The Effects of Coronavirus Victimization Distress and Coronavirus Racial Bias on Mental Health Among Black, Indigenous and Latinx Young Adults in the United States

Celia B. Fisher [1,2 *], Xiangyu Tao [1], and Tiffany Yip [1]

[1]Department of Psychology, Fordham University, Bronx, New York, U.S.

[2] Center for Ethics Education, Fordham University, Bronx, New York, U.S.

* Corresponding Author: Fisher@fordham.edu

Brief Title: Effects of Coronavirus Victimization Distress and Racial Bias on Mental Health Among U.S. Ethnic Minority Adults

The Effects of Coronavirus Victimization Distress and Coronavirus Racial Bias on Mental Health Among Black, Indigenous and Latinx Young Adults in the United States

Abstract

Background. People of color in the U.S. have been disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in terms of rates of infection and morbidity. Explanations for these disparities include over-representation as essential workers and long-standing inequities in access to health services. Prior to the pandemic, racial discrimination has been associated with depression and general anxiety. However, the effect of discrimination and racial bias specific to the Coronavirus on mental health has not been examined. The aim of this study was to assess the effects of Coronavirus victimization distress and Coronavirus racial bias beliefs on the mental health of young adult people of color.

Method. An online survey administered to a national sample of 350 Black, Indigenous and Latinx adults (18 – 25 years) included Coronavirus health risks, prescription and financial security, measure of depression and anxiety and 2 new psychometrically validated measures for Coronavirus related victimization distress and racial bias.

Results. Employment, number of Coronavirus health risks, Coronavirus victimization distress and Coronavirus racial bias were positively correlated with each other and with depression and anxiety. By contrast, household income and perceived financial and prescription security were negatively correlated with Coronavirus victimization, Coronavirus racial bias and with the mental health indices. Structural equation modeling controlling for demographic variables indicated perceived Coronavirus racial bias mediated the effect of Coronavirus victimization distress on both mental health measures across all groups.

Conclusions. Results suggest the COVID-19 pandemic has created new pathways to mental health disparities among young adults of color by reversing formerly protective factors such as employment, and by exacerbating structural and societal inequities linked to race. Findings highlight the necessity of creating mental health services tailored to the specific needs of racial/ethnic minorities during the current and future health crises.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has amplified existing racial/ethnic disparities in the United States. People of color have higher risks of COVID-19 infection and mortality. Black, Indigenous and Latinx adults are at disproportionally higher risk. For example, as of July 28, 2020, Black, Indigenous, and Latinx people in the U.S. compared with other racial/ethnic groups accounted for greater proportions of Coronavirus infections among young adults ages 18 – 29 years (17.7%, 1.3%, 30.28%, respectively) and an even greater proportion of deaths (34.6%, 4.5%, 38.66%, respectively) (1). Disparities faced by people of color during the pandemic are rooted in long-standing inequities in access to health services and health outcomes (2-4). These include lower levels of treatment satisfaction and trust, utilization rate, and service outcome resulting in delay and lack of adherence to treatment uptake (3-5). Compared with other racial/ethnic groups Black, Indigenous and Latinx persons in the US also have higher rates of CDC identified medical conditions associated with risk of severe illness from COVID-19, including obesity, diabetes, asthma, and HIV (6-14). In addition, Black, Indigenous, and Latinx adults are more likely to be employed as lower skilled workers, and during the current crises, as essential workers (15, 16), which increases risk of COVID-19 exposure. In 2018, approximately 20% of employed Black and Latinx men worked in service occupations, compared to 13% of

White and Asian men (16). Although 11.9% of all workers are Black, they account for 17% of workers in Coronavirus frontline industries such as grocery and drug stores, public transportation, trucking, and health care (15). In addition to these longstanding disparities in healthcare, stay at home orders and reallocation of pharmaceuticals for emergency care have created barriers to prescriptions for health conditions related to higher risk for Coronavirus, placing people in lower economic strata and racially segregated communities at higher risk (17).

Mental health among people of color

People of color also suffer higher mental health risks compared to non-Hispanic whites (5, 18, 19). The National Center for Health Statistics (20) reported that Indigenous populations are 50% more likely to report hopelessness, worthlessness, and feelings of nervousness or restlessness compared to non-Hispanic Whites and 80% more likely to report frequent sadness. Black and Latinx women also report significantly greater depressive symptomatology than non-Hispanic White females (18, 21). Although the prevalence rates of major depression and general anxiety among Black and Latinx are often reported to be similar or lower than non-Hispanic Whites, these findings have been attributed to the fact people of color in the US seek mental health clinical care at rates well below their need and face discrimination during diagnosis and treatment, misdiagnosis and clinician bias (2, 5, 22-24). Other studies suggest the long-lasting effects of depression may be higher for African American and Caribbean Black men compared to non-Hispanic Whites (56% versus 38.6%) (25).

Factors contributing to mental health problems among people of color

The health, economic and employment disparities described above for people of color also contribute to increased internalizing disorders. Medical disparities currently identified as

increasing Coronavirus risk, have previously been shown to be associated with poor mental health in studies on the general population and on people of color specifically. For example, obesity and asthma have been associated with mood disorders and health-related quality of life among Black and Latinx populations in the U.S. (26-30). Relatedly, inadequate access to health care also contributes to depression and anxiety (31). Lower socioeconomic status (SES), financial and food insecurity in general have been associated with higher levels of depression and anxiety among Black and Latinx populations (32-39); although some studies found that higher SES is associated with depression among Black people (40-42). Past research has repeatedly reported on the protective effect of employment on mental health (43, 44). However, during the pandemic, employed individuals, especially those in positions involving in-person contact with others during working hours, are at higher risks of COVID-19 infection (45). Since racial/ethnic minorities are more likely to be employed in health care or low-wage jobs that are considered essential during the pandemic (31, 46), emerging reports indicate they are experiencing higher levels of depression and anxiety (47). Finally, although in general gender and sexual minority status among young adults is associated with increases in depression and anxiety (48, 49), intersecting ethnic and sexual minority identities have been identified as an increased risk factor for depression and suicidal ideation among Latinx and Black sexual minority men and women (50-54) and across people of color identified as transgender females (55, 56).

The relationship between racial/ethnic discrimination and systemic racism on depression and anxiety among people of color

People of color experience unique stressors related to their marginalized social identity that adversely contribute to depression and anxiety (57), including explicit racial/ethnic discrimination and microaggressions (58-61). Intergenerational trauma created by American slavery, colonialism, Jim Crow laws, and segregation, has been shown to effect both physical and psychological health among Black people (62-64). Loss and violation of sacred lands and a history of segregation of American Indian boarding schools and food programs is a significant stressor for Indigenous persons (12, 65). For Latinx people, studies have found significant association among documentation status (66, 67), fear of deportation (68), acculturation stress (69-71), and mental health status. Although to date, the effect of racial bias associated specifically with the Coronavirus on mental health has not been examined, the negative impact of racial/ethnic discrimination on physical and mental health has been well documented (58, 72-76). Based on the stress and coping framework (77), racial/ethnic discrimination is a social stressor that affects physiological and psychological responses such as increased levels of heart rate, cortisol secretions, blood pressure, emotional reactivity, and reliance on maladaptive emotion-regulation strategies (72). These in turn lead to higher risks of both physical health problems such as obesity and cardiovascular disease (78-80), and internalizing disorders such as depression and anxiety (73).

Prior research on populations facing contagious disease discrimination

Research on victimization distress due to contagious diseases such as HIV, H1N1, and the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) has found that contagious disease discrimination is associated with long-term negative mental health outcomes including

depression and anxiety (81-84). For example, in a study on SARS-related stigma in Hong Kong, residents who lived in the first officially identified site of community outbreak reported they were marginalized in their work, social, and home environments and experienced high levels of psychological distress, which did not decrease during the post-SARS era (85, 86). Prior biases against marginalized social groups also play a role in disease discrimination. For example, in Malaysia, during the HINI Flu epidemic, farmers held misconceptions that societal "out-groups" such as sexual minorities, the homeless and sex workers had higher risks of infections, which in turn led to discrimination against these groups (87).

Individuals who have personally experienced a negative event may attribute the victimization to various factors, such as personal reasons and discrimination (88). Following an experience of Coronavirus related bullying or discrimination, people of color may attribute the event to racial/ethnic discrimination based on beliefs that the Coronavirus has increased systemic racism in the US. The attributional ambiguity perspective suggests that attributions to racial discrimination rather than personal attributions may be self-protective, buffer the harmful effect of negative events, and contribute to better mental health (89). However, recent studies have suggested that there are still harmful effects on mental health with attributions to discrimination (73). This suggests that perceived increases in systemic racism as a consequence of the Coronavirus pandemic may not only be directly related to increases in depression and anxiety but may mediate the influence of Coronavirus victimization on these mental health indices.

