10) observed, “For West Indian New Yorkers of African descent, being black is the ‘master status’ that pervades and penetrates their lives.” From the Crown Heights riots and the Church Avenue boycott of greengrocers to the killing of Michael Griffith by a white mob and police brutality against Abner Louima, the fact that all of these cases involved black immigrants was rarely highlighted in the national media, except in the occasional local coverage where reporters are more sensitive to the ethnic differences among the black population (Foner 2001; Waters 1999; Kasinitz 1992). These incidents confirm what second-generation West Indians reported experiencing in their life, where they are just as likely as native blacks to report being discriminated against by the police, at work, at school, at local shops, and at other establishments (Waters and Kasinitz 2010).

Immigrant Selectivity and the West Indian Advantage

A long literature has documented the so-called West Indian advantage over native blacks in obtaining secure employment (Model 2008). Indeed, conservatives have used these differences as evidence that continuing marginalization of African Americans is partially due to their lack of the right “cultural” values (for example, see Sowell 1978). Though immigrant selectivity clearly plays a role in this debate, other aspects of West Indian culture and native whites’ preference for West Indians over native blacks might potentially matter (Model 2008, Waters 1999; Patterson 1995). For example, the sociologist Suzanne Model (2008, 57) has pointed out that “selectivity theorists believe that only a subset of Caribbean-raised individuals have these desirable traits: those who chose to migrate. Those who choose to stay home are not exceptional. Culturalists, on the other hand, believe that all Caribbean-raised individuals, both movers and stayers, have these desirable traits.” Adjudicating among these competing perspectives, Model concludes that positive selectivity is the key factor that underlies this advantage. Specifically, she finds that “immigrant adults are more positively selected on education, and immigrant workers are more positively selected on occupation than their non-migrant compatriots” in her analysis of a sample of movers and stayers from the West Indies to the United States (30).

This chapter builds on this debate by comparing the experience of second-generation West Indians with native blacks, essentially avoiding immigrant selectivity among the first generation as a likely explanation for differences in socioeconomic outcomes. That said, second-generation West Indians are still selective in the sense that they might have parents who have brought with them certain outlooks or motivations, which shape the way in which the second generation makes sense of the opportunities in the United States. And yet, what selectivity indicates is not that ethnic-specific cultural strategies do not matter, but that the cultural elements operating are those of the selected group of immigrants who migrated from their home country and who have established themselves in the U.S. setting, not those of their parents’ culture from their home country (Patterson 2000). Put differently, this chapter starts with the premise that any cultural influence on an ethnic group can only be understood interactively with the structural conditions and the physical environment in which ethnic groups live in the United States—a point that is also made in the agenda-setting chapter of this volume (Patterson and Fosse).

Instead of focusing exclusively on individual-level variables, the chapter also broadens the scope of this long-standing discussion on the West Indian advantage over native blacks by taking seriously the neighborhood context in which members of both groups grew up. This kind of geocoded
data on the second generation has not been available until recently, and this analysis is the first attempt to document this intraracial difference in residential environment between the two groups. This is because the U.S. census stopped asking the parental birthplace question after 1970, making it impossible to separate second-generation West Indians from those in the later generations using census data. Whereas the quantitative analyses establish the differences in socioeconomic outcomes and neighborhood environments for the two groups, the qualitative evidence provides details on the social dynamics occurring within these neighborhoods and the cultural strategies that members of both groups adopt to navigate their life in this context. In particular, this chapter highlights how cultural understandings shape the ways these groups “live” in their neighborhoods, which also carry implications for their socioeconomic outcomes.

The West Indian Second-Generation Attainment Gap

Whereas studies on the West Indian advantage mostly focused on labor market outcomes, this chapter extends this discussion by including educational outcomes as well as delinquency rates. Overall, data from the ISGMNY study confirm the second-generation advantage among West Indians across eight measures: high school dropout, unemployment rate, NEET\(^6\) rate, college graduate, professional attainment, arrest rate, incarceration rate, and teenage pregnancy. These eight measures are standard outcomes in urban poverty research, providing a comprehensive snapshot of socioeconomic attainment. Native blacks reported the most disadvantaged outcomes, while West Indians reported outcomes similar to those of native whites. For example, 11.4 percent of the native black sample did not have a high school education, compared to only 6.9 percent of West Indians and 4.2 percent of native whites. Native blacks were twice as likely to be unemployed compared to West Indians (11.8 percent) and native whites (9.1 percent). Similarly, their NEET rate (25.7 percent) was twice higher than West Indians’ (13 percent) and four times the rate of native whites (6.3 percent). On attainment measures, native blacks were less likely than West Indians and native whites to have completed a bachelor’s degree or to be in a professional occupation by the age of twenty-five. Among native black females, the teen pregnancy rate (24.7 percent) was also double West Indians’ (12.7 percent) and six times higher than native whites’ (3.5 percent). Among native black males, the arrest rate was 31.9 percent and the incarceration rate was 15.7 percent, higher than those for West Indians and native whites.

Moving beyond descriptive statistics, Figure 7.1 presents selected predicted probabilities for eight outcomes for all three ethnic groups based on multivariate logistic regression analyses that include controls for key demographics and family background. Controlling for observed background conditions, West Indians are much less likely than native blacks to drop out of high school, be unemployed, be idle, or have a child by the age of eighteen. They are also much more likely than native blacks to have graduated from college and to be in a professional occupation by the age of twenty-five. However, there are no significant differences between native blacks and West Indians (or native whites) in arrest and incarceration rates. These results indicate a clear West Indian advantage in educational and labor market outcomes, even after controlling for parental background characteristics (i.e., measurable characteristics in immigrant selectivity).

