Race, Gender, Class, and Perceived Everyday Discrimination

Philip Q. Yang[1] and Sharon M. Henderson
College of Arts and Sciences, Texas Woman's University, Texas, USA

Abstract: Everyday discrimination has been studied for the last three decades, but there is a lack of quantitative research on the effects of race, gender, and class, and especially their intersectional effects, on perceived everyday discrimination for the U.S. population as a whole, despite a few studies at the local or group levels. Using new data from the 2018 General Social Survey and multiple regression, this study investigates how race, gender, and class independently and intersectionally shape everyday discrimination experiences in the United States. The results indicate that, holding other variables constant, Blacks self-claimed a significantly higher level of everyday discrimination than Whites, but other races did not differ significantly from Whites in such an experience; class was inversely associated with the level of everyday discrimination, and gender did not have an independent effect. However, while Black men self-reported a higher level of everyday discrimination than White men, Black women self-reported a lower level of everyday discrimination than White women; higher-class Blacks tended to report a significantly higher level of everyday discrimination experiences than lower-class Blacks. The findings have significant implications for research and practice in the area of everyday discrimination.
Keywords: Perceived everyday discrimination, race, gender, class, intersectionality, the United States

As the dominant form of discrimination is gradually shifting from overt and blatant discrimination to covert and subtle discrimination in the United States, everyday discrimination has gained increasing attention from scholars in the last three decades. The concept of everyday racism or everyday discrimination was first proposed by Philomena Essed (1991) in her dissertation in the early 1990s. Built on Essed's work, David Williams and his associates' seminal work on the everyday discrimination scale (EDS) has boosted the popularity of the term "everyday discrimination" (Williams et al., 1997). Since then, many studies have tested the reliability of the EDS (e.g., Bastos et al., 2010; Bastos & Harnois, 2020; Chan et al., 2012; Harnois et al., 2019; Kessler et al., 1999; Kim et al., 2014; Krieger et al., 2005; Shariff-Marco et al., 2011). Copious studies have also established the links between everyday discrimination and adverse physical and mental health outcomes such as hypertension, strokes, respiratory illness, cardiovascular diseases, pains, anxiety, depression, obesity, smoking, and emergency room visits (e.g., Banks et al., 2006; Borrell et al., 2010; Cozier et al., 2014; Deitch et al., 2003; Earnshaw et al., 2016; Gee et al., 2007; Hunte & Williams, 2009; Krieger & Sidney, 1996; Lewis et al., 2006; Paradies et al., 2015; Pasco & Richman, 2009; Wiehe et al., 2010; Williams et al., 2019). Nevertheless, despite a few studies at the local or group levels (Barnes et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2016; Lewis et al., 2012; Panter et al.,

---

[1] Corresponding Author: Professor of Sociology, College of Arts and Sciences, Texas, USA. E-Mail: pyang@twu.edu

2008), there is a lack of quantitative research on the impact of race, class, and gender on everyday discrimination experience at the national level in the United States. In particular, to the best of our knowledge, little quantitative research has examined the intersectional effect of race, gender, and class on everyday discrimination. For instance, we do not know how Black women differ from Black men in perceived everyday discrimination, how Black women differ from White women in perceived everyday discrimination, how Black men are different from White men in such an experience, and how class intersects with race in everyday discrimination experience. It is important to study how race, gender, and class are related to everyday discrimination so that we can understand how experiences of everyday discrimination vary between racial minorities and Whites, between men and women, among classes, and among people in different social locations of race, gender, and class.

The current study investigates how race, gender, and class independently and intersectionally shape everyday discrimination experiences in the United States, using an intersectional approach as the theoretical guidance and the new data from the nationally representative General Social Survey (GSS) collected in 2018. We define *everyday discrimination* as subtle, pervasive discriminatory acts experienced by socially disadvantaged groups on a day-to-day basis. Everyday discrimination may take many forms, including, but not limited to, slights, indignities, insults, threats, and microaggressions (Panter et al., 2008; Rolón-Dow & Bailey, 2023). In the remainder of this paper, we outline our theoretical framework, propose our hypotheses, describe our data and methods, present our results, and discuss the implications of our findings.

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

In order to study the intersectional effect of race, gender, and class on everyday discrimination, we use intersectionality as the theoretical framework to guide our empirical analysis. Initially formulated by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), the intersectionality framework identifies multiple dimensions of advantages and disadvantages such as race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, and disability; the genesis, however, is with the intersection of Black women. The intersectional approach argues that these axes of oppression and power do not operate in isolation but function in an interlocking and intersecting fashion (Andersen & Collins, 1995; Christian et al., 2019; Collins, 1990, 2019). The intersecting social locations of individuals determine their unique experiences. For this particular study, we believe that the positions of race, gender, and class affect how individuals perceive everyday discrimination. We also believe that insights can be gained by examining both independent and intersectional effects of race, class, and gender on perceived everyday discrimination. It is necessary to analyze the independent effects of race, class, and gender because isolating each variable and its impact on the subject's experience is "an essential analytical step" to "understand the intersectionality in the end" (Belkhir & Barnett, 2001, pp. 163-164; Bowleg, 2008). However, the analysis of independent effects is insufficient and must be supplemented by intersectional analysis in order to gain a full understanding of how these variables influence the outcome. In this study, the intersectional approach will help shed light on how Black women differ from Black men in perceived everyday discrimination, how Black women differ from White women in such an experience, how Black men are different from White men in such an experience, and how class intersects with race to influence everyday discrimination experiences.