The current study

Although the devastating impact of COVID-19 on the health of people of color in the U.S. has been well established, there is a paucity of research on how individual and societal

factors are affecting the mental health of these populations. The current study conducted an anonymous online survey in April 2020 to examine the association among demographic variables, Coronavirus victimization distress, and Coronavirus racial bias with depression and anxiety among Black, Latinx and Indigenous young adults. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Employment status, sexual and gender minority identity, lower household income, financial and prescription insecurity, and number of COVID-19 health risks will be associated with higher levels of depression and anxiety among young adults of color.

2. Higher levels of victimization distress and perceived racial bias specifically related to the Coronavirus will be directly associated with depression and anxiety among young adults of color.

3. Coronavirus racial bias will mediate the association between Coronavirus victimization distress and depression and anxiety among young adults of color. The conceptual model for this mediating effect is provided in Table 1.

Figure 1. Conceptual model for the mediating effect of Coronavirus racial bias on the association between Coronavirus victimization distress and depression and anxiety.



Note. Conceptual model of the mediating effect of Coronavirus racial bias on the association between Coronavirus victimization distress and depression and anxiety. Structural equation modeling will test the model with the following covariates held constant: race/ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, employment, financial security, prescription security and COVID-19 health risks.

Methods

Participants

Data were collected during April 2020 as part of a larger Internet-based national survey on the biological, psychological and social impact of the Coronavirus pandemic among young adults from diverse racial/ethnic groups. For the current study, eligible participants self-identified as Black, Indigenous, or Latinx; were between 18 – 25 years of age; self-reported they did not currently have the Coronavirus; lived in the United States for more than one year; and could read English at an eighth-grade level.

Procedure and data validation

Recruitment was conducted by Qualtrics XM. Qualtrics XM is an aggregator of survey panel websites and can recruit individuals who have signed up to take paid surveys across multiple sites. Participants are paid in points which they can exchange for gift cards. For the current study, Qualtrics XM sent emails or provided posts to young adults who had signed up to take surveys through various survey websites and offered compensation worth $16.50 converted into the survey panel's point system. The emails and posts briefly described the study and provided a link to a screener on another Qualtrics site. The screener included questions on participants' age, race/ethnicity, assigned sex at birth, gender, sexual orientation, the US state

and zip code in which they lived, length of time living in the U.S., geographic region, living situation, employment and student status.

The target goal was to recruit a minimum of 100 participants from each of the 3 racial/ethnic groups and to over sample for individuals living in rural areas to obtain a representative geographic sample. A Qualtrics system feature excluded participants who did not meet eligibility criteria and prevented them from re-entering the screener. Manual data validation protocols were established to exclude fraudulent or repeat participants; consistency between age and date of birth; inconsistency between reported city in which the survey was taken and zip code, and responses with identical IP addresses. Qualtrics also includes a speed check to exclude participants who respond in less than half the time of the median survey response. Approximately 57,000 people were sent emails or posts. A total of 418 Black, 223 Indigenous, and 195 Latinx participants took the screener, with 469 meeting eligibility requirements. Of those 350 (74.63%) completed the survey and passed the speed check. For the purposes of this study, an additional 38 respondents were eliminated if they reported they had the Coronavirus and 7 were eliminated for missing data on the Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale, resulting in a final sample of 305 (42% Black, 28% Indigenous; 30% Latinx).

Following the screener, eligible individuals were immediately sent to a page providing informed consent information. Participants who selected “I agree” at the bottom of the informed consent page, were redirected to the main survey which consisted of 204 items which took on average 14.02 minutes (SD = 33.84); some participants took an hour or more to complete the survey resulting in the large standard deviation. Participants were able to quit the survey at any time by closing the survey window and their data was not included in analysis. At the end of the survey, online resources on health information and Coronavirus prevention were provided.

Qualtrics uses unique identification numbers for each participant so that identifiable information and survey data are not stored on Qualtrics servers. The identity of participants and their contact information were therefore unknown to the investigators. Participants received the agreed amount of incentive within seven days after they completed the survey to allow for data quality checks. The study was approved by the University Institutional Review Board.

Measures

Demographic information

Demographic information collected during screening included age, gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, employment (full or part-time; whether one was employed as an "essential worker"), student status, and region (urban, suburban, exurban, rural). Additional information included: household income; financial security; prescription security; and an 8 item checklist on CDC COVID-19 health risks. Item choices are provided in Table 1

Table 1. Frequency and percentages for sociodemographic characteristics and COVID-19 health risks for Black, Indigenous, and Latinx participants young adults ages 18 – 25 years.

	Black		**Indigenous**		**Latinx**		**Total**			
	(N = 128)		**(N = 86)**		**(N = 91)**		**(N = 305)**			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\mathbf{X^2}_{\mathbf{df}}$	***p***
Gender									X^2_4=2.02	.73
Cisgender Male	31	14.21	23	26.74	17	18.68	71	23.28		
Cisgender Female	67	52.34	46	53.49	53	58.24	166	54.43		
Gender Minority	30	23.44	17	19.77	21	23.08	68	22.30		

Sexual Orientation									X^2_4= .65	.96
Heterosexual	91	71.09	59	68.6	61	67.03	211	69.18		
Sexual Minority	33	25.78	25	29.07	27	29.67	85	27.87		
Do not wish to answer	4	3.13	2	2.33	3	3.3	9	2.95		
Employment Status									X^2_4=1.45	.83
Not employed	55	42.97	34	39.53	32	35.16	121	39.67		
Essential workers	44	34.38	31	36.05	34	37.36	109	35.74		
Non-essential workers	29	22.67	21	24.42	25	27.47	75	24.59		
Student	73	57.03	45	52.33	56	61.54	174	57.05	X^2_2=1.53	.46
Financial Security									X^2_4=7.61	.11
I can’t make ends meet	46	35.94	23	26.74	22	24.18	91	29.84		
I have just enough	49	38.28	40	46.51	51	56.04	140	45.90		
I am comfortable	33	25.78	23	26.74	18	19.78	74	24.26		
Household Annual Income									X^2_6=1.83	.93
Less than $30,999	58	45.31	42	48.84	39	42.86	139	45.57		
$31,000 – $79,999	38	29.69	25	29.07	31	34.07	94	30.82		
More than $80,000	11	8.59	9	10.47	8	8.79	28	9.18		

I do not want to answer/I do not know	21	16.41	10	11.63	13	14.29	44	14.43		
Education Level									X^2_8=13.89	.085
Partial high school or less	11	8.59	9	10.47	14	15.38	34	11.15		
High school graduate	59	46.09	29	33.72	23	25.27	111	36.39		
Some college	41	21.09	34	27.91	37	23.08	112	36.72		
Graduate degree	15	11.72	12	13.95	17	18.68	44	14.43		
Missing data	2	1.56	2	2.33	0	0	4	1.31		
Region									**X^2_6=22.60**	**.001**
Urban	35	27.34	25	29.07	30	32.97	90	29.51		
Suburban	43	33.59	35	40.7	42	46.15	120	39.34		
Exurban	4	3.13	9	10.47	9	9.89	22	7.21		
Rural	46	35.94	17	19.77	10	10.99	73	23.93		
Prescription Security									X^2_6=6.81	.57
No, because of costs or lack of insurance	19	14.84	9	10.47	16	17.58	44	14.43		
No, unable to reach a doctor to get a prescription I need	25	19.53	10	11.63	14	15.38	49	16.07		
No, have not been able to get to a pharmacy to pick up my prescription	8	6.25	7	8.14	4	4.4	19	6.23		

Yes, have been able to fill my prescription needs	26	20.31	20	23.26	24	26.37	70	22.95		
Have not had any prescription needs	50	39.06	40	46.51	33	36.26	123	40.33		
COVID-19 Health risks [a]										
Asthma or chronic lung disease	21	16.41	24	27.91	23	25.27	68	22.30	$X^2_1 = 4.59$	.10
Heart condition	16	12.50	12	13.95	9	9.89	37	12.13	$X^2_1 = .71$	.70
HIV	7	5.47	4	4.65	6	6.59	17	5.57	$X^2_1 = .32$	.85
Rheumatoid Arthritis	10	7.81	8	9.30	8	8.79	26	8.52	$X^2_1 = .16$	.94
Other immunocompromised disease	8	6.25	11	12.79	9	9.89	28	9.18	$X^2_1 = 2.72$	.26
Cancer treatment	6	4.69	7	8.14	5	5.49	18	5.90	$X^2_1 = 1.14$	.56
Diabetes	11	8.59	9	10.47	8	8.79	28	9.18	$X^2_1 = .24$	.89
Obesity	17	13.28	14	16.28	14	15.38	45	14.75	$X^2_1 = .41$	.81

[a] Mean number of COVID-19 Health risks, standard deviations and range for each group are provided in Table 5.

Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale (CVDS)

The Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale (CVDS) is a 5-item scale adapted from items in the Daily Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire (90), the LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale (91), and the Adolescent Discrimination Distress Index (ADDI) (75). The items assess distress in response to different instances of victimization (e.g. “teased or bullied”, “physically threatened”) resulting from other’s believing the participant was a

Coronavirus risk. Each item was formatted as "I have been […] because someone thought I was infected with the Coronavirus." Responses were on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = It never happened, 2 = It happened but did not upset me; 3 = It happened and upset me a little; 4 = It happened and upset me moderately; 5 = It happened and upset me quite a bit).

Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale (CRBS)

The Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale (CRBS) is a 9-item scale developed to assess participants' beliefs about how the Coronavirus is negatively affecting societal attitudes toward one's race/ethnicity. Sample items include "I believe the country has become more dangerous for people in my racial/ethnic group because of fear of the Coronavirus"; "People of my race/ethnicity are more likely to lose their job because of the Coronavirus"; Negative social media posts against people of my race/ethnicity have increased because of the Coronavirus." Participants indicated their Coronavirus racial bias beliefs on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 – Strongly disagree, 4 – Strongly agree).

Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)

The 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) was used to assess the frequency of past-month experiences with depressive symptoms (92). Sample Items include "Trouble falling asleep, staying asleep, or sleeping too much" and "Feeling down, depressed or hopeless". Responses are scored on a 4-point scale, anchored by (0) Not at All and (3) Nearly Every Day. Composite scale scores are computed by the average of item responses. In prior studies, Cronbach's alpha for this scale ranged from .79 to .91 across adults identifying as Black,

Indigenous, and Latinx (93-95). The measurement invariance of the PHQ-9 across Black, Indigenous, Latinx and Non-Hispanic White young adults has been established (96-98).

General Anxiety Disorder Screener (GAD-7)

The 7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder Screener (GAD-7) (99) was used to assess anxiety symptoms of participants during the past month. Sample items include “Being so restless that it is hard to sit still” and “Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen”. Participants respond to a 4-point scale, anchored by (0) *not at all* and (3) *nearly every day*. Composite scale scores are computed by the average of item responses. In prior studies, Cronbach’s alpha for GAD-7 ranged from .79 to .91 across adults identifying as Black, Indigenous, and Latinx (100-104).

Data analysis plan

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all demographic variables. This was followed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Chi-square tests to assess differences on these variables among the 3 racial/ethnic groups. To determine the independence and structure of the Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale and the Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale, several confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted followed by Cronbach alphas to assess resulting scale reliability. Measurement invariance was then tested to assess whether the constructs of the Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale and Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale were the same across the three racial/ethnic minority groups (105). Correlational analyses and ANOVAs were then conducted to examine: (1) the associations among Coronavirus victimization distress, Coronavirus racial bias, and demographic variables; and (2) differences on

depression and anxiety levels based on demographic variables, Coronavirus victimization distress and Coronavirus racial bias.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) using the R-4.0.1. and *lavaan* package (106, 107) to test the a priori conceptual model based on research hypotheses, which assessed the hypothesis that Coronavirus racial bias exerted a mediating role of Coronavirus racial bias on the effect of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety. Two SEM analyses were conducted, with the first analysis estimated the effect across all racial/ethnic groups, and the second multigroup analysis estimated the effect for each racial/ethnic group separately. An alternative model was then examined, which reversed the relationship between Coronavirus racial bias and Coronavirus victimization distress, with the Coronavirus victimization distress mediated the relationship between Coronavirus racial bias and depression or anxiety.

Goodness of fit indices included the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA). A fit of > 0.95 for the CFI and TLI and < 0.06 for RMSEA was considered to indicate adequate fit (108). To test the indirect effects for statistical significance, the bias-corrected bootstrapping approach was adopted as it is robust against the violation of normal distribution assumptions for both the sampling distribution and indirect effect (109). One thousand re-samples were drawn to estimate the standard errors of the indirect effects and their 95% confidence intervals.

Results

Descriptive data

The sample included 305 participants (Mean age = 20.84, SD = 2.19, range =18 – 25) self-identified as, Black (N = 128; Mean age = 20.71, SD = 2.15), Indigenous (N = 86; Mean age = 21.30, SD = 2.41) and Latinx (N = 91%; Mean age = 20.58, SD = 1.99). An ANOVA indicated no significant age differences across groups ($F_{2, 203} = 2.80$, $p = .06$). Demographic data, percentages and Chi square tests of significance provided in Table 1 for each racial/ethnic group. Across race/ethnicity the majority identified as cisgender females or cisgender males, reported heterosexual sexual orientation, were full or part-time employed (60.33%; including 35.74% essential workers); and approximately half were students. Nearly one third (29.8%) indicated they felt financially insecure ("can't make ends meet"). Approximately 45.57% reporting an annual household income below the national poverty rate for a family of 5 ($30,680) (110).

On average participants reported 1.52 COVID-19 pre-existing health risks (range = 0 – 8). The mean and standard deviation (SD) for health risks for each group was: Black (Mean = .75, SD = 1.34, range = 0 – 7); Indigenous (Mean = 1.03, SD = 1.85, range = 0 – 8); and Latinx (Mean = .90, SD = 1.43, range = 0 – 6). The distributions are highly skewed (skewness > 2 for each group), as more than half of Black (65.62%), Indigenous (56.98%), and Latinx (53.84%) participants did not report COVID-19 health risks. As indicated in Table 1, across groups thirty-seven percent reported difficulty filling prescriptions during the past month. Chi-square tests yielded no significant differences among the three racial/ethnic groups for the above demographic categories, except for region, which included a higher percentage of Black participants in rural areas.

Psychometric validation of the Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale (CVDS) and Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale (CRBS)

As a prerequisite for the SEM analysis, three confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to determine the independence and structure of the Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale (CVDS) and the Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale (CRBS). Model 1 included all items on both scales. Table 2 provides factor loadings of items on each scale. In this model, modification indices (MI = 39.54) indicated a strong correlated error between item 7 on the CRBS ("Due to the Coronavirus I have been cyberbullied because of my race/ethnicity") and the CVDS (111). For that reason, item 7 on the CRBS was removed from the scale. Model 2 included all five items on the CVDS and 8 items on the CRBS. Finally, to yield higher reliability and communalities for the SEM (112), Model 3 was developed, with all five items on CVDS and four parcels constructed from the 8-item CRBS, which were created by randomly pairing two items together and calculating the mean.

Table 2. Factor loadings for Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale and Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale based on CFA Model 1.

	Coronavirus Victimization Distress	**Coronavirus Racial Bias**
I have been teased or bullied because someone thought I was infected with the Coronavirus	**.752**	.321
I have been physically threatened, hit or beaten up because someone thought I was infected with the Coronavirus	**.870**	.339
I have been treated rudely or unfairly because someone thought I was infected with the Coronavirus	**.825**	.312

I have been verbally taunted or called bad names in public because someone thought I was infected with the Coronavirus	**.787**	.303
I have been cyberbullied because someone thought I was infected with the Coronavirus	**.863**	.322
Due to the Coronavirus I have been cyberbullied because of my race/ethnicity	.570	.659 [a]
Since the Coronavirus I have seen a lot more cyberbullying of people of my race/ethnicity	.424	**.689**
Negative social media posts against people of my race/ethnicity have increased because of the Coronavirus	.377	**.744**
I worry about people thinking I have the Coronavirus simply because of my race/ethnicity.	.339	**.731**
People of my race/ethnicity are more likely to get the Coronavirus	.338	**.766**
Most social and mass media reports about the Coronavirus create bias against people of my racial/ethnic group.	.277	**.719**
People of my race/ethnicity will not receive Coronavirus healthcare as good the care received by other groups	.209	**.547**
I believe the country has become more dangerous for people in my racial/ethnic group because of fear of the Coronavirus.	.192	**.613**

People of my race/ethnicity are more likely to lose their job because of the Coronavirus.	.042	**.480**

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

[a] This item was removed from final scale based on analysis of confirmatory factor analysis.

