

The Intersection of Gender and Race: A Heterodox Approach to Gender and Race Disparities

For Presentation at the Association for Heterodox Economics 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference

Greenwich, England

July 2014

Marlene Kim, Professor  
Dept. of Economics  
University of Massachusetts, Boston  
100 Morrissey Blvd.  
Boston, MA 02125  
Voice: 617/287-6954  
Fax: 617/287-6976  
Marlene.Kim@umb.edu

## The Intersection of Gender and Race: A Heterodox Approach to Gender and Race Disparities

Gender and race pervade economic inequalities. This paper uses the United States as a case study to review some of these inequalities and surveys the reasons for them. I find that mainstream economics has not adequately explained gender, race, and especially, the intersection of gender and race, because it assumes market mechanisms and ignores facets of power, social behavior, and how these can change. This article reviews heterodox economic theories as well as those in other disciplines. I argue that theories in disciplines outside of economics and heterodox economic theories are better at explaining the complexities of discrimination, the intersection of race and gender, and how these race and gender disparities have changed.

This essay strives to explain three factors we observe: (1). Women continue to work in jobs at the lowest pay, status, and skill, and this pattern is world-wide. (2). Women of color face additional penalties besides race and gender. (3). Race and gender inequalities have changed over time. This essay begins by examining racial and gender inequalities so that the theories discussed can be evaluated as to which adequately explain these. It then reviews the theories and discusses which of these applies to the patterns we observe in the United States.

### AN OVERVIEW OF RACE, GENDER AND INTERSECTIONAL DISPARITIES

In the US, although racial and gender disparities have narrowed over the past few decades, even today, race and gender differences permeate important economic outcomes. For example, in the United States, racial and ethnic minorities are less likely to hold jobs. All racial and ethnic minorities have higher unemployment rates, with the rates for African Americans double that of white workers (see Table 1). When they are without work, most are unemployed for longer periods of time: Asian Americans and African Americans have the highest long term unemployment rates in the United States (Kim, 2012).

Even when racial minorities find jobs, they hold the worst ones--those with lower earnings and less potential for advancement. As Table 2A shows, African Americans and Latinos are underrepresented in higher-paid jobs as CEOs and in higher-paid professional occupations, including technical, scientific, and medical jobs. They remain overrepresented in lower-paid jobs that require physical labor, such as cleaning and maintenance, food preparation, food service, security guards, and production jobs. (See Table 2A). Latinos are also overrepresented as construction laborers and in farming occupations. Consequently, African American and Latino workers earn less than white workers (see Table 3).

Having higher unemployment rates and lower pay relegates their families to lower incomes and higher poverty rates. African Americans and Latinos have 58% and 68% the income, respectively, of white families and triple the poverty rates (DeNavas-Walt et al, 2013; Kim, 2013). (See Table 4). Not surprisingly, white households hold six times the wealth of African American and Latino families, and this disparity has increased since the Great Recession (McKernan et al., 2013).

Gender also affects economic outcomes. Although women have made advances in law and medicine, they continue to be the majority of workers in traditionally female jobs such as nursing, librarians, teachers' assistants, clerical, child care, and personal service workers (Table 2B; see also Christensen, in press). They remain underrepresented as CEO's and face a glass ceiling in advancement into higher management (Table 2A; see also Ragins et al., 1998). Consequently, women earn less than men and have higher poverty rates (see Tables 3 and 4). (See Figart and Warnecke, 2013)

Like their male minority counterparts, women of color are segregated into lower-paid production jobs (Kim, 2013). Like these same-race men and their white female counterparts, they are also overrepresented in lower-paid service jobs (Kim, 2013). Relegated to the worst jobs because of both their race and gender, they have the lowest earnings: African American women earn 68% of white male workers, and Latinas, 59% (see Table 3). In comparison, white women earn 81% of white men.

Much research has argued that the gender and race penalties women of color face are not necessarily additive (King, 1995; Bell et al., 1993), and that any intersectional penalties of gender and race may affect them in different ways, depending on the circumstances (Zinn and Dill, 1996; King, 1995; Bell et al., 1993). Indeed, African American women in the US appear to suffer additional penalties from the combination of both their gender and race. They suffer a 15% reduction in their earnings from their gender, 9% because of their race, and an additional 3% because of the intersection of both their gender and race, which appears to arise from the jobs in which they work (Kim, 2007).