What factors might account for this persistent gap in socioeconomic attainment, even after adjusting for basic background conditions? In what follows, I argue that community-level structural conditions matter, but so do cultural understandings that are specific to these groups. I first attempt to show that West Indians tend to live in slightly better neighborhoods compared to native blacks, both in childhood and young adulthood. Though this neighborhood advantage partially accounts for the gaps in attainment, there are important differences in how both groups choose to “live” within their neighborhood. Specifically, I point to particular cultural strategies relevant to the navigation of the disadvantaged context: parenting strategies, involvement with the drug trade, and the engagement with the local peer network. I contend that these cultural factors interact with structural environment in shaping the divergence in mobility across groups.

How Structure Matters: Concentrated Poverty, Violence, and Racial Segregation

In this section, I begin by using the geocoded ISGMNY data to describe the neighborhood structural context for both groups from birth to young adulthood. I then turn to the qualitative data to describe their
subjective experiences of these structural conditions. Together, this provides a comprehensive overview of the lived experiences on the ground for both groups.

**Neighborhood Context from Birth to Young Adulthood**

To begin, Figure 7.2 provides bivariate results on neighborhood trajectories over time using share of non-Hispanic whites and mean household income at the census tract level for West Indians, native blacks, and native whites. Mean household income was adjusted using the Consumer Price Index and benchmarked in the year 2000. As expected, the average native white respondent was born in a predominantly white neighborhood and continued to live in such neighborhoods well into young adulthood. In contrast, native blacks and West Indians live in areas with much lower levels of non-Hispanic whites. In young adulthood, native blacks live in neighborhoods where non-Hispanic whites comprised only 9 percent of the tract population, whereas West Indians are almost equally segregated from non-Hispanic whites. On mean household income, there are important differences between native blacks and West Indians. Native blacks live in the neighborhoods with the lowest mean household income across the three time points, whereas West Indians live in areas of much better quality. Overall, these results demonstrate that second-generation West Indians have not become spatially assimilated into the white mainstream, with many still living in black neighborhoods, though they are more likely to be in neighborhoods characterized by less concentrated disadvantage.

To further explore intraracial differences in neighborhood structural context, Figure 7.3 presents results from multivariate analyses restricted to only native black and West Indian respondents. The top panel indicates that West Indians on average live in neighborhoods with mean income that is $8,180 higher than native blacks, a large, statistically significant gap that remains even after controlling for all observed, relevant background conditions. Similarly, the lower panel presents the coefficients for ethnic dummies for both the adjusted and unadjusted models for percent non-Hispanic white, concentrated disadvantage, and affluence. The first variable captures the extent of segregation from whites, while the latter two variables capture the extreme ends of the distribution of neighborhood structural conditions. On the one hand, there is no statistically significant difference between West Indians and native blacks in both models
regarding the proportion of non-Hispanic whites. On the other hand, West Indians live in neighborhoods that are much less disadvantaged and more affluent than those of native blacks, even after adjusting for all relevant observed background conditions.

These findings point to the distinction between racial and socioeconomic composition in the two groups' residential contexts, which is crucial to our understanding of their experiences. Though native blacks and
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**Figure 7.2.** Neighborhood trajectory from birth to young adulthood: percent non-Hispanic white and mean household income

**Figure 7.3.** Intraracial differences in neighborhood attainment in young adulthood

West Indians live in neighborhoods with similar proportions of native whites and are equally segregated from whites, West Indians also live in neighborhoods that have less concentrated disadvantage and have access to more resources than those of native blacks. In the following section, I turn to the qualitative evidence to explore respondents' subjective
experiences growing up in these neighborhoods. Specifically, this analysis draws on data from thirty native black and thirty West Indian respondents in the qualitative sample.

The African American Narrative: The Perils of the Street

The majority of native black respondents in the survey reported growing up in neighborhoods with high rates of crime (72.9 percent) and drugs (66.3 percent). Among those who participated in the qualitative component, twenty-two of the thirty native black respondents also provided detailed accounts of drugs and crimes in the neighborhoods where they grew up. In fact, many incidents occurred very close to home, with some interviewees reporting incidents “right in front of my door” or “in the staircase.” This is the case for both working-class blacks and the black poor, who grew up in neighborhoods with high levels of concentrated poverty. Navigating the dangerous streets within their neighborhood became both a daily task for black respondents and a skill that they had to learn early on in life (for similar findings, see Harding 2010; Anderson 1990, 1999). Those who managed to “get out of the neighborhood” quickly learned that they would end up “seeing the same things,” referring to the widespread drug sales and dealing networks that they encountered when growing up (for a similar account, see Venkatesh 2006).

In addition, native blacks were more likely to grow up in housing projects. Specifically, 15.4 percent of native black respondents reported living in a housing project, compared to only 5.4 percent among West Indians and less than 1 percent among native whites. Many recalled early experiences in Brownsville, East New York, or the South Bronx—the most disadvantaged areas in the city. Some complained about the resignation with which neighborhood residents approached their living environment and noted that the lack of police enforcement in poor neighborhoods made the situation much worse. For example, Juan was twenty-seven and worked in the service sector at the time of the interview. Having grown up in Crown Heights, he described “project living” as “normal living,” though he was aware of how different his neighborhood, which he referred to as “the ghetto,” really was from the suburbs:

Q: How would you compare where you live now [Jamaica] to Flatbush?
A: The community is great. They have a lot to offer for the children. . . . It’s better. I mean I cannot be afraid to let them run outside ahead of me, whereas in Flatbush in Brooklyn, you don’t know where a bullet is coming from. So it’s a big step up.