Table 3 shows the $\chi 2$ statistic and the global model fit indices of the three hypothesized CFA models. Model 2 had a relatively good fit based on all three model fit indices including the global fit index root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fix Index (CFI), and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI). However, model 3 fit the data best among all tested models, and met rule of thumb criteria for adequate fit (RMSEA < .06, CFI and TLI > .95) (108). Both resultant scales had high demonstrated internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .91 for CVDS, Cronbach's alpha = .86 for CRBS). The two scales were positively correlated (r = .43, p < .001).

Table 3. Global model fit indices of CFA models for Coronavirus Victimization Distress and Coronavirus Racial Bias items.

Model	**$\chi 2$**	***df***	**RMSEA**	**CFI**	**TLI**
1	220.21	76	.079	.935	.922
2	139.66	64	.062	.962	.953
3	34.24	26	.032	.995	.993

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = Comparative Fix Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index.

Measurement invariance of the CVDS and the CRBS across Black, Latinx and Indigenous

The measurement invariance of model 3 across Black, Indigenous, and Latinx participants was examined (See Table 4 for detailed results). The sequence of tests of measurement invariance included configural invariance, metric invariance, scalar invariance, and strict invariance. The null hypothesis of the χ2 difference test was that the more restricted invariance model (e.g., metric invariance) fit the data equally as well as the less restricted invariance model (e.g., configural invariance). Thus, the χ2 difference test of the two nested invariance models in the sequence should ideally be non-significant or there should be no material change in RMSEA (105, 113). With the exception of the invariance model, the models were not statistically different, and the RMSEA change of strict invariance from scalar invariance did not increase noticeably (change ≤ .01), supporting measurement invariance of the CVDS and CRBS across the three racial/ethnic groups.

Table 4. Global model fit indices of measurement invariance tests for the CVDS and CRBS

Invariance Model	χ^2	***df***	**χ^2 difference test**			**RMSEA**
			Comparison	**χ^2(*df*)**	**p**	
Configural	109.10	78				.063
Metric	124.31	92	Configural	15.21 (14)	.36	.059
Scalar	145.87	106	Metric	21.56 (14)	.088	.061
Strict	160.57	110	Scalar	14.70 (4)	.0054	.067

Racial/ethnic and demographic differences on the CVDS and CRBS

Mean scores on the CVDS and CRBS among the 3 racial/ethnic groups are illustrated in Table 5. An ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-hoc comparison (p = .001) indicated Black and Latinx participants had significantly higher scores on the CRBS than Indigenous respondents, but no significant racial/ethnic differences emerged for the CVDS. Gender minority persons reported higher scores on the CVDS ($F(2,302) = 7.78$, $p = .001$) and CRBS ($F(2,302) = 4.39$, $p = .013$) than cisgender females (p=.01, p<.001, respectively), but did not differ from males. There were no significant differences between participants employed as essential workers and those employed in other positions, so employment was combined as one category. Employed participants compared to non-employed reported higher scores on the CVDS ($F(1,303) = 15.65$, $p < .001$) and the CRBS ($F(1,303) = 4.77$, p =.03). There were no significant differences between participants who did not have any prescription needs or were able to fill their prescriptions and as a group these participants reported lower levels of CVDS ($F(1,303) = 70.33$, $p < .001$) and CRBS ($F(1,303) = 17.15$, $p < .001$) than those reporting prescription difficulties. Pearson's correlation tests indicated significant positive correlations between the number of COVID-19 health risks and scores on the CVDS ($r = .39$, $p < .001$) and CRBS ($r = 17$, $p < .01$). There were no differences on CVDS and CRBS based on age, sexual orientation, financial security, or annual household income.

Table 5. Means, standard deviations, and ranges for COVID-19 health risks, CVDS, CRBS, PHQ-9, and GAD-7 for Black, Indigenous, and Latinx participants.

	Black (N = 128)	**Indigenous (N = 86)**	**Latinx (N = 91)**	**Total (N = 305)**		
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	***F***	***p***

	Range	Range	Range	Range	**(df1, df2)**	
COVID-19 Health Risks	.75 (1.34) Range = 0 – 7	1.03 (1.85) Range = 0 – 8	.90 (1.43) Range = 0 – 6	.88 (1.52) Range = 0 – 8	.92 (2, 302)	.55
Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale (CVDS)	1.67 (.96) Range = 1 – 5	1.60 (.98) Range = 1 – 5	1.65 (.90) Range = 1 – 3.6	1.64 (.94) Range = 1 – 5	.17 (2,302)	.84
Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale (CRBS)	2.35 (.74) Range = 1 – 4	1.97 (.74) Range = 1 – 4	2.26 (.67) Range = 1 – 4	2.21 (.74) Range = 1 – 4	7.11 (2, 203)	**.001**
Patient Health Questionnaire□9 (PHQ□9)	2.28 (.81) Range = 1 – 4	2.37 (.83) Range = 1 – 4	2.32 (.76) Range = 1 – 4	2.32 (.80) Range = 1 – 4	.30 (2, 203)	.74
Generalized Anxiety Disorder Screener (GAD-7)	2.31 (.87) Range = 1 – 4	2.47 (.84) Range = 1 – 4	2.46 (.79) Range = 1 – 4	2.40 (.84) Range = 1 – 4	1.24 (2, 203)	.29

Relationship of race/ethnicity, CVDS and CRBS and other demographic variables with mental health indices

Before examining the SEM model, Pearson's correlation analyses were conducted to examine relationships among demographic variables and the CVDS and CRBS and the mental health indices (See Table 6). Consistent with hypotheses 1, employment status, sexual orientation, and number of COVID-19 health risks were significantly and positively associated with scores on the PHQ-9 and GAD-7 and financial and prescription security were significantly and negatively associated with the mental health indices. There were no racial/ethnic, age, gender, or household income differences on either mental health indices.

Table 6. Correlation matrix of all study variables and potential covariates.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale (CVDS)	1	.38***	.25***	.19***	.027	-.042	.11	.090	.22***	.39***	-.085	-.43***	.069
2. Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale (CRBS)		1	.30***	.25***	.17***	-.10	.086	.059	.12*	.17**	-.061	-.23***	-.021
3. Depression (PHQ-9)			1	.82***	-.031	-.11	.109	.24***	.16**	.25***	-.23***	-.19***	.046
4. Anxiety (GAD-7)				1	-.018	-.089	.057	.21***	.14*	.22***	-.20***	-.15*	.041
5. Race/ethnicity					1	-.13*	.063	.00	.022	-.046	-.033	-.069	.017
6. Age						1	-.090	-.048	.12*	-.042	-.071	.003	.034
7. Gender							1	.22***	-.022	.12*	-.041	-.021	-.15*
8. Sexual Orientation								1	.029	.056	-.098	-.040	-.010
9. Employment									1	.22***	.085	-.23***	.16**
10. COVID-19 Health Risks										1	-.13*	-.19***	-.001

11. Financial Security											1	.14**	.19**
12. Prescription Security												1	.062
13. Household Income													1

Note. N = 305. CVDS and CRBS are both mean scores from the two scales. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Tests of the mediation hypothesis

As illustrated in Table 6, consistent with hypothesis 2, scores on the CVDS and CRBS were significantly and positively associated with depression and anxiety measures. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was conducted to test the third hypothesis that perceived Coronavirus racial bias mediates the effect of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety. Gender, age, sexual orientation, financial security, COVID-19 health risks, prescription security, and employment status were added as covariates based on significant associations between these factors and studied variables. Household income was not included as a covariate since there were 14.43% missing data, and it was unrelated to mental health, CVDS or CRBS. To accommodate the use of categorical exogenous variables, parameters were estimated using weighted least squares with robust standard errors (WLSMV) (107). Missing data (N = 9) on sexual orientation were handled by listwise deletion (107). Model fit statistics are summarized for two SEM analyses in Table 7. The first analysis, which posited Coronavirus racial bias as the mediator of the effect of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety, with racial/ethnic groups added as a covariate, showed adequate fit on all three fit indices including the RMSEA (.034), 90% CI [.019 .047], CFI (.980), and TCL (.972). Based on the same model, a multigroup

analysis for three racial/ethnic minority groups was then conducted and adequate fit (RMSEA = .048, 90% CI [.029 .063], CFI = .965, TLI = .954) was found.

Table 7. Global model fit indices of structural equation models.

	χ2	*df*	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
Main Model	158.85	118	.034	.980	.972
Multigroup Analysis	389.31	320	.047	.967	.956
Alternative Model	226.89	119	.055	.947	.927

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = Comparative Fix Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index.