With higher unemployment rates and the lowest earnings, women of color have the highest poverty rates: 41% for families headed by African American women, 43% for those headed by Latinas, and 41% for those headed by white women. In comparison, 7.3% of white families are poor. (See Table 4)

What can explain these disparities? Because much of the difference in income, wealth, and long-term poverty result from different job outcomes, the remainder of this paper focuses on differentials in employment and especially earnings. Mainstream economists attribute inequalities by race and gender in earnings and occupational distributions to human capital, other productivity differences, or in the case of women, preferences and different career aspirations (Heckman, 1998; Abowd and Killingsworth, 1985; O'Neill, 1994; O'Neill and O'Neill, 2005). African Americans and Latinos indeed have lower educational achievements, and women work fewer hours on average than men and are more likely to take time off from work than men (O'Neill and O'Neill, 2005; Trejo, 1997; Abowd and Killingsworth, 1985). Women may also choose occupations that allow them to take time off from work without being penalized when they return from caring for children (O'Neill, 1994).

Yet although these factors may account for some of the differences we observe, they do not account for all of the disparities. Much research indicates that after accounting for the amount of time worked, work experience, education, and detailed productivity measures, women still earn less than men, and racial and ethnic minorities less than white workers (Blau and Kahn, 2007; Joy, 2003; Graham and Smith, 2005; Binder et al., 2010; Kim, 2007; Leicht, 2008; Smith,

2012). Such research finds that women, African American and Hispanic workers receive lower salaries or salary growth compared to white men, even with the same performance appraisals (Castilla, 2012; Neumark, 1999), and in academia, women are underpaid even with detailed productivity measures such as the number of books and research articles they write and research grants they received (Blinder et al., 2010).

Other research finds that job preferences cannot account for black workers' concentration in low level jobs and their underrepresentation in high paid ones (Gill, 2001). Preferences also cannot explain the high concentration of women in traditionally female jobs; moreover, neither can career aspirations or any proclivity towards intrinsic (helping others) rather than extrinsic (high pay and status) rewards of jobs (Blau and Ferber, 1991; Solberg, 2004; Fortin, 2007; England, 2005; Reskin, 1993; Jacobs, 1989).

Although women and racial and ethnic minorities indeed may choose different college majors than men, even when attending the same university, having the same college major, and having the same grade point average, women earn less than men, and black worker's salaries fail to keep up with their white male counterparts (Weinberger and Joy, 2007). Only in some studies, when including quantitative measures of ability, do racial disparities disappear (O'Neill, 1990; Neal and Johnson, 1996); however, these studies are highly controversial. Other studies that use different specifications, such as including measures of age, education, or social capital, find that racial disparities re-appear even with these quantitative measures of ability (Darity and Mason, 1998; Goldsmith et al., 1998; Blackburn, 2004).

Because of these disparities, many scholars believe that race and gender discrimination still exists. Correspondence and audit studies find that resumes with black and other non-Anglo names are less likely to be invited to interviews or hired compared to those with Anglo names, even with the same qualifications (Bertrand and Mullitainathan, 1994; Riach and Rich, 1992). Similarly, compared to similar resumes of men, resumes with women's names are less likely to be interviewed for jobs in higher paid restaurants, while being more likely to be interviewed for lower paid restaurants (Newmark, 1996). Those with Latino accents, moreover, are less likely to receive job offers than similar white applicants (see Bergmann, 1996). Students with white male names are more likely to be helped by professors than those with female or racial or ethnic names, including Chinese, Indian, Hispanic, and African American students (Milkman et al., 2012, 2014).

Paired testing studies involve pairs of applicants (a woman and a man or an African American and white couple) carefully trained to interview, stating that they have similar education, experience, traits, and work history as well as having the same interview skills as each other. These studies confirm that women and minorities are less likely to be offered jobs, but when they are offered jobs, these are at lower pay levels than comparable white men (Bergmann, 1996). Similar paired testing studies find that racial and ethnic minorities have a more difficult time obtaining housing, mortgages, and housing insurance than whites (Munnell et al., 1996; Squires and Chadwick, 2006; Massey and Lundy, 2001; Turner et al., 2002; Fischer and Massey, 2004). Finally, an experiment in which musicians auditioned behind a screen for a symphony orchestra found that the number of women accepted into the orchestra increased when one could not discern the gender of the performer (Goldin and Rouse, 2000).