Q: What are the bad things about this neighborhood?
A: What I would say is bad is the Boulevard. It’s got a lot of drug trafficking. And that’s the only downfall of the neighborhood, which they are trying to stop, but that’s about it really. You don’t see much rape going on or robbing or stealing or any of that source but they are very well protected around here. Security is good. Twenty-four hours. It’s just the Boulevard mainly trafficking with drugs. That’s the downfall. (thirty-two-year-old African American female)

To sum up, many native black respondents reported growing up in some of New York’s most disadvantaged neighborhoods with higher levels of crime along with significant gang- and drug-related activities. They also lived in some of the most segregated neighborhoods with the lowest presence of non-Hispanic whites and often in close proximity of West Indians. Navigating and surviving in this disadvantaged context is one of the suburbs living out there and it be different for them living out in the ghetto like out here. It was hard growing up. I mean, street drugs, bodies, murders, I mean to me all of this was the typical lifestyle out there. That’s how it was. They settle down short; that was the lifestyle out there; that was when I was growing up. (twenty-seven-year-old African American male)
the most salient themes in the interviews. This includes reflections on how to stay safe, how to avoid fights, how to resist the pressure to join a youth gang, as well as involvement with the drug trade, which often opened the door to more serious criminal involvements. These topics will be further explored in the second half of this chapter, which focuses on how group-specific cultural strategies matter for social mobility.

The West Indian Narrative: Islands in the City

One-third of the West Indian respondents in the survey reported growing up in Flatbush, Crown Heights, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and Jamaica. In contrast to native blacks, West Indians were more likely to live in mixed neighborhoods or in close proximity of other mixed areas, with a presence of whites or other non-white ethnic groups. Their neighborhoods also differed from those of native blacks in one important dimension: they are often surrounded by other coethnics from the West Indies. For example, Jarrell, a recent graduate of a public university and a case manager at a social service agency, described his experience in Flatbush as living in “an island in the city”:

Q: What was it like to grow up in Flatbush?
A: Flatbush is like living on an island, (laughter) in the middle of a big city.

Q: Why do you say that?
A: Because 99 percent of the residents of Flatbush are from the Islands, and it’s kind of like [a] melting pot of Caribbean culture mixed with American. The way things are done, the way people speak is still kind of representative of where they come from but always with the capitalist kind of twist to it because we are American. (twenty-three-year-old West Indian male)

Many West Indian respondents in the survey also reported growing up in neighborhoods with high rates of crime (68.1 percent) and drugs (57 percent), though there was a reduction in scale and nature of these incidents compared to native blacks. For example, whereas shooting was a regular occurrence in the neighborhoods described by black respondents, it was infrequently mentioned among West Indian respondents. Middle-class West Indians described growing up in relatively decent neighborhoods in Queens where children got along with their peers, though they were still likely to be in close proximity with native blacks.

Among respondents in the qualitative component of the study who did grow up in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods such as East New York or Brownsville, neighborhoods that were notorious for their high concentrations of social problems, almost all lived in the areas with less crime and violence, while native blacks tended to concentrate within public housing projects in these neighborhoods. In terms of crime, stories of “car stolen in front of one’s house” or “three or four cars went missing on the same street overnight” were prevalent in these neighborhoods and were seen as matter-of-fact parts of life. These crimes, though widespread, do not compare to drive-by shootings, which are more common in inner-city native black neighborhoods.

As expected, residential segregation also affects a large proportion of West Indians (for similar findings, see Crowder 1999; Crowder and Tedrow 2001). Several reported watching their neighborhood turn from mostly white to predominantly black over a short period of time. This ethnic transition also mapped onto the increase of violence, which featured prominently in the lives of the second generation. For example, Jackie, a recent college graduate and a teacher in the New York City public schools, describes her experience growing up in Flatbush:

Q: Can you tell me what it was like to grow up in [Flatbush]?
A: It was a good experience. I think at the time when we first moved here, I guess it was one of those big influxes of people coming in from the West Indies, so we had mostly African Americans and West Indians in that neighborhood, and that’s when the West Indians really started to come in and so it was always a good experience. I think the area that we lived in, I lived in what I consider to be projects. They weren’t public housing, but they just kind of ended up like projects because all the white people left and all the black people came [laughter]. I guess by the time I got to junior high school and high school there was a lot of violence and the drugs, the influx of crack and things like that. So that had its effect. But I think it was a good experience, and I think that it toughened me up. (twenty-five-year-old West Indian female)