Racism, sexism, and classism influence how people are treated on a daily basis. Many studies have documented that racial minorities are more likely than Whites to experience discrimination because of historical racism and contemporary racism (e.g., Bumiller, 1988; Chong,

2023; Feagin, 2006; Feagin & Ducey, 2018; Feagin et al., 2001; Roscigno, 2007; Smith, 2002; Yang, 2000). Some qualitative evidence shows that minorities are more likely to experience everyday discrimination than Whites (Armstrong, 2019; Chou & Feagin, 2015; Feagin & Cobas, 2014; Feagin & McKinney, 2003; Rawls & Duck, 2020). A few studies have also documented racial differences in everyday discrimination (Barnes et al., 2004; Lewis et al., 2012; Panter et al., 2008). Women are more likely than men to experience discrimination in their economic, political, and social lives (e.g., Dill, 1988; Massey, 2007; Patten, 2016; Yang, 2000). Lower-class people tend to encounter more discrimination than higher-class people (Kadi, 1996). The effects of race, class, and gender may not be additive but are likely to be multiplicative (when taken intersectionally). For example, minority women's experience is different from that of White women; lower-class Blacks will have an experience different from higher-class Blacks; lower-class, minority women are most likely to experience everyday discrimination differently from higher-class White men. Based on the foregoing considerations and empirical evidence, we propose the following hypotheses for testing:

$H_{1:}$ Racial minorities are more likely to self-report everyday discrimination than Whites, all else being equal.

$H_{2:}$ Women are more likely to self-claim everyday discrimination than men, controlling for other variables.

$H_{3:}$ A higher class is associated with a lower level of self-claimed everyday discrimination, holding other variables constant.

$H_{4:}$ The effect of gender on everyday discrimination is moderated by race.

$H_{5:}$ The effect of class on everyday discrimination is moderated by race.

Data and Methods

Data

The source of data for this study is GSS 2018 (NORC, 2019). GSS 2018 is a nationally representative sample of the non-institutionalized U.S. adult population aged 18 or older. We selected GSS 2018 because this dataset provided for the first time data on the question of everyday discrimination surveyed in 2018. Since GSS 2018 is a probability sample, with proper weighting, findings are generalizable to the U.S. adult population. GSS 2018 also includes many variables that may influence self-claimed everyday discrimination, such as race, gender, class, age, religion, and nativity. We weighted the data by the weight variable provided by the GSS based on a complex weighting process that corrects for the selection bias of including only one adult per household in the sample in order to represent the actual population. Only respondents who provided valid answers to the everyday discrimination questions are included in this study. After the restriction to the valid cases of the variables pertinent to everyday discrimination, 1,532 cases remain. The sample size is large enough to generate accurate estimates of the population parameters.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is everyday discrimination. This variable is measured by an index constructed on the basis of five everyday discriminatory experiences that people self-claimed. Respondents were asked to respond to the following question: "In your day-to-day life, how often have any of the following things happened to you?

A. You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people.

B. You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores.

C. People act as if they think you are not smart.
D. People act as if they are afraid of you.
E. You are threatened or harassed" (NORC, 2019, pp. 2770-2772).

For each of these five experiences, there were six response categories: (1) Almost every day, (2) At least once a week, (3) A few times a month, (4) A few times a year, (5) Less than once a year, and (6) Never. The categories were reverse recoded so that a higher number indicates a higher level of everyday discrimination, and there is also a zero point. The new codes are (0) Never, (1) Less than once a year, (2) A few times a year, (3) A few times a month, (4) At least once a week, and (5) Almost every day. This constructed index has possible values ranging from 0 to 25. A Cronbach's Alpha Reliability test was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the five statements. The value of Alpha was 0.753, indicating that these five indicators have internal consistency and are good indicators of the dependent variable.

It should be noted that the GSS question and everyday discrimination experiences were derived from David Williams et al.'s (1997) well-known EDS. The original EDS came with nine items, which separated "less courtesy" (Item 1) from "less respect" (Item 2) and included three other everyday discrimination experiences or items (i.e., "6. People act as if they think you are dishonest. 7. People act as if they're better than you are. 8. You are called names or insulted"). The NORC used a short version of the EDS developed for the Chicago Community Adult Health Study by Sternthal et al. (2011) with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.77, which is very similar to ours.