The first analysis (Fig 2) which included all participants and race/ethnicity as a covariate generated the best model fit statistics with sufficient power. Table 8 illustrates the standardized direct, indirect, and total effects of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety through Coronavirus racial bias. In this model, Coronavirus victimization distress had significant indirect effects on depression and anxiety (ß = .102, p =.006, 95% CI [.023, 0.115], ß = .095, p =.006, 95% CI [.024, .117], respectively); direct and total effects were non-significant. The analysis indicates that Coronavirus racial bias beliefs fully accounted for the influence of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety.

Figure 2. Standardized results for structural equation model 1 with bootstrapping approach testing the mediating effect of Coronavirus racial bias on the association between Coronavirus victimization distress and depression and anxiety.



Note. Fig 2. Structural equation model 1 standardized results with bootstrapping approach testing the mediating effect of Coronavirus racial bias on the association between Coronavirus victimization distress and depression and anxiety. Covariates included race/ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, employment status, financial security, healthcare, and COVID-19 health risks

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 8. Total, direct and indirect standardized effects of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety based on the first SEM analysis

Paths		***B***	**95% CI**
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Depression	Total Effect	·142	[-.004, .164]
	Indirect Effect	.102	[.023, .115]*
	Direct Effect	.040	[-.087, .116]

Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Anxiety	Total Effect	.104	[-.022, .153]
	Indirect Effect	.095	[.024, .117]*
	Direct Effect	.009	[-.102, .100]

* Statistically significant result based on 95% CI.

Test of Alternative Hypothesis

To further investigate support for the model above, a third SEM analysis considered an alternative model which posited Coronavirus victimization distress as the mediator of the effect of Coronavirus racial bias on depression and anxiety. We found an acceptable fit based on values of RMSEA and CFI, but the TLI (.927) did not support adequate fit (See Table 7). Moreover, the standardized direct, indirect, and total effects were not statistically significant.

Exploratory Analysis

The Black subsample had adequate power (=.80) to conduct the SEM; however, the Indigenous and Latinx groups needed another six and two participants, respectively, to achieve sufficient power (114). To inform future studies, we conducted exploratory analysis to examine the same model separately for the three racial/ethnic minority groups. Table 9 presents the standardized direct, indirect, and total effects of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety through Coronavirus racial bias for each racial/ethnic minority group. Similar to the results of the main model, significant indirect effects on depression were found for both Indigenous (ß = .146, p =. 083, 95% CI [.011, .226]) and Black (ß = .090, p =.032, 95% CI

[.012, .120]) participants, yet indirect effects on anxiety were not significant. Unexpectedly, for Latinx participants, Coronavirus victimization distress had significant direct (ß = .270, p =.034, 95% CI [.010, .321], ß = .250, p =.031, 95% CI [.009, .314], respectively) and total effects (ß = .331, p =.002, 95% CI [.064, .327], ß = .334, p =.001, 95% CI [.074 .343], respectively) on depression and anxiety, although the indirect effects were not significant.

Table 9. Total, direct and indirect standardized effects of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression and anxiety for each racial/ethnic minority group based on the multigroup SEM analysis

Paths		***B***	**95% CI**
Black			
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Depression	Total Effect	.162	[-.054, .278]
	Indirect Effect	.090	[.009, .110]*
	Direct Effect	.072	[-.121, .228]
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Anxiety	Total Effect	.083	[-.126, .196]
	Indirect Effect	.076	[-.003, .123]
	Direct Effect	-.038	[-.196, .157]

Indigenous			
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Depression	Total Effect	.033	[-.135, .133]
	Indirect Effect	.146	[.011, .231]*
	Direct Effect	-.112	[-.274, .055]
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Anxiety	Total Effect	.040	[-.129, .146]
	Indirect Effect	.125	[-.012, .203]
	Direct Effect	-.084	[-.243, .098]
Latinx			
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial Bias → Depression	Total Effect	.331	[.062, .334]*
	Indirect Effect	.061	[-.047, .130]
	Direct Effect	.270	[.002, .334]*
Coronavirus Victimization Distress → Coronavirus Racial	Total Effect	.334	[.074, .362]*

Bias → Anxiety	Indirect Effect	.084	[-.031, .144]
	Direct Effect	.250	[.011, .324]*

* Statistically significant result based on 95% CI.

Discussion

People of color in the United States have been disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in terms of rates of infection and morbidity. Explanations for these disparities include over-representation as essential workers and long-standing inequities in financial security and access to health services associated with racial/ethnic discrimination. Prior to the pandemic, racial and ethnic discrimination has been associated with poor mental health. Our data demonstrate that in addition to employment and health risks, victimization experiences and perceived increases in systemic racial biases specifically associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are related to higher levels of depression and anxiety among Black, Indigenous and Latinx young adults across geographic regions of the U.S.

Prior studies have indicated that employment is a protective factor against mental health problems (43, 44). However, as indicated by the present study, the COVID-19 pandemic represents a unique situation in which young adults of color who are employed face greater risk for depression and anxiety. Our study suggests this is due not only to the infection risks associated with work outside the home during this period, but to victimization by others based on social perceptions that people of color are more likely to be infected with the virus. Past research has also shown that sexual and gender minority status, medical conditions and financial

insecurity have direct impact on depression and anxiety among Black, Indigenous and Latinx young adults (26, 27, 32-42, 48-56). Our results are consistent with past research indicating the above factors are associated with internalizing disorders, and also demonstrates that during the COVID-19 pandemic, prescription insecurity can contribute to mental health risk. Prior research has shown an association between the pre-existing conditions now associated with increased Coronavirus risk. Since the incidence of these pre-existing conditions are disproportionately high among people of color, in particular obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and chronic illness (6-14, 115-119), it is not surprising that our study demonstrated an association between the number of Coronavirus health risks and mental health indices. Of note, is that 28% and 22% of our participants identified as sexual or gender minorities, respectively. As both persons of color and members of sexual and gender minority groups, the current COVID-19 crisis is likely exacerbating mental health stressors due to lack of access to the medical care resulting from multiple barriers such as medical mistrust, provider bias, and lack of insurance (2, 5, 22-24).

Coronavirus victimization distress and Coronavirus racial bias

This study provides evidence for the psychometric validity of two new scales: The Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale and the Coronavirus Racial Bias Scale. These scales offered the opportunity to examine the relationship among Coronavirus specific discrimination and perceived racial bias, demographic factors, and mental health. We found that participants who were employed and reported prescription insecurity and more COVID-19 health risks reported higher levels of Coronavirus victimization and Coronavirus racial bias. These findings underscore the fact, that in addition to health and economic disparities, Black, Indigenous and Latinx young adults are bearing a disproportionate social burden during the current health crises.

The level of Coronavirus victimization distress and percentage of participants reporting other risk factors did not differ across different racial/ethnic groups, with one exception: Black and Latinx respondents reported higher levels of Coronavirus racial bias than Indigenous young adults. This finding may be explained by news and social media reports during April 2020 at the time this study was conducted. These reports identified COVID-19 infections among Black and Latinx as the most vulnerable groups for COVID-19 infection and death (6, 120), with outbreaks on tribal lands largely ignored by the federal government, mainstream media and online tracking (121); although recent studies suggest a relationship between household characteristics and infection rates on reservations (122). Thus, at the time this survey was conducted, Indigenous participants may have been less likely to have been exposed to public expressions of Coronavirus related racial bias against their group.

Results of our main SEM analysis for the full sample indicate that Coronavirus victimization distress was not directly associated with mental health, as the effect was fully mediated by Coronavirus racial bias beliefs. This finding was strengthened by the results of the alternative SEM model which did not find any mediation effect of Coronavirus victimization distress on the relationship of Coronavirus racial bias to mental health indices. These findings may be explained by prior work on attribution theory, suggesting that in certain instances members of marginalized groups may attribute negative social experiences to racial discrimination, which in turn has a harmful effect on mental health (73, 88). Thus, participants in the present study may have attributed the bullying, threats, and unfair treatment described in the Coronavirus Victimization Distress Scale items to perceived increases in racial biases created by the pandemic.

Although the results of separate group SEM analysis must be viewed with caution given the smaller sample size resulting in lower statistical power, they raise questions for future research. Similar to the results of the main model, for Black and Indigenous participants, Coronavirus racial bias continued to mediate the effects of Coronavirus victimization distress on depression, although the effect was not significant for anxiety. By contrast, for Latinx participants, Coronavirus victimization distress had significant direct effects on depression and anxiety which was not mediated by perceived Coronavirus racial bias. One explanation for this finding, which needs further investigation, is the statistically powerful effect that sexual minority status had on mental health indices among the Latinx respondents. Thirty-three percent of Latinx participants identified as sexual minorities in this sample. Thus, these young adults may have been more likely to attribute Coronavirus victimization to social biases against sexual minorities than to discrimination based on their ethnicity (123).