Half of the respondents in the qualitative sample also noted Flatbush’s familiar feel to the “islands,” including the availability of ethnic food right around the corner and the diverse mix of people from the West Indies, which added a specific flavor to neighborhood life. This sense of familiarity is an aspect of city living that they appreciated, especially in the
larger context of a global city like New York. All nostalgic longing for home aside, respondents often remarked how violent Flatbush actually was. To place this into context, our respondents in the ISGMNY study grew up in the late 1980s and early 1990s at the peak of the crack epidemics. The large coethnic presence in their neighborhood does help ameliorate some of the prejudice, violence and fear of trouble. However, even in the most “ethnic” West Indian neighborhoods, the presence of African Americans is still quite significant. (For example, the proportion of West Indians in East Flatbush in 2010 was 51% and this was the neighborhood with the highest concentration of West Indians.) When asked to identify the worst things about Flatbush and Crown Heights, drugs and crime were often the most likely responses. Though respondents observed the positive aspects of the mixture of different cultures, many also remembered Flatbush as a place where there were “guys selling drugs” and “guys getting girls pregnant” along with “kids getting beaten up.” And yet, some respondents managed to “pull thorough all of that” and ended up doing well, providing a vivid contrast between the West Indians and native blacks. For example, Tony, a twenty-nine-year-old West Indian respondent from a working-class background, reflected on his experience in Flatbush as “tough.” Despite his proximity to the drug trade, he was determined to “never [get] sucked in and involved in all of that,” went to college, and eventually found work in the financial sector.

The West Indian case also illustrates the spatially embedded nature of structural (dis)advantages. In this sense, the residential experience of West Indians is similar to middle-class native blacks who often share the same vulnerability (see Pattillo 2013). For example, Mark’s parents were both middle-class professionals: his mother worked as a registered nurse, and his father was a bank clerk. A graduate of the City University of New York, Mark worked as a system administrator for a foreign bank at the time of the interview. Though Mark grew up in East New York, he did not realize that his family lived in close proximity of public housing projects in the neighborhood because the area in which he grew up was more family friendly and sheltered—a “pocket of affluence” amidst a highly disadvantaged area.

Q: What was it like to grow up in East New York? 
A: East New York has been kind of a bit of a rough neighborhood at least for the last thirty years, but at the time that I was growing up there, a lot of what has really torn it up over the last ten years had not really happened yet. So from the way I saw it, it was not really all that bad, from the perspective of a child growing up there. I lived on a block and in a part of East New York where there are a lot of houses, one- or two-family houses where a lot of the people on the street knew each other, so your neighbors knew you. So the part of East New York where I lived in was a place where I think there was a pretty strong sense of community. Now, five blocks away were the projects, and I did know that there was a very different thing happening in the projects. I didn’t really spend much time there . . . So at least for the very first early part of my growing up there, I didn’t really think much about the fact that I lived in East New York. As I got a little bit older and actually probably explored the neighborhood more, I got to understand that kind of little corner of it that I was in was not all of it and came to kind of appreciate everything that was going on in the neighborhood. (twenty-eight-year-old West Indian male)

To sum up, West Indians reported growing up in relatively segregated neighborhoods in close proximity with native blacks, but with lower levels of crime and violence. They are also more likely than native blacks to report the presence of other coethnics as well as non-black populations in their neighborhoods. Even though respondents from both groups faced similar structural disadvantages in poverty, segregation, and violence in their neighborhoods, they draw on different group-specific strategies to navigate this disadvantaged context. The following section turns attention to three sets of cultural mechanisms and describes them in more details.

**How Culture Matters: Parenting Strategies, Delinquency, and Local Peer Networks**

The previous section documented that native blacks and West Indians grew up in structurally similar, yet not identical, neighborhoods. Though both perceived similar levels of drugs, crime, and violence in their neighborhoods, West Indians reported a greater presence of other racial groups. I now turn to the specific strategies that each group adopts to navigate this disadvantaged context and the cultural understandings that both groups exhibit, showing how these differences shape their experiences in their neighborhoods. Specifically, I point to three cultural mechanisms
that partially explain the attainment gap between West Indians and native blacks: parenting strategies, involvement with the local drug trade, and the neighborhood peer networks. I argue that these strategies have the unintended consequences of facilitating social mobility among second-generation West Indians while potentially hindering the prospects of native blacks.

Parenting Strategies and Supervision

Growing up in Brownsville in close proximity to public housing projects, twenty-four-year-old Rachel was aware of the dangers of the streets. She shared that “there was a lot of violence” and that “there was nothing good” about her experience there. In fact, Rachel recounted being shot by a stray bullet in her own home. Her father lived in Barbados, but he did provide financial support and visited occasionally throughout her adolescence. Though there was no expectation that she had to finish college, her mother encouraged her “to go as far as she [could] go” in her education. Having attended a private university, she was working with the mentally challenged as a social worker at the time of the interview. She emphasized the importance of upbringing and expressed concern that young children today do not show as much respect to their parents:

My friends and I, we would hang outside. When the streetlight came on, I had to be in the house. And my friends used to laugh at me, “Oh, the warden is calling you.” But as an adult now I see children not being called in for lunch or supper. You are really free to roam the streets all day, and my mother’s upbringing—she raised me how she was raised. Like my mother said, back home, these children out here doing these things, I would be able to beat them, send them home to their mother, and they would get beat too, again. But here, everyone minds their own business, because you complain to the parent and the parent gets upset that you complained. Or the child themselves gets very disrespectful. And you’ve got to worry about whether you’re going to get a bullet in you. So you kind of are conditioned to just sit and watch and not really do anything. (twenty-four-year-old West Indian female)