Independent Variables

Our independent variables are race, gender, and class. Race is a nominal variable, which was dummy coded as Black (Black=1, Otherwise=0) and Other race (Other race=1, Otherwise=0), with White as the reference category. Gender was also dummy coded (Female=1, Male=0). Class is an ordinal variable, including four categories: lower class, working class, middle class, and upper class.

Control Variables

To test the independent and interactive effects of race, gender, and class on perceived everyday discrimination, we controlled for other factors that could potentially affect the dependent variable. Based on the literature (Barnes et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2016; Lewis et al., 2012; Perez et al., 2008; Yang, 2021) and the availability in GSS 2018, we selected the following variables as control variables: age, education, religion, region, and nativity. Age is a continuous variable with values ranging from 18 to 89 or older. Education is measured by the highest year of schooling completed. Religion is dummy coded with 1 for Christian and 0 for non-Christian. We created three dummy variables for region coded 1 for the designated category and coded 0 otherwise: Northeast, Midwest, and West. The South is used as the reference category as it has been known to be a historical negative hotbed for racial attitudes and activities. Nativity is a dummy variable coded 1 for those born abroad and coded 0 for those born in the United States.

Interaction Variables

To test the interaction or intersectional effects between race and gender and between race and class, we created several interaction variables or cross-product terms: Female x Black, Female x Other race, Class x Black, and Class x Other race.

Limitations of the Data

The limitations of GSS 2018 ought to be acknowledged. First, albeit a valuable indicator of discrimination, perceived everyday discrimination may not measure actual everyday discrimination because it is self-reported and not subject to verification. Second, our perceived everyday discrimination index (EDI) is built on the short version of the EDS, excluding indicators related to dishonesty, superiority, and name-calling, although the short version is proven to be reliable based on the Cronbach's Alpha Reliability test (Alpha=0.753). Third, some potential determinants of everyday discrimination, such as sexual orientation and body weight, available in GSS 2018, have substantial numbers of missing values. Since the imputation of missing values for these variables is infeasible and the inclusion of them in the analysis will drop the sample size by more than two-thirds and bias the estimates, we decided to exclude them from the final presentation of the findings. Finally, some potential predictors of perceived everyday discrimination (e.g., mental and physical disability) were not available in GSS 2018 and, therefore, were not used as control variables in this study. These limitations notwithstanding, GSS 2018 remains one of the best sources of quantitative information available to study the perceptions of everyday discrimination.

Methods of Analysis and Analytical Strategy

We used descriptive statistics to gain an understanding of the everyday discrimination status and our predictors. Correlational analysis was performed to examine the initial relationships between the predictors and everyday discrimination. Our primary method of analysis is ordinary least squares (OLS) regression because the dependent variable is an index. We tested three regression models. Model 1 regresses the dependent variable on the independent variables. Model 2 adds the control variables to Model 1 to see if the effects of race, gender, and class on everyday discrimination change. Finally, Model 3 adds interaction variables to Model 2 to test the intersectional effects of race, gender, and class on everyday discrimination.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 provides the means and standard deviations (*SD*) of all variables used in this analysis. The dependent variable, the everyday discrimination index (EDI), had a mean of 6.55 and an *SD* of 4.71. The mean of 6.55 on a scale of 0 to 25 corresponded to the level of "less than once a year," indicating, on average, a relatively low level of perceived everyday discrimination in the United States.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations (SD) of Variables Used in the Analysis, U.S. Adults, GSS 2018

Variable	Mean	SD
Dependent Variable		
Perceived everyday discrimination	6.550	4.710
Independent Variables		
Race		
Black	0.145	0.352
Other	0.121	0.326
Female	0.549	0.497
Class	2.430	0.667
Control Variables		
Age	45.33	17.648
Education	13.83	2.900
Christian	0.702	0.458
Foreign Born	0.131	0.337
Region		
Northeast	0.136	0.342
Midwest	0.214	0.410
West	0.246	0.431
South	0.404	0.491

The means of dummy variables can be interpreted as percentages after multiplying by 100. Thus, Table 1 shows that 14.5% of the respondents identified as Black, and 12.1% identified as other races, leaving 73.4% of the respondents as White. Females comprised 54.9% of the sample compared to 45.1% of males. The mean of class (= 2.43) on a 4-point scale indicated an average class ranking between the working class and the middle class. The average age of the respondents was about 45 years. Their average education level was nearly 14 years or close to an associate degree. Christians made up 70.2% of the sample, and 29.8% were non-Christians. Foreign-born respondents constituted 13.1% of the sample, and an overwhelming majority (86.9%) were U.S.-born. A higher percentage of the respondents came from the South (40.4%) than from other regions (24.5% for the West, 21.4% for the Midwest, and 13.6% for the Northeast).