Limitations and future directions

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the relationship to mental health of victimization distress and perceived racial bias directly related to the Coronavirus among Black, Indigenous and Latinx young adults. However, due to the cross-sectional nature of the survey, we are unable to interpret the results as definitive of mediation or causation. It will be important for future studies to examine the longitudinal impact of Coronavirus victimization distress and associated racial bias beliefs on mental health among young adults within these populations. In addition, our data collection and recruitment methods yielded a geographically diverse national sample of Black, Indigenous and Latinx young adults; however, this methodology does not allow for absolute certainty that inclusion criteria were met and also limited participation those with Internet or mobile phone access and who had previously registered for online surveys.

This study developed and psychometrically validated new measures of victimization and racial bias associated with the current pandemic. This validation was limited to the sample surveyed and future research will assess the extent to which it will be validated on other Black, Indigenous and Latinx populations as well as other racial/ethnic groups in the U.S. For example, although the infection and morbidity rate of Asian heritage groups in the U.S. has not met levels seen among the populations included in this study, since April, reports of Coronavirus victimization and racial bias against Asian groups has increased and is worthy of study (124). Relatedly we found somewhat different patterns in the relationship of victimization distress and racial bias to mental health indices among the 3 different groups. Studies with larger sample sizes to achieve necessary power for each of these groups will help understand the extent to which these differences will be replicated. Finally, our data also suggest, that for some populations, minority stress associated with sexual orientation may have a greater influence on interpretations of Coronavirus related victimization. It will be fruitful to examine if this is tied to the legacy of HIV/AIDS discrimination among sexual minority young adults (125).

Conclusions

The mental health of people of color in the United States has been associated with longstanding experiences of racial and ethnic discrimination and systemic bias. This study highlights how the current COVID-19 pandemic has added to these mental health burdens through increases in Coronavirus victimization and perceived racial bias experienced by Black, Indigenous and Latinx young adults. These findings also demonstrate how an infectious disease crisis can reverse the usual protective effects of employment on mental health, when working people of color are more likely to be employed in settings that increase their exposure to

infection and subsequent social bias. In addition, this study underscores the deleterious effects on mental health of Coronavirus health risks and associated prescription insecurity and the continuing vulnerabilities associated with financial insecurity and sexual minority status. In addition to ongoing efforts to increase multicultural mental health services, these findings highlight the urgency of mental health services tailored to the specific needs of racial/ethnic minorities during the current and future health crises.

References

1. CDC. Demographic Trends of COVID-19 cases and deaths in the US reported to CDC. 2020.

2. Nestor BA, Cheek SM, Liu RT. Ethnic and racial differences in mental health service utilization for suicidal ideation and behavior in a nationally representative sample of adolescents. Journal of affective disorders. 2016;202:197-202.

3. Manuel JI. Racial/Ethnic and Gender Disparities in Health Care Use and Access. Health Services Research. 2018;53(3):1407-29.

4. Ben J, Cormack D, Harris R, Paradies Y. Racism and health service utilisation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLOS ONE. 2017;12(12):e0189900.

5. Chen JA. Psychiatric Symptoms and Diagnoses Among U.S. College Students: A Comparison by Race and Ethnicity. Psychiatric services (Washington, DC). 2019;70(6):442-9.

6. El Chaar M, King K, Galvez Lima A. Are black and Hispanic persons disproportionately affected by COVID-19 because of higher obesity rates? Surgery for Obesity and Related Diseases. 2020.

7. Cho P, Geiss LS, Burrows NR, Roberts DL, Bullock AK, Toedt ME. Diabetes-Related Mortality Among American Indians and Alaska Natives, 1990–2009. American Journal of Public Health. 2014;104(S3):S496-S503.

8. Gold DR, Wright R. Population disparities in asthma. Annu Rev Public Health. 2005;26:89-113.

9. Peek ME, Cargill A, Huang ES. Diabetes health disparities. Medical Care Research and Review. 2007;64(5_suppl):101S-56S.

10. Beavis AL, Gravitt PE, Rositch AF. Hysterectomy□corrected cervical cancer mortality rates reveal a larger racial disparity in the United States. Cancer. 2017;123(6):1044-50.

11.Bancks MP, Kershaw K, Carson AP, Gordon-Larsen P, Schreiner PJ, Carnethon MR. Association of Modifiable Risk Factors in Young Adulthood With Racial Disparity in Incident Type 2 Diabetes During Middle Adulthood. JAMA. 2017;318(24):2457.

12. Warne D, Lajimodiere D. American Indian health disparities: Psychosocial influences. Social and Personality Psychology Compass. 2015;9(10):567-79.

13. Peng TY, Ehrlich SF, Crites Y, Kitzmiller JL, Kuzniewicz MW, Hedderson MM, et al. Trends and racial and ethnic disparities in the prevalence of pregestational type 1 and type 2 diabetes in Northern California: 1996–2014. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2017;216(2):177.e1-.e8.

14. Flegal KM, Kruszon-Moran D, Carroll MD, Fryar CD, Ogden CL. Trends in Obesity Among Adults in the United States, 2005 to 2014. JAMA. 2016;315(21):2284.

15.Rho HJ, Brown H, Fremstad S. A basic demographic profile of workers in frontline industries. Center for Economic and Policy Research. 2020.

16. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity, 2018. US Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2019.

17. CDC. Groups at Higher Risk for Severe Illness 2020 [updated May 14, 2020. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/groups-at-higher-risk.html.

18. Longmire-Avital B. Young, Depressed, and Black: A Comparative Exploration of Depressive Symptomatology Among Black and White Collegiate Women. Journal of college student psychotherapy. 2018;32(1):53-72.

19. Baldwin JA, Eaves ER, Brown BG, Elwell K, Williamson HJ. The Behavioral Health of American Indian/Alaska Native Populations: Risk and Resiliency. Springer International Publishing; 2020. p. 205-30.

20. National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States, 2015: with special feature on racial and ethnic health disparities. Washington (DC): US Government Printing Office. 2016.

21. Shattell MM, Smith KM, Quinlan-Colwell A, Villalba JA. Factors Contributing to Depression in Latinas of Mexican Origin Residing in the United States: Implications for Nurses. 2008;14(3):193-204.

22. Alegría M, Canino G, Shrout PE, Woo M, Duan N, Vila D, et al. Prevalence of mental illness in immigrant and non-immigrant U.S. Latino groups. The American journal of psychiatry. 2008;165(3):359-69.

23. Vilsaint CL, NeMoyer A, Fillbrunn M, Sadikova E, Kessler RC, Sampson NA, et al. Racial/ethnic differences in 12-month prevalence and persistence of mood, anxiety, and substance use disorders: Variation by nativity and socioeconomic status. Comprehensive psychiatry. 2019;89:52-60.

24. Shao Z, Richie WD, Bailey RK. Racial and Ethnic Disparity in Major Depressive Disorder. Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities. 2016;3(4):692-705.

25. Williams DR, Gonzalez HM, Neighbors H, Nesse R, Abelson JM, Sweetman J, et al. Prevalence and distribution of major depressive disorder in African Americans, Caribbean blacks,

and non-Hispanic whites: results from the National Survey of American Life. Archives of general psychiatry. 2007;64(3):305-15.

26. Sherr L, Cluver L. World Health Day focus on HIV and depression-a comorbidity with specific challenges. J Int AIDS Soc. 2017;20(1).

27. Schachter J, Martel J, Lin C-S, Chang C-J, Wu T-R, Lu C-C, et al. Effects of obesity on depression: a role for inflammation and the gut microbiota. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity. 2018;69:1-8.

28. Assari S. Association between obesity and depression among American Blacks: role of ethnicity and gender. Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities. 2014;1(1):36-44.

29. Pate CA, Zahran HS, Bailey CM. Impaired health-related quality of life and related risk factors among US adults with asthma. Journal of Asthma. 2019;56(4):431-9.

30. Oh H, Stickley A, Singh F, Koyanagi A. Self-reported asthma diagnosis and mental health: Findings from the Collaborative Psychiatric Epidemiology Surveys. Psychiatry research. 2019;271:721-5.

31. Schneider EC, Zaslavsky AM, Epstein AM. Racial disparities in the quality of care for enrollees in Medicare managed care. Jama. 2002;287(10):1288-94.