In general, West Indians tend to be stricter with their children compared to native blacks. The use of corporal punishment in disciplining children is a case in point. Waters and Sykes (2009, 72) describe this key difference as “one between ‘strict’ Caribbean parenting and ‘lax’ American parenting.” At the same time, parenting strategy is crucial in a disadvantaged context. As immigrants, West Indian parents had fewer ties to their immediate neighborhood, were more apprehensive of their surrounding and tended to be more protective of their children. This often led to stricter parenting strategies because they believed that “physical punishment was the way to deal with a child who had misbehaved” (Waters and Sykes 2009, 73). Many second-generation respondents recalled closely supervised visits to the neighborhood playground during childhood, hours spent at the local museum or library, and stricter curfew times during adolescence. When they went outside to play, they “could just be in front of the house” and “couldn’t go to too many places” because their parents were afraid to let them out of sight. For example, Shena, a thirty-one-year-old West Indian female, described her mother’s decision not to allow her to play outside as a “typical kind of West Indian immigrant thing” because her mother did not want her to “mix with the Americans and all that foolishness.”

Another key difference was family structure. West Indians also grew up with more adult figures in the household because they were more likely to grow up in two-parent households and their household tended to include both kin and non-kin adults (see also Bashi 2007; Kasinitz et al. 2008). In contrast, native blacks were more likely to grow up in single-parent households where the father was absent and the mother bore the burden of parenting, disciplining, and supervision. Specifically, 34 percent of native black respondents reported growing up with a single mother, compared to 25.6 percent of West Indians. This closer supervision has several implications for delinquency among the second generation, from drug use to skipping school. For example, the following respondent’s attitude toward drugs use is illustrative:

Q: Were you around people dealing drugs?
A: Maybe, but I wasn’t aware. I was around people that used to smoke reefer.
Q: How did you feel about that?
A: I just knew don’t do it, or you’re gonna get your butt whipped.

(triety-one-year-old West Indian male)

In contrast, many native blacks reported a more lax attitude when it came to drug use. The following example might be an extreme case, but it highlights the range of parenting approaches.
A: I didn’t know what I was smoking. I thought it was a cigarette, to tell you the truth. And I was walking around saying things to people I shouldn’t have said to them. And there was a time when I came in from a bout of smoking and just pass out on the couch and my stuff would drop out of my pocket and my mother would find it.

Q: What did she say?

A: She’d take it and hide it just to see what I would do.

Q: What would you do?

A: Take it back and smoke it. It was mine. I bought it. (twenty-five-year-old African American female)

To be fair, there are examples and counterfactuals of “stricter” parents among native blacks. Twenty-five-year-old Camille grew up in a South Bronx housing project with a single mother. She described her neighborhood as a place where “very few people worked.” She reported being afraid to go outside because of the gunshots and murders that occurred in the neighborhood. This was in spite of the fact that the neighborhood was generally family oriented in the sense that “everyone knew everyone.” And yet, she was able to stay out of trouble, and she attributed this to her “strong” mother who kept her on track:

Q: What was it like to grow up there, in your childhood neighborhood?

A: Basically it was pretty rough. You walk outside the building, and there were drug dealers and everything else. Thank God most of my family lived in that building so that somewhat protected me and my sister from everything that was going on around us. Basically it kept them away from us, and my mother was very strong as far as us going to school and not listening to the gang. She made sure me and my sister were going to school, and she would make sure we were going somewhere far away. It’s just me and my sister, so we went to Aviation High School so she made sure we wasn’t around the vicinity as far as the Bronx was concerned. (twenty-five-year-old African American female)

What these examples demonstrate is the importance of parenting strategies and how they shape the neighborhood spaces where youths spend time growing up as well as how much time they spend both inside and outside the home. More generally, these findings point to how space and time matter for theories of neighborhood effect and how parents often serve as an important mediating mechanism in disadvantaged context. Strict parenting has a more immediate impact on whether youths become involved in the local drug trade, which leads to downward mobility. The next section explores this theme in more detail.

**Delinquency and the Local Drug Trade**

One direct consequence of less parental supervision is native blacks’ higher propensity to be involved in the local drug trade. Because drugs permeated many of the neighborhoods where West Indians and native blacks grew up in the 1980s and early 1990s, they also reported coming into contact with drugs early on in life and began engaging in drug selling as an informal income-generating strategy. For many, the “allure of the streets” often came a little too early, which was difficult to resist in the face of poverty and disadvantage. For example, Justin was born in Harlem and spent his earlier years with his mother, who worked as a nurse. Even though he reported being close to his father, his father had passed away when Justin was only eight. At the time of the interview, Justin had just completed a GED program and was working in the food services industry. He recounted his experience growing up in Harlem and how his involvement with the drug trade eventually led him to drop out of high school and into other criminal activities. Unfortunately, his experience is not atypical:

Q: Have you ever sold drugs?