Correlational Analysis

In Table 2, the zero-order correlation coefficients show preliminary bivariate relationships between the predictors and EDI. It is evident that Blacks were significantly more likely to self-claim everyday discrimination than non-Blacks ($r =.127$), but other races ($r =-.062$) were less likely to do so than all other races. There was a highly significant inverse relationship between class ranking and EDI ($r =-.149$). Age was highly significant at the 0.001 level and negative ($r =-.233$), indicating older people were less likely to claim everyday discrimination than their younger counterparts. The foreign-born were significantly less likely to profess everyday discrimination than the U.S.-born ($r =-.141$). Only the dummy variable for the Northeast was significant, but no other regional dummy variables were. Unexpectedly, the relationship between gender and everyday discrimination was not significant at the 0.05 level. Also, unexpectedly, education and religion were not significantly related to everyday discrimination. No sign of a multicollinearity problem exists. These relationships are preliminary because other predictors have not been controlled. Thus, multiple regression is called for.

Regression Analysis

Table 3 presents the results of three OLS regression models. Model 1 tests the independent effects of race, gender, and class on EDI. The F value of Model 1 ($=16.044$) is highly significant at the 0.001 level, indicating that this is a good model. However, the R^2 ($=0.04$) shows that it only explains 4% of the variance in EDI.

In Model 1, all regression coefficients are statistically significant, at least at the 0.05 level, except for gender. As expected, controlling for other variables in the model, Blacks were 1.440 levels higher than Whites in experiencing everyday discrimination. On the other hand, other races were significantly less likely to claim everyday discrimination. As hypothesized, social class was negatively associated with EDI. At odds with our hypothesis, the dummy variable for Females was not significant at the 0.05 level and was negative.

By introducing the control variables, Model 2 increases the variance explained in EDI significantly to 10.7% ($R^2 = 0.107$). However, with one exception, the significance levels and the signs of coefficients for the independent variables do not change. Holding all other variables constant, Blacks were still 1.099 levels higher than Whites in experiencing everyday discrimination, although the magnitude somewhat decreased compared to that in Model 1. However, the difference between other races and Whites in EDI had lost statistical significance at the 0.05 level. These results lend mixed support to Hypothesis 1. Nevertheless, Hypothesis 3 is still fully supported because a high-class level decreased EDI significantly by a .852 level. The effect of gender remains virtually unchanged. This result confirms that the gender difference in everyday discrimination is not spurious and insignificant. Thus, Hypothesis 2 is not supported.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Variables Used in the Analysis, U.S. Adults, GSS 2018 (N=1515)

	E.D.	Black	O.R.	Class	Female	Age	Education	Christian	Northeast	Midwest	West	F.B.
E.D.	1											
Black	0.127**	1										
O.R.	-0.062**	-0.153***	1									
Class	-0.149***	-0.087**	-0.072*	1								
Female	-0.017	0.037	-0.030	-0.057	1							
Age	-0.233***	-.0680**	-0.143***	0.146***	0.007	1						
Education	-0.014	-0.025	-0.142***	0.296***	0.024	0.015	1					
Christian	-0.040	0.096***	-0.095***	0.024	0.089**	0.196***	-0.061	1				
Northeast	-0.073*	-0.003	-0.002	0.067**	0.040	-0.012	0.054*	-0.064	1			
Midwest	0.009	-0.050	-0.118***	0.020	-0.063	0.009	0.032	0.018	-0.207**	1		
West	-0.001	-0.115***	0.199***	-0.040	0.006	-0.057*	0.031	-0.127**	-0.226**	-0.298**	1	
F.B.	-0.141***	-0.045	0.423***	-0.066*	0.035	-0.046*	-0.147***	-0.056*	0.021	-0.106**	0.069*	1

Note. E.D.= Everyday discrimination; O.R.=Other race; F.B.= Foreign-born.

$*p < .05$ $**p < .01$ $***p < .001$ (1-tailed test)

Table 3

OLS Regression Models Predicting Respondents Experience with Everyday Discrimination, U.S. Adults, 2018 (standard error in parentheses)

Predictor	Model_1 B	β	Model_2 B	β	Model_3 B	β
Constant	9.121*** (.487)		11.702*** (.745)		12.267*** (.782)	
Race (reference = White)						
Black	1.440*** (.341)	0.108	1.099*** (.340)	.082	-1.069*** (1.273)	-0.08
Other race	-0.886* (.371)	0.061	-.463 (.411)	.032	-2.208 (1.390)	0.151
Class	-1.033*** (.178)	0.147	-.852*** (.183)	.121	-1.164*** (.214)	0.165
Female	-0.300 (.238)	0.032	-.187 (.233)	.020	.017 (.270)	0.002
Age			-.059*** (.007)	.221	-.058*** (.007)	0.219
Education			.013 (.042)	.008	.021 (.042)	0.013
Christian			-.165 (.262)	.016	-.188 (.262)	0.018
Region (reference = South)						
Northeast			-.966* (.365)	.070	-1.026** (.365)	0.074
Midwest			-.310 (.310)	.027	-.360 (.310)	0.031
West			-.193 (.305)	.018	-.201 (.304)	0.018
Foreign Born			-1.968*** (.380)	.141	-1.968*** (.379)	0.142
Interactions						
Female x Black					-1.285* (.678)	-0.076
Female x Other race					-.136 (.725)	-0.007
Class x Black					1.251** (.480)	0.224
Class x Other race					.776 (.554)	0.128
R^2	0.04		.107		.115	
F	16.044***		16.399***		12.948***	
N	1532		1515		1515	