32. Hoebel J, Maske UE, Zeeb H, Lampert T. Social inequalities and depressive symptoms in adults: the role of objective and subjective socioeconomic status. PloS one. 2017;12(1):e0169764.

33. Arenas DJ, Thomas A, Wang J, DeLisser HM. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Depression, Anxiety, and Sleep Disorders in US Adults with Food Insecurity. J Gen Intern Med. 2019;34(12):2874-82.

34. Lemstra M, Neudorf C, D'Arcy C, Kunst A, Warren LM, Bennett NR. A Systematic Review of Depressed Mood and Anxiety by SES in Youth Aged 10–15 Years. Canadian Journal of Public Health. 2008;99(2):125-9.

35. Nagata JM, Palar K, Gooding HC, Garber AK, Whittle HJ, Bibbins-Domingo K, et al. Food Insecurity Is Associated With Poorer Mental Health and Sleep Outcomes in Young Adults. J Adolesc Health. 2019;65(6):805-11.

36. Weinstein N, Stone DN. Need depriving effects of financial insecurity: Implications for well-being and financial behaviors. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General. 2018;147(10):1503.

37. Peplinski B, McClelland R, Szklo M. Associations between socioeconomic status markers and depressive symptoms by race and gender: results from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA). Annals of Epidemiology. 2018;28(8):535-42.e1.

38. McCurley JL, Gutierrez AP, Bravin JI, Schneiderman N, Reina SA, Khambaty T, et al. Association of social adversity with comorbid diabetes and depression symptoms in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos Sociocultural Ancillary Study: a syndemic framework. Annals of Behavioral Medicine. 2019;53(11):975-87.

39. Villegas E, Hannon B, Hammons A, Teran□Garcia M, Wiley A. Is Food Security Influencing Emotional Health? A Study with Hispanic Immigrant Mothers. The FASEB Journal. 2017;31:791.27-.27.

40. Walton QL, Boone C. Voices Unheard: An Intersectional Approach to Understanding Depression among Middle-Class Black Women. Women & Therapy. 2019;42(3-4):301-19.

41. Assari S, Gibbons FX, Simons R. Depression among black youth; interaction of class and place. Brain sciences. 2018;8(6):108.

42. Assari S. Social Determinants of Depression: The Intersections of Race, Gender, and Socioeconomic Status. Brain Sciences. 2017;7(12):156.

43. McGee RE, Thompson NJ. Unemployment and depression among emerging adults in 12 states, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2010. Prev Chronic Dis. 2015;12:E38.

44. Paul KI, Moser K. Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 2009;74(3):264-82.

45. Bonanno GA, Brewin CR, Kaniasty K, Greca AML. Weighing the costs of disaster: Consequences, risks, and resilience in individuals, families, and communities. Psychological science in the public interest. 2010;11(1):1-49.

46. Solomon D, Maxwell C, Castro A. Systematic Inequality and Economic Opportunity. Washington: Center for American Progress. 2019.

47. Mehdi M, Waseem M, Rehm MH, Aziz N, Anjum S, Javid MA. Depression and Anxiety in Health Care Workers during COVID-19. Biomedica. 2020;36.

48. Krueger EA, Meyer IH, Upchurch DM. Sexual orientation group differences in perceived stress and depressive symptoms among young adults in the United States. LGBT health. 2018;5(4):242-9.

49. Heterogeneity of transgender identity nonaffirmation microaggressions and their association with depression symptoms and suicidality among transgender persons [press release]. US: Educational Publishing Foundation2019.

50. Bostwick WB, Meyer I, Aranda F, Russell S, Hughes T, Birkett M, et al. Mental health and suicidality among racially/ethnically diverse sexual minority youths. American journal of public health. 2014;104(6):1129-36.

51. Vu M, Li J, Haardörfer R, Windle M, Berg CJ. Mental health and substance use among women and men at the intersections of identities and experiences of discrimination: insights from the intersectionality framework. BMC public health. 2019;19(1):108.

52. Rhodes SD, Martinez O, Song E-Y, Daniel J, Alonzo J, Eng E, et al. Depressive symptoms among immigrant Latino sexual minorities. American Journal of Health Behavior. 2013;37(3):404-13.

53. Race/ethnicity and sexual orientation disparities in mental health, sexism, and social support among women veterans [press release]. US: Educational Publishing Foundation2019.

54. Flanders CE, Shuler SA, Desnoyers SA, Vankim NA. Relationships Between Social Support, Identity, Anxiety, and Depression Among Young Bisexual People of Color. Journal of Bisexuality. 2019;19:2.

55. Jefferson K, Neilands TB, Sevelius J. Transgender women of color: discrimination and depression symptoms. Ethn Inequal Health Soc Care. 2013;6(4):121-36.

56. Lefevor GT, Janis RA, Franklin A, Stone W-M. Distress and Therapeutic Outcomes Among Transgender and Gender Nonconforming People of Color. The Counseling Psychologist. 2019;47(1):34-58.

57. Stein GL, Gonzalez LM, Huq N. Cultural stressors and the hopelessness model of depressive symptoms in Latino adolescents. Journal of youth and adolescence. 2012;41(10):1339-49.

58. Benner AD, Wang Y, Shen Y, Boyle AE, Polk R, Cheng Y-P. Racial/ethnic discrimination and well-being during adolescence: A meta-analytic review. American Psychologist. 2018;73(7):855.

59. Douglass S, Mirpuri S, English D, Yip T. "They were just making jokes": Ethnic/racial teasing and discrimination among adolescents. Cultural diversity & ethnic minority psychology. 2016;22(1):69-82.

60. Lui PP. Racial Microaggression, Overt Discrimination, and Distress: (In)Direct Associations With Psychological Adjustment. The Counseling Psychologist. 2020;48(4):551-82.

61. Forrest-Bank SS, Cuellar MJ. The Mediating Effects of Ethnic Identity on the Relationships between Racial Microaggression and Psychological Well-Being. Social Work Research. 2018;42(1):44-56.

62. Barlow JN. Restoring Optimal Black Mental Health and Reversing Intergenerational Trauma in an Era of Black Lives Matter. Biography. 2018;41(4):895-908.

63. Farisi AB, Habibi H, Mariska PN. Cultural Identity of Colonialism: Traumatic Effects of Slavery and Racism. Cultura Interpreta. 2019;9(3):117-24.

64. Grills CN, Aird EG, Rowe D. Breathe, baby, breathe: Clearing the way for the emotional emancipation of Black people. Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies. 2016;16(3):333-43.

65. Gone JP, Hartmann WE, Pomerville A, Wendt DC, Klem SH, Burrage RL. The impact of historical trauma on health outcomes for indigenous populations in the USA and Canada: A systematic review. American Psychologist. 2019;74(1):20.

66. Documentation status and psychological distress among New York City community college students [press release]. US: Educational Publishing Foundation2020.

67. Cobb CL, Meca A, Branscombe NR, Schwartz SJ, Xie D, Zea MC, et al. Perceived discrimination and well-being among unauthorized Hispanic immigrants: The moderating role of ethnic/racial group identity centrality. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology. 2019;25(2):280-7.

68. Stafford AM, Bigatti SM, Draucker CB. Cultural stressors experienced by young Latinas with depressive symptoms living in a tumultuous sociopolitical climate in the United States. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing. 2019;33(5):36-42.

69. Cervantes RC, Cardoso JB, Goldbach JT. Examining differences in culturally based stress among clinical and nonclinical Hispanic adolescents. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology. 2015;21(3):458-67.

70. Cariello AN, Perrin PB, Williams CD, Espinoza GA, Morlett-Paredes A, Moreno OA, et al. Moderating influence of enculturation on the relations between minority stressors and physical health via anxiety in Latinx immigrants. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology. 2019.

71. Chu J, Maruyama B, Batchelder H, Goldblum P, Bongar B, Wickham RE. Cultural pathways for suicidal ideation and behaviors. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology. 2020;26(3):367-77.

72. Pascoe EA, Smart Richman L. Perceived discrimination and health: a meta-analytic review. Psychological bulletin. 2009;135(4):531.

73. Schmitt MT, Branscombe NR, Postmes T, Garcia A. The consequences of perceived discrimination for psychological well-being: a meta-analytic review. Psychological bulletin. 2014;140(4):921.

74. Priest N, Truong M, Chong S, Paradies Y, King T, Kavanagh A, et al. Experiences of racial discrimination and cardiometabolic risk among Australian children. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity. 2020.

75. Fisher CB, Wallace SA, Fenton RE. Discrimination distress during adolescence. Journal of youth and adolescence. 2000;29(6):679-95.