A: Yeah. Crack, weed. It ain’t something I do every day. I ain’t like none of these other bums; they’d be on the corner all day every day. I’m the type of person, if I need some money real bad. Like if I really want something, like if I wanted a pair of sneakers, and I’ve got like 50 and the sneakers cost like 125, I’ll go out there, sell a little bit of drugs just so I can get some sneakers, and that’s it; I won’t do it for like a year. It’s just for when I really really want something. Like if I want to go to a party or something, I’ll go out there for like twenty minutes, half an hour, get enough money for the party, and I’m done. I ain’t no full-time, real into it, heavy, it’s just when I need some money. (eighteen-year-old African American male)

Whereas native blacks often stated that “you have to hustle to make money” to justify their involvement in the drug trade, West Indians’
reaction was quite a different one. Many protested that drugs were “kill-
ing” their neighborhood and “destroying” their community:

Q: Have you ever been around people dealing drugs?
A: (laughter) Yes. [And] I think it is destroying our community.
Q: What makes you say that?
A: Because when there’s a need for something and you’re not
working, you got to find somehow to get it, so obviously you’re
going to have to steal and thief to get it. Drugs is the root of that.
(twenty-four-year-old West Indian male)

Though they were not immune from their neighborhood environment,
female respondents made an effort to avoid the drug trade. Among female
respondents with children, some noted the lack of recreational facilities
and institutional resources in their neighborhood that could provide children with safe, supervised play spaces in controlled environments. Others
have observed that there was “not enough oriented towards the children”
and that there was “nothing to do” when they were growing up. As a
result, they found themselves spending time on the streets, which many
white respondents also reported doing. However, in contrast to the clean,
safe streets in predominantly white neighborhoods, street life in black
neighborhoods often presents its own perils and challenges, potentially
leading to negative consequences for adolescents and young adults. For
example, twenty-five-year-old Rhonda described how her neighborhood
changed from a pretty peaceful neighborhood into one with gangs and
other forms of violence.

Q: So what do you think caused the change?
A: Anybody who wants to make the quick dollar. The quickest way to
do it is drugs, and I guess that’s what everybody’s into. Everybody,
I guess for the youth, I guess it’s, you know, you see the videos,
Jay-Z and everybody, and everything is diamonds and gold and
money money this and money money that. You know, most of them
don’t have an education; they don’t want to go to school; they just
want to make quick money. The quickest way is drugs, for them.
Q: So you think that’s what happened?
A: I mean, I can’t blame it on rap. [But] a lot of rappers in their rap,
say how they got their money hustlin’, and that’s how kids see—oh,
I got to hustle now to get money, and that’s what they look up to.
So they don’t want to [go] the long route of going to school and
workin’; they want to do it quick. So they don’t understand. You
can’t get a pension selling drugs. What’s gonna happen when you’re
too old to sell drugs? They don’t see that far. (twenty-five-year-old
African American female)

These experiences show that native blacks and West Indians also differ
in their involvement with the local drug trade. While both reported that the
“using and dealing of illegal drugs” was a major problem in their
neighborhood while growing up, West Indians are more likely to distance
themselves from the drug trade. One reason for this “distancing” strategy
among West Indians is their lower connections to the neighborhood
peer network. The next section highlights this theme and shows how it
protects against downward mobility among second-generation West
Indians.

Neighborhood Peer Networks and Social Mobility

As immigrants, West Indians had not spent as much time as native blacks
in their neighborhoods, and as a result, had fewer local ties. Their neigh-
borhoods were more transient, with a constant influx of new immigrants.
Furthermore, West Indians were more likely to attend schools outside of
their neighborhood and less likely to spend time in their own neighbor-
hood of residence. As a result, West Indian youths were less connected to
their neighborhood peer networks which has the unintended benefit of
protecting them from their neighborhood. In contrast, 70 percent of the
native blacks in the ISGMNY survey reported that they grew up in neighbor-
hoods where “most neighbors knew each other.” For example, Erin
grew up in a working-class family where both of her parents worked in the
service sector. After graduating from a two-year community college, she
found work at a local bank and was thirty-one at the time of the interview.
Erin’s experience growing up was generally pleasant, and she appreciated
the fact that everyone on the block knew and spent time with each other:

Q: What were the best things about Bedford Stuyvesant at that time?
A: The best things? I mean, the best thing—having friends on that
block to have fun with, and everybody knowing everybody so if you
needed something and your mother or father wasn’t home, you
knew you could go to that next person, and they was gonna take
care of you, ‘cause they knew your mother and whatever you got
from them, your mother or father would pay it back or give it back
or whatever. It was just more of a family-oriented type of situation.
(thirty-one-year-old African American female)

In contrast, West Indians found themselves more withdrawn from the neighborhood, even when they lived in areas that were heavily coethnic, either because of prejudice against them or because they wanted to “stay out of trouble” and not “[get] into other people’s business.”

Q: What kinds of people lived in that neighborhood?
A: Mostly my block happened to be the block of the West Indians. We kind of all lived on the same block. We stayed friendly with each other, and we all pretty much knew each other that were from the West Indies. We knew where each other were from and things like that. That was on one side of the street, and on the other side of the street is all Americans. So it was like a long time ago, before everybody learned about West Indian culture, it used to be more like, “Oh you’re West Indian; you’re banana boat.” As a child, in elementary school, it’s kind of frustrating, but it’s still kind of frustrating now because everyone thinks West Indian, they’re Jamaican, and that is still frustrating because we’re not all from one place . . .

But like I said, I got shot by a stray bullet, and that kind of altered my thinking about a lot of people that were around me. I knew what they did, but it was none of my business per se, so I kept out of it. And they did what they had to do. As long as we were respectful of each other, I found a lot of people around that were pretty much struggling, and my family included. (twenty-four-year-old West Indian female)

In turn, being embedded in the local peer network increases the likelihood of delinquency involvement. For example, eighteen among the thirty native black respondents in the qualitative sample described how involvement in the local drug trade shaped the experience of youths in their neighborhood, with junior high marking a key turning point that separated drug dealers from those who chose not to deal. Moreover, nine of these eighteen native black respondents reported initially adopting drug dealing purely as an informal income-generating strategy, which enabled them to afford the luxury items that their parents might not be able to provide, such as a pair of Nike sneakers, a gold chain, or a new car. However, some of these young people found themselves increasingly unable to resist the pull of the streets and the allure of fast money.