Note. *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$ (1-tailed test)

The effects of the control variables in Model 2 deserve some notice. Age had a highly significant negative effect on EDI. Each year increase in age was associated with a .059 level decline in EDI. The foreign-born were also significantly less likely to self-claim everyday

discrimination than the U.S.-born (B = -1.968). There were some regional differences in EDI. Northeasterners were significantly less likely to self-claim everyday discrimination than Southerners (B = -.966), but residents in the West and Midwest did not differ significantly from Southerners in DEI, although they were slightly less likely to do so. Education and religious affiliation did not have a significant effect on EDI. The variables with the greatest impact on DEI in terms of βs include age (.221) and class (.121). Among the dummy variables, some stronger predictors include the foreign-born (.141) and Black (.082).

Is it possible that the effect of gender is moderated by race? Does class also interact with race to influence EDI? Model 3 tests these possibilities by including several interaction variables. The R^2 (= .115) of Model 3 indicates this model explains 11.5% of the variance in EDI. Two of the interaction terms are significant, at least at the 0.05 level. Using the coefficient for the main-effect term Female and the coefficient for the interaction term Female x Black for our calculation, we found that Black women were 1.302 levels lower than Black men in self-reporting everyday discrimination;[2] White women were only 0.017 level lower than White men in self-reporting everyday discrimination.[3] The difference between Black women and White women in claiming everyday discrimination was -1.285 (= -1.302 Female$_b$ – (-0.017 Female$_w$)) as shown in the significant coefficient for the interaction term Female x Black (B = -1.285), which indicates that Black females were -1.285 levels lower than White females in claiming everyday discrimination. For men, the coefficient for the main-effect term Female should be the same, except that the sign is reversed. This can be verified by re-dummy coding Female as Male and rerunning the model. For the interaction terms, Female should be replaced by Male. Redoing the calculation above, we found that Black men were 1.302 levels higher than Black women in self-reporting everyday discrimination; White men were 0.017 levels higher than White women in reporting everyday discrimination; Black men were 1.285 levels higher than White men to self-report everyday discrimination. However, as shown in Model 3 of Table 3, the interaction term between the Female dummy variable and the Other race dummy variable was insignificant at the .05 level, indicating that females of other races were not significantly different from White females in self-claiming everyday discrimination. Hence, the effect of gender on everyday discrimination did vary across races. Hypothesis 4 is partly supported.

Similarly, the significant coefficient for the interaction term Class x Black indicates that for each level increase in social class, Blacks were 0.087 levels higher in claiming everyday discrimination.[4] Nonetheless, the insignificant coefficient for the interaction term Class x Other race indicates that for each level increase in social class, other race was 0.388 levels lower in claiming everyday discrimination.[5] Thus, the effect of social class on everyday discrimination did vary across races. Hypothesis 5 is partly supported.

Discussion and Conclusions

---

2. The formula for calculating the effect of gender on everyday discrimination for Black women (B_{bf}) is as follows: B_{bf} = -0.017 Female – 1.285 Female x (1) – 0.136 Female x (0) = -1.302 Female

3. The formula for calculating the effect of gender on everyday discrimination for Black women (B_{wf}) is as follows: B_{wf} = -0.017 Female – 1.285 Female x (0) – 0.136 Female x (0) = -0.017 Female

4. The formula for calculating the effect of class on everyday discrimination for Blacks (B_b) is as follows: B_b = -1.164 Class + 1.251 Class x (1) + .776 Class x (0) = .087 Class

5. The formula for calculating the effect of class on everyday discrimination for other race (B_o) is as follows: B_o = -1.164 Class + 1.251 Class x (0) + .776 Class x (1) = -.338 Class

Everyday discrimination has been studied for the last three decades, but there is a lack of quantitative research on the effects of race, gender, and class, and especially their intersectional effects, on perceived everyday discrimination for the U.S. population as a whole, despite a few studies at the local or group levels. Using new data from GSS 2018 and multiple regression, this study investigates how race, gender, and class independently and intersectionally shape everyday discrimination experiences in the United States. The results indicate that holding other variables constant, Blacks self-claimed a significantly higher level of everyday discrimination than Whites, but other races did not differ significantly from Whites in such an experience; the class was inversely associated with the level of everyday discrimination, and gender did not have an independent effect. However, while Black men self-reported a higher level of everyday discrimination than White men, Black women self-reported a lower level of everyday discrimination than White women; higher-class Blacks tended to report a significantly higher level of everyday discrimination experiences than lower-class Blacks. The intersectional approach helps gain a better understanding of everyday discrimination.