76. Yip T. The effects of ethnic/racial discrimination and sleep quality on depressive symptoms and self-esteem trajectories among diverse adolescents. Journal of youth and adolescence. 2015;44(2):419-30.

77. Clark R, Anderson NB, Clark VR, Williams DR. Racism as a stressor for African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. American psychologist. 1999;54(10):805.

78. Nolen-Hoeksema S, Wisco BE, Lyubomirsky S. Rethinking rumination. Perspectives on psychological science. 2008;3(5):400-24.

79. Adam EK, Heissel JA, Zeiders KH, Richeson JA, Ross EC, Ehrlich KB, et al. Developmental histories of perceived racial discrimination and diurnal cortisol profiles in adulthood: A 20-year prospective study. Psychoneuroendocrinology. 2015;62:279-91.

80. Brondolo E, Libby DJ, Denton EG, Thompson S, Beatty DL, Schwartz J, et al. Racism and ambulatory blood pressure in a community sample. Psychosom Med. 2008;70(1):49-56.

81. Williams J, Gonzalez-Medina D. Infectious diseases and social stigma. Applied Innovations and Technologies. 2011;4(1):58-70.

82. Person B, Sy F, Holton K, Govert B, Liang A, National Center for Inectious Diseases SCOT. Fear and stigma: the epidemic within the SARS outbreak. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004;10(2):358-63.

83. Crockett KB, Kalichman SC, Kalichman MO, Cruess DG, Katner HP. Experiences of HIV-related discrimination and consequences for internalised stigma, depression and alcohol use. Psychology & health. 2019;34(7):796-810.

84. Baral SC, Karki DK, Newell JN. Causes of stigma and discrimination associated with tuberculosis in Nepal: a qualitative study. BMC public health. 2007;7(1):1-10.

85. Lee S, Chan LY, Chau AM, Kwok KP, Kleinman A. The experience of SARS-related stigma at Amoy Gardens. Social science & medicine. 2005;61(9):2038-46.

86. Siu JY-m. The SARS-associated stigma of SARS victims in the post-SARS era of Hong Kong. Qualitative health research. 2008;18(6):729-38.

87. Goodwin R, Haque S, Neto F, Myers LB. Initial psychological responses to Influenza A, H1N1 ("Swine flu"). BMC Infectious Diseases. 2009;9(1):166.

88. Major B, Quinton WJ, McCoy SK. Antecedents and consequences of attributions to discrimination: Theoretical and empirical advances. 2002.

89. Major B, Kaiser CR, McCoy SK. It's not my fault: When and why attributions to prejudice protect self-esteem. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 2003;29(6):772-81.

90. Balsam KF, Beadnell B, Molina Y. The Daily Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire: Measuring minority stress among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender adults. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development. 2013;46(1):3-25.

91. Balsam KF, Molina Y, Beadnell B, Simoni J, Walters K. Measuring multiple minority stress: the LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology. 2011;17(2):163.

92. Spitzer RL. Validation and Utility of a Self-report Version of PRIME-MD: The PHQ Primary Care Study. JAMA. 1999;282(18):1737.

93. Huang FY, Chung H, Kroenke K, Delucchi KL, Spitzer RL. Using the patient health questionnaire-9 to measure depression among racially and ethnically diverse primary care patients. Journal of general internal medicine. 2006;21(6):547-52.

94. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Löwe B. The Patient Health Questionnaire Somatic, Anxiety, and Depressive Symptom Scales: a systematic review. General Hospital Psychiatry. 2010;32(4):345-59.

95. Easton SD, Roh S, Kong J, Lee Y-S. Childhood Sexual Abuse and Depression among American Indians in Adulthood. Health & social work. 2019;44(2):95-103.

96. Keum BT, Miller MJ, Inkelas KK. Testing the factor structure and measurement invariance of the PHQ-9 across racially diverse US college students. Psychol Assess. 2018;30(8):1096.

97. Harry ML, Waring SC. The measurement invariance of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 for American Indian adults. Journal of affective disorders. 2019;254:59-68.

98. Patel JS, Oh Y, Rand KL, Wu W, Cyders MA, Kroenke K, Stewart JC. Measurement invariance of the patient health questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) depression screener in US adults across sex, race/ethnicity, and education level: NHANES 2005–2016. Depression and anxiety. 2019 Sep;36(9):813-23.

99. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JB, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. Archives of internal medicine. 2006;166(10):1092-7.

100. Löwe B, Decker O, Müller S, Brähler E, Schellberg D, Herzog W, et al. Validation and standardization of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder Screener (GAD-7) in the general population. Medical care. 2008:266-74.

101. Dear BF, Titov N, Sunderland M, McMillan D, Anderson T, Lorian C, et al. Psychometric comparison of the generalized anxiety disorder scale-7 and the Penn State Worry Questionnaire for measuring response during treatment of generalised anxiety disorder. Cognitive behaviour therapy. 2011;40(3):216-27.

102. Wurster HE, Sarche M, Trucksess C, Morse B, Biringen Z. Parents' adverse childhood experiences and parent–child emotional availability in an American Indian community: Relations

with young children's social–emotional development. Development and Psychopathology. 2019:1-12.

103. Saunders HE. Adverse childhood experiences, stress, and emotional availability: an American Indian context: Colorado State University. Libraries; 2016.

104. Parkerson HA, Thibodeau MA, Brandt CP, Zvolensky MJ, Asmundson GJG. Cultural-based biases of the GAD-7. Journal of Anxiety Disorders. 2015;31:38-42.

105. Satorra A, Bentler PM. A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. Psychometrika. 2001;66(4):507-14.

106. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.

107. Rosseel Y, Oberski D, Byrnes J, Vanbrabant L, Savalei V, Merkle E, et al. Package ‘lavaan’. 2017. p. 2017.

108. Hu Lt, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal. 1999;6(1):1-55.

109. MacKinnon DP, Lockwood CM, Williams J. Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. Multivariate behavioral research. 2004;39(1):99-128.

110. HHS. HHS POVERTY GUIDELINES FOR 2020 2020 [Available from: https://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty-guidelines.

111. MacCallum R. Specification searches in covariance structure modeling. 1986;100:107-20.

112. Little TD, Cunningham WA, Shahar G, Widaman KF. To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. Structural equation modeling. 2002;9(2):151-73.

113. Cheung GW, Rensvold RB. Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. Structural equation modeling. 2002;9(2):233-55.

114. MacCallum RC, Browne MW, Sugawara HM. Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. Psychological methods. 1996;1(2):130.

115. Raifman MA, Raifman JR. Disparities in the Population at Risk of Severe Illness From COVID-19 by Race/Ethnicity and Income. American journal of preventive medicine. 2020;59(1):137-9.

116. CDC. Summary Health Statistics: National Health Interview Survey: 2018. Table A-15a 2020 [cited 2020 August 10]. Available from: https://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Health_Statistics/NCHS/NHIS/SHS/2018_SHS_Table_A-15.pdf.

117. CDC. National diabetes statistics report, 2020. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, US Department of Health and Human Services. 2020.

118. CDC. HIV surveillance report, 2018 (preliminary). Atlanta: CDC. 2019.

119. Twice M. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Heart Disease 2019 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus/spotlight/HeartDiseaseSpotlight_2019_0404.pdf.

120. Owen WF, Carmona R, Pomeroy C. Failing another national stress test on health disparities. Jama. 2020.

121. Akee R. How COVID-19 is impacting indigenous peoples in the U.S. PBS News Hour. 2020.

122. Rodriguez-Lonebear D, Barceló NE, Akee R, Carroll SR. American Indian Reservations and COVID-19: Correlates of Early Infection Rates in the Pandemic. Journal of Public Health Management and Practice. 2020;26(4):371-7.

123. Cohen JM, Blasey C, Barr Taylor C, Weiss BJ, Newman MG. Anxiety and Related Disorders and Concealment in Sexual Minority Young Adults. Behavior Therapy. 2016;47(1):91-101.

124. Ruiz NG, Horowitz JM, Tamir C. Many Black and Asian Americans Say They Have Experienced Discrimination Amid the COVID-19 Outbreak 2020 [updated July 1, 2020; cited 2020 August 12]. Available from: https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2020/07/01/many-black-and-asian-americans-say-they-have-experienced-discrimination-amid-the-covid-19-outbreak/.

125. Fitzsimons T. LGBTQ History Month: The early days of America's AIDS crisis 2018 [updated Oct. 15, 2018; cited 2020 August 14]. Available from: https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/lgbtq-history-month-early-days-america-s-aids-crisis-n919701.