Q: How did you get into [drugs]?
A: The streets. Just like I said, I was living with my older sister. My oldest sister, she could never buy me the things I wanted, and first of all, I was selling drugs actually and that was the type of thing where that money, in fact, there’s a picture of me right there when I used to be back in my bad days. That’s a $12,000 chain over there. That’s straight gold link, and it’s $12,000, and I used to be into that. And then I was, “You know what? This is slow money.” Then I started doing robberies, and that was it.

Q: About what time did you drop out?
A: In my junior year. The money just got too good to me, and I just didn’t want to go to school no more, so I just was chasing the dollar. So that was it. (thirty-year-old African American male)

These stories show that embeddedness in the local peer networks in a disadvantaged context can carry negative consequences. To be sure, close neighborhood ties can bring certain benefits, such as a stronger sense of neighborhood social cohesion and ongoing social support. However, the majority of West Indian second generation reported being detached and removed from their neighborhood. In other words, West Indians grew up in some of these poor neighborhoods, but were never fully integrated with their local peers. Their experiences highlight the divergent paths to mobility that could result even when ethnic groups grew up in similarly disadvantaged settings. On the one hand, West Indians are less affected by their neighborhoods given the stricter parents and the cultural frames that distance themselves from the local drug trade. On the other hand, these findings highlight how poverty shapes the cultural strategies that these youths adopt and the choices they make in light of structural constraints. This also points to the important role of both cultural and structural conditions in shaping individuals’ life chances.

Discussion and Conclusion

This comparison seeks to highlight the interaction between structural conditions and cultural strategies in shaping second-generation social mobility. Though both ethnic groups are equally segregated from native whites, I find that West Indians lived in neighborhoods with lower levels of concentrated poverty. In cases where second-generation West Indians share the same high-poverty neighborhood with native blacks, West Indians
are more likely to live in the smaller “pockets of affluence” within the neighborhood—blocks that are slightly more advantaged and have lower levels of violence. In addition, these two groups adopt different cultural strategies in their navigation of this context, with parenting strategies being an important tool that shapes both how much time youths spend and where they spend their time within their neighborhood.

The West Indian experience also illustrates the spatially embedded nature of advantaged and disadvantaged neighborhoods. West Indians were in closer proximity to integrated or mixed neighborhoods, whereas native blacks were in the midst of the most disadvantaged areas. West Indians were more likely to be surrounded by their coethnics, even when they lived in segregated neighborhoods. As immigrants, West Indians’ social mobility over time also facilitated spatial mobility into residence in better, though segregated, neighborhoods. This spatial proximity to other native blacks had some negative consequences, but by and large, West Indians reported being shielded from the nearby violence, mostly by their parents who would “keep them inside.” The role of family support in sheltering and protecting their children is repeatedly emphasized by West Indians. In sum, there is a combination of cultural strategies that promote social mobility: strict and protective parenting; a supportive home environment; and spending time inside doing homework and distancing from the street life in poor neighborhoods. These cultural strategies are neither specific to a particular ethnic group nor to a particular social class, though the qualitative data presented here suggest they were more prevalent among West Indians than native blacks.

What does this analysis reveal about the assimilation of the West Indian second generation? On the one hand, the theory of segmented assimilation predicts that West Indians will adopt the oppositional cultural outlook among native blacks and will be at risk of downward assimilation (Portes and Zhou 1993). In many ways, West Indians provide the most direct test of this theory, not only because they are phenotypically black, but they also live in neighborhoods adjacent to native blacks and often experience similar levels of discrimination in the casual setting by the police and others. On the other hand, other scholars emphasize the importance of a “minority culture of mobility” which refers to key cultural elements that provide “strategies for economic mobility in the context of discrimination and group disadvantage, and respond to distinctive problems that usually accompany minority middle-class status” (Neckerman et al. 1999, 946). Put differently, minority status can confer certain advantages. They can provide connections to ethnic resources that might promote social mobility, such as ethnic schools (Lee and Zhou 2014) or minority professional associations (Agius-Vallejo 2012). This minority culture of mobility is further supported by affirmative action and institutional policies that aim to reduce barriers to social mobility among blacks and Latinos in the post-civil-rights era, which disproportionately benefits the West Indian second generation (Kasinitz et al. 2008). And yet, as a racially black group, West Indians have yet to achieve parity with native whites, although they are certainly outperforming native blacks. These results show no evidence in support of downward mobility, while also provide partial support for the role of “selective acculturation” which emphasizes the importance of parental supervision and support in facilitating the process of assimilation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). More importantly, these findings suggest that the very mechanisms that lead to downward assimilation (i.e., proximity to native blacks, inner-city youth culture, and local peer networks) based on the theory of segmented assimilation are operating in the opposite directions. While many West Indians grew up in poor black neighborhoods, they are not embedded in their local peer networks and are more likely to adopt a distancing stance when it comes to the local drug trade and other delinquent activities. Instead of assimilating into the black underclass, as theorists of segmented assimilation might have warned, West Indian parents adopt elements of the minority culture of mobility in their navigation of a disadvantaged context. In other words, the cultural practices that they have recreated in their host society as a result of their structural position and neighborhood context seem to be a form of selective acculturation that also ensures the strongest mobility outcomes possible among the West Indian second generation.