The results of this study about racial differences in everyday discrimination are congruent with the findings of Lewis et al.'s (2012) study based on certain racial/ethnic groups of women aged 42-52 in seven cities, Barnes et al.'s (2004) study based on Blacks and Whites aged 68 or older from Chicago, and Panter et al.'s (2008) study based on the incoming law students. Our findings suggest that Blacks were more likely to report everyday discrimination than Whites and that the everyday discrimination experiences of minority groups varied as other races did not differ significantly from Whites. The diverse experiences in everyday discrimination suggest that one size does not fit all. Various minority groups experience everyday discrimination differently.

Our result about the effect of class validates conventional wisdom that higher-class people are less likely to experience everyday discrimination than their lower-class counterparts. The effect is highly significant and unambiguous. Class is indeed a significant predictor of everyday discrimination.

Harnois and Ifatunji (2011) argued for the importance of an intersectional framework in survey research on racial discrimination. Our findings confirm the utility of an intersectional approach in understanding everyday discrimination. When we looked at the effect of gender alone, we found an insignificant gender difference in everyday discrimination. However, gender is proven to interact with race to influence everyday discrimination. We also found a significant interaction effect between class and race on everyday discrimination. Examining the intersectional effects did provide additional insights into the everyday discrimination experience. Black men's experience differed from White men's experience. In contrast, Black women's experience was different from White women's experience in the opposite direction. The experience of higher-class Blacks was different from that of lower-class Blacks. The finding that Black women were less likely than White women and Black men to self-report everyday discrimination is similar to Yang's (2021) finding pertaining to employment discrimination. This result may be explained by such ideals or conceptions as "strongblackwoman" and "superwoman," which suggest Black women have strength, perseverance, endurance, survival, rationality, and self-reliance (Harris-Perry, 2011; Springer, 2002). Thus, self-claiming everyday discrimination may be perceived or construed as a weakness, a rejection of the "strongblackwoman" image, and submission to victimization.

Additionally, the result of a negative association between age and EDI suggests that older people are less likely to self-report everyday discrimination than younger people. This is probably because they were used to irregular everyday behaviors and did not see them as abnormal. This result contradicts the finding of Rippon et al. (2014) for older adults in England. We also unexpectedly found that the foreign-born experienced a lower level of everyday discrimination

than the U.S.-born, but this result coincides with the findings of other studies regarding the difference between the foreign-born and the U.S.-born in other types of perceived discrimination (e.g., Brondolo et al., 2015; Krieger et al., 2011). There are a few probable reasons. The foreign-born are less likely to attribute their maltreatment to race-based discrimination than to some other factors (Clark et al., 1999; Goto et al., 2002). The foreign-born may be less conscious of the collective representation held by other U.S. residents about their group (Brondolo et al., 2015). Perhaps the foreign-born have a different reference point—experience in their home country since many of them probably encounter worse experiences in their homeland than in the U.S.

Our findings also have practical implications for practitioners and policymakers. Since Black men appear to be the victims of everyday discrimination more than other segments of the population, special attention must be given to Black men in order to mitigate the impact of everyday discrimination on them. The findings that women were not significantly different from men in everyday discrimination and Black women were less likely than White women to report everyday discrimination may not necessarily indicate that women, and Black women in particular, suffered less from everyday discrimination. People may not report everyday discrimination for various reasons such as shame, a lack of awareness, fear of repercussions, or concerns about being viewed as fuzzy over trifling matters. In addition, some may not bother reporting because the penalty for everyday discrimination is not enforceable from a legal standpoint. Hence, all women should be encouraged to report problems of everyday discrimination whenever it occurs. The public may be less familiar with everyday discrimination than with well-known racial, gender, and disability discrimination. Awareness campaigns can help increase awareness of everyday discrimination. We should also educate people that everyday discrimination does negatively affect people's lives and should not be ignored even though it may not rise to the level of law violation.

Future research should incorporate the predictors of sexual orientation and body weight if better data and measurements become available. The effect of religion on everyday discrimination should be verified in future research. This study has included all potential determinants of perceived everyday discrimination available in GSS 2018 to the extent possible, but any new data and predictors in the future can help shed new light on this subject. This study focused on the intersectional effects of race, gender, and class on everyday discrimination, but future studies of everyday discrimination may expand the intersectional analysis beyond race, gender, and class.

References

Andersen, M., & Collins, P. (1995). *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (2nd ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.

Armstrong, J. (2019). "The Reward was Worth the Sacrifice": How Membership in Black Greek Letter Fraternities (BGLFs) Redefines Black Men's College Experiences. *American Journal of Qualitative Research, 3*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/5808

Banks, K. H., Kohn-Wood, L. P., & Spencer, M. (2006). An examination of the African American experience of everyday discrimination and symptoms of psychological distress. *Community Mental Health Journal*, *42*(6), 555–570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-006-9052-9

Barnes, L. L., De Leon, C. F. M., Wilson, R. S., Bienias, J. L., Bennett, D. A., & Evans, D. A. (2004). Racial differences in perceived discrimination in a community population of older blacks and whites. *Journal of Aging and Health*, *16*(3), 315–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264304264202

Bastos, J. L., Celeste, R. K., Faerstein, E., & Barros, A.J. (2010). Racial discrimination and health: A systematic review of scales with a focus on their psychometric properties. *Social Science & Medicine*, *70*(7), 1091–1099. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.12.020

Bastos, J. L., & Harnois, C. E. (2020). Does the Everyday Discrimination Scale generate meaningful cross-group estimates? A psychometric evaluation. *Social Science & Medicine*, *265*, Article 113321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113321

Belkhir, J. A., & Barnett, B. M. (2001). Race, gender, and class intersectionality. *Race, Gender, and Class*, *8*(3), 154–174. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41674988

Borrell, L. N., Diez Roux, A. V., & Jacobs, D. R. Jr. (2010). Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination, smoking and alcohol consumption in the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis (MESA). *Preventive Medicine*, *51*(3–4), 307–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2010.05.017

Bowleg, L. (2008). When black + lesbian + woman ≠ black lesbian woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectional research. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5–6), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z

Brondolo, E., Rahim, R., Grimaldi, S., Ashraf, A., Bui, N., & Schwartz, J. (2015). Place of birth effects on self-reported discrimination: Variations by type of discrimination. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *49*, 212–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.10.001

Bumiller, K. (1988). *The civil rights society*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chan, K. T-K., Tran, T. V., & Nguyen, T. N. (2012). Cross-cultural equivalence of a measure of perceived discrimination between Chinese-Americans and Vietnamese-Americans. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *21*(1), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2011.647348

Chong, E. K.- man. (2023). Innovations in Education: Moral Education, Social Cohesion, and Culture diplomacy. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, *6*(1), i-v. https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2023.1

Chou, R. S., & Feagin, J. R. (2015). *Myth of the model minority: Asian Americans facing racism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Christian, M., Seamster, L., & Ray, V. (2019). Critical race theory and empirical sociology. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *65*(8), 1–8.

Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for African Americans. A biopsychosocial model. *The American Psychologist*, *54*(10), 805–816. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.10.805

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Unwin Hyman.

Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.

Cozier, Y. C., Yu, J., Coogan, P. F., Bethea, T. N., Rosenberg, L., & Palmer, J. R. (2014). Racism, segregation, and risk of obesity in the black women's health study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *179*(7), 875–883. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwu004

Crenshaw, K. (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*(1), Article 1.

Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., & Bradley, J. C. (2003). Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, *56*(11), 1299–1324. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267035611002

Dill, B. T. (1988). Our mothers' grief: Racial ethnic women and the maintenance of families. *Journal of Family History*, *13*(1), 415–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/036319908801300125

Earnshaw, V. A., Rosenthal, L., Carroll-Scott, A., Santilli, A., Gilstad-Hayden, K., & Ickovics, J. R. (2016). Everyday discrimination and physical health: Exploring mental health processes. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *21*(10), 2218–2228. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105315572456

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. SAGE Publications.

Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic racism: A theory of oppression.* Routledge.

Feagin, J. R, & Cobas, J.A. (2014). *Latinos facing racism: Discrimination, resistance, and endurance*. Routledge.

Feagin, J. R., & Ducey, K. (2018). *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Feagin, J. R., & McKinney, K.D. (2003). *The many costs of racism*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Feagin, J. R., Vera, N., & Batur, P. (2001). *White racism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Gee, G. C., Spencer, M. S., Chen, J., & Takeuchi, D. (2007). A nationwide study of discrimination and chronic health conditions among Asian Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*, *97*(7), 1275–1282. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2006.091827

Gong, F., Xu, J., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2016). Racial and ethnic differences in perceptions of everyday discrimination. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *3*(4), 506–521. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649216681587

Goto, S. G., Gee, G. C., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2002). Strangers still? The experience of discrimination among Chinese Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(2), 211–224. http://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.9998

Harnois, C. E., Bastos, J. L., Campbell, M. E., & Keith, V. M. (2019). Measuring perceived mistreatment across diverse social groups: An evaluation of the Everyday Discrimination Scale. *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*, *232*, 298–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.05.011

Harnois, C. E., & Ifatunji, M. (2011). Gendered measures, gendered models: Toward an intersectional analysis of interpersonal racial discrimination. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(6), 1006–1028. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2010.516836

Harris-Perry, M. V. (2011). *Sister citizen*. Yale University Press.

Hunte, H. E., & Williams, D. R. (2009). The association between perceived discrimination and obesity in a population-based multiracial and multiethnic adult sample. *American Journal of Public Health*, *99*(7), 1285–1292. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.128090

Kadi, J. (1996). *Thinking class*. South End Press.

Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *40*, 208–230. https://doi.org/10.2307/2676349

Kim, G., Sellbom, M., & Ford, K. L. (2014). Race/ethnicity and measurement equivalence of the Everyday Discrimination Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, *26*(3), 892–900. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036431

Krieger, N., & Sidney, S. (1996). Racial discrimination and blood pressure: The CARDIA study of young black and white adults. *American Journal of Public Health*, *86*(10), 1370–1378. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.86.10.1370

Krieger, N., Smith, K., Naishadham, D., Hartman, C., & Barbeau, E. M. (2005). Experiences of discrimination: Validity and reliability of a self-report measure for population health research on racism and health. *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*, *61*(7), 1576–1596. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.03.006

Krieger, N., Kosheleva, A., Waterman, P. D., Chen, J. T., & Koenen, K. (2011). Racial discrimination, psychological distress, and self-rated health among US-born and foreign-born Black Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*, *101*(9), 1704–1713. http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300168

Lewis, T. T., Yang, F. M., Jacobs, E. A., & Fitchett, G. (2012). Racial/ethnic differences in responses to the Everyday Discrimination Scale: A differential item functioning analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *175*(5), 391–401. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwr287

Massey, D. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. Russell Sage Foundation.

National Opinion Research Center. (2019). *General Social Surveys, 1972–2018: Cumulative Codebook*. National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

Panter, A. T., Daye, C. E., Allen, W. R., Wightman, L. F., & Deo, M. (2008). Everyday discrimination in a national sample of incoming law students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(2), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1037/1938-8926.1.2.67

Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., Gupta, A., Kelaher, M., & Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS One*, *10*(9), Article e0138511. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138511

Pasco, E. A., & Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(4), 531–554. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016059

Patten, E. (2016). *Racial, gender wage gaps persist in U.S. despite some progress*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/01/racial-gender-wage-gaps-persist-in-u-s-despite-some-progress/

Perez, D. J., Fortuna, L., & Alegria, M. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of everyday discrimination among U.S. Latinos. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *36*(4), 421–433. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20221

Rawls, A., & Duck, W. (2020). *A nation divided: Interaction orders of race and the high cost of "tacit" racism in everyday life*. University of Chicago Press.

Rippon, I., Kneale, D., de Oliveira, C., Demakakos, P., & Steptoe, A. (2014). Perceived age discrimination in older adults. *Age Ageing*, *43*(3), 379–386. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/aft146

Rolón-Dow, R., & Bailey, M. J. (2022). Insights on Narrative Analysis from a Study of Racial Microaggressions and Microaffirmations. *American Journal of Qualitative Research, 6*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/11456

Roscigno, V. (2007). *The face of discrimination*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Shariff-Marco, S., Breen, N., Landrine, H., Reeve, B. B., Krieger, N., Gee, G. C. et al. (2011). Measuring everyday racial/ethnic discrimination in health surveys: How best to ask the questions, in one or two stages, across multiple racial/ethnic groups? *Du Bois Review*, *8*(1), 159–177. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X11000129

Smith, T. (2002). *Measuring racial and ethnic discrimination*. National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

Springer, K. (2002). Third-wave black feminism? *Signs*, *27*(4), 1059–1082. https://doi.org/10.1086/339636

Sternthal, M., Slopen, N., & Williams, D. R. (2011). Racial disparities in health: How much does stress really matter? *Du Bois Review*, *8*(1), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X11000087

Wiehe, S. E., Aalsma, M. C., Liu, G. C., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2010). Gender differences in the association between perceived discrimination and adolescent smoking. *American Journal of Public Health*, *100*(3), 510–516. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.169771

Williams, D. R., Lawrence, J. A., Davis, B. A., & Vu, C. (2019). Understanding how discrimination can affect health. *Health Services Research*, *54*(2), 1374–1388. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13222

Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socioeconomic status, stress, and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *2*(3), 335–351. https://doi.org/10.1177/135910539700200305

Yang, P. Q. (2000). *Ethnic studies: Issues and approaches*. SUNY Press.

Yang, P. Q. (2021). Race, gender, and perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Black Studies*, *52*(5), 509–527. https://doi.org/10.1177/00219347211006486

Notes on Contibutors

Philip Q. Yang is Professor of Sociology at Texas Woman's University. He is the author of three books, the editor of four books, and an author of more than 100 articles on race and ethnicity, immigration, citizenship, transnationalism, Asian Americans/immigrants, Chinese immigration and immigrants, and demography in numerous referred journals and edited volumes. His research has received funding from various sources including the National Science Foundation.

Sharon M. Henderson is a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at Texas Woman's University. Her areas of research interests include Black/African American studies, race and ethnic studies, criminology, and political sociology. Email: SHenderson6@twu.edu.

ORCID

Philip Q. Yang, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7454-2898
Sharon M. Henderson,