More broadly, these findings suggest that race is “more than just black” (Wilson 2009) and the complex link between ethnicity and culture deserves further research (Lee and Zhou 2014; Smith 2014). In other words, the very meaning of blackness has changed in the last decade with the country’s first black president, the solidification of the black middle-class, the emergence of the black elites and the diversification of the black population. There is more than one way to be “black” and this heterogeneity invites a reexamination of the assumptions underlying our theories of assimilation, including the theory of segmented assimilation, which has adopted a certain historical specificity to the meaning of “blackness,” along with heightened concerns about the permanent black underclass in the 1990s. Finally, this analysis is specific to New York City and to the
historical period during which this sample of respondents came of age. The linkage between neighborhoods and social mobility might be more tenuous in other cities with lower levels of residential and school segregation. And yet, West Indians and native blacks would likely confront the perils and opportunities that this analysis reveals, but they can also be creative about the cultural strategies that they employ.
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1. Introduction

This chapter examines whether religious and social organizations benefit youth by offsetting the long-term consequences of growing up in a disadvantaged environment. Disadvantages suffered during childhood not only impose an immediate cost on children and families but have also been shown to impose harm that lasts well into adulthood. Research in economics and other social sciences has documented that children who grow up in poverty have worse physical health, lower levels of cognitive ability, lower levels of school achievement, more emotional and behavioral problems, and higher teenage childbearing rates. Other sources of disadvantage include growing up with a single or less educated parent; parental job loss, divorce, or death; and growing up in a poor neighborhood. Moreover, the consequences of a disadvantaged upbringing may be compounded by weak ties to the community and the family.

Not all children who grow up disadvantaged suffer negative outcomes to the same extent. Families and children can adopt strategies to try to minimize the negative impacts of their surroundings. In this chapter, we examine one such strategy: engagement with religious and other social organizations. The link between poverty and poor outcomes has been hypothesized to be partially due to deficiencies in parenting, home environments, and neighborhoods. Religious and social organizations could
to drug dealers or advice for how to get away with criminal activity in the neighborhood, it was also common for them to caution the younger children in the family not to take the same route.
9. Hacks are a common form of transportation throughout Baltimore.
10. Franklintown is a black working-class neighborhood that is in decline.
11. The tuition of this community college is lower than the national average, but we could not verify whether or not it is the least expensive in the United States.

7. More Than Just Black

1. I am grateful to Andrew Deeney, Ethan Posse, Philip Kasinitz, Jennifer Lee, Orlando Patterson, Wendy Roth, and Rob Smith for their comments on previous drafts of this paper. I am also grateful to Phillip Kasinitz, John Molkenkopf and Mary Waters for providing me with access to the geo-coded IMSGNY data.
2. See also Kasinitz et al. (2008).
3. For further and technical details of the ISGMNY study, see the Methodological Appendix in Kasinitz et al. (2008).
4. I use “native blacks” to denote respondents who were born in the United States to native-born African American parents, “native whites” to denote respondents who were born in the United States to native-born European American parents, and “West Indians” to denote respondents who were born in the United States to parents who were born in the West Indies.
5. See Model (2008) for a recent summary of this literature.
6. The NEET rate accounts for those who are “not engaged in education, employment, training, or caregiving.”
7. Since these two analyses are based on “male respondents only,” the sample size is rather small.
8. For more details, please see Tran (2011).
9. Figures reported are predicted probabilities for the three ethnic groups. These probabilities were calculated from logistic regression models with “native white” as the reference category, holding all other covariates at their mean values. “College graduate” indicates having a bachelor’s degree by age 25 whereas “Professional” indicates being in a professional occupation by age 25. These logistic models adjust for respondent’s age, gender, parental education, number of adult earners in household while growing up, family structure, number of children in household while growing up, and number of moves between the ages of 6 and 18. The models for “College graduate” and “Professional” only include respondents above the age of 25. The models for “Arrested” and “Incarcerated” only include male respondents. The model for “Teen parent” only includes female respondents. Full logistic regression results available upon request from the author.
10. Neighborhood concentrated disadvantage is an index measure based on the four items at the tract level: percent poverty, percent unemployed, percent on public assistance, and percent female-headed households with children.
11. Neighborhood concentrated affluence is an index measure based on three items at the tract level: percent with a bachelor’s degree or more, percent in managerial and professional occupation, and percent household with income greater than $70,000.
12. For the purpose of this analysis, neighborhoods were defined using census tracts at three time points: where the respondent was born (i.e. birth neighborhood), lived the longest between the ages of 6 and 18 (i.e. childhood neighborhood), and lived at the time of the survey (i.e. adult neighborhood). The figures are unadjusted mean values for each ethno-racial group.
13. The bars are the coefficients for the West Indian dummies in the multivariate analyses where the reference group is “native black”. Analyses limited to respondents who are not currently living with parents. “Unadjusted” models controlled for ethnic origin, age and gender. “Adjusted” models included the full set of controls: ethnic origin, age, gender, parental education, parental employment status, family structure, number of siblings respondent grew up with, respondent’s education and income, times moved between the ages of 6 and 18, years in current neighborhood, public housing project living while growing up, neighborhood disorder and cohesion index.
14. West Indians attended high schools that are further away from their neighborhoods and often of better quality compared to native blacks. For further details, please see Tran (2011, ch. 7).
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