Why? Research indicates the prevalence of implicit biases. These biases reveal that compared to whites, most people are more likely to view African Americans as dangerous, Asians as foreign, and women as liberal arts majors instead of scientists and engineers ([implicit.harvard.edu/implicit](http://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit)). As the experiment with the orchestra indicates, women are less likely to be viewed as competent musicians or workers compared to men. In summary, white men are favored for higher paid jobs and promotions compared to women and racial and ethnic minorities.

## THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS

### *Economic Theories of Discrimination*

What can explain these biases and different treatment by gender, race, and ethnicity? One neoclassical explanation for such bias is statistical discrimination (Phelps, 1972). If there is imperfect information, so that employers may not know how productive workers are, and if racial minorities are less productive, on average, than non-minority workers, employers would hire non-minorities if they are risk adverse. Similarly, if employers believe that on average women quit their jobs or work fewer hours than men, they will hire men instead. Yet although this explanation gives a motivation for discrimination, it does not explain women's and minorities' failures to be promoted within firms, when firms would have complete information about them; nor does it explain why on average women receive higher performance appraisals than men but fail to receive increased pay from these compared to men (Smith, 2012; Castilla, 2012; Neumark, 1999). It also fails to explain why women and racial minorities may be hired in the lowest-paid jobs but not in others, including jobs such as child care, where information about productivity is not easily available or measured.

Gary Becker (1973) argued that employers can simply be prejudiced (“have a taste for discrimination”) towards racial minorities and women, and if so, would have to be compensated for their distaste by paying lower wages to these workers. Although this distaste would be competed away if non-discriminatory employers hired racial minorities, it could persist if prejudice were widespread or if employers had monopsony power. Indeed, interviews with employers show widespread preferences by race or gender (Moss and Tilly, 2001; Levine, 1998; Lawler and Bae, 1998).

Becker also suggested that employees could hold such prejudice against certain employees, so that these prejudiced workers would have to be compensated with higher pay for their displeasure. Rather than paying such premiums, employers could refuse to hire racial minorities, or they could have completely segregated workplaces. Evidence in some industries suggests that employees do show displeasure with working with certain employees: men working with women in the sciences, engineering or IT (Hewlett, 2008), or in jobs in the building trades (Eisenberg, 1998). Finally, he suggested that customer discrimination could occur, with customers not being willing to be served by black workers. Indeed, some evidence of customer discrimination exists (Moss and Tilly, 2001).

Becker does not explain any reasons for these various tastes for discrimination, however, or how they occur. Nor does he explain why women and racial minorities are prevalent or accepted in some jobs (secretaries, janitors, farm workers) but not in others. Why would there be discrimination against women or racial minorities in some jobs but not others? And why are the jobs that are least unattainable those with the highest pay and status? Certainly, more needs to be considered to answer these questions.

### *Marxian and Marxist-Feminists*

What is missing in neoclassical theory is an understanding of power and patriarchy in determining these outcomes. Marxian theories integrate issues of power as a motivator for race and sex discrimination. Employers may want to keep racism alive so that white workers don't want to work with minority workers; thus workers cannot unite, organize, and reap more of the profits from employers (Reich, 1981). Historically, employers used strike breakers who were different races in order to encourage division among workers (Reich, 1981; Foner, 1974). In addition, patriarchy is still prevalent—men may want to keep the good jobs for themselves and women dependent on them economically in order to keep and perpetuate their male privilege (Hartmann, 1981). Although these theories are important for incorporating issues of power and patriarchy, they are less able to discuss women of color and the intersection of race and gender. Economic theories, compared to those in other fields, are inadequate for addressing multiple oppressions (Charusheela, 2013).

### *Feminist Theory*

Multicultural and multiracial feminist scholars are the opposite in this respect. They start with the premise that multiple oppressions exist. They believe that race and gender are part of these oppressions, and these can manifest differently, depending on one's class, country, sexual preference, religion, and other factors, such as disability. Thus gender and race are part of a matrix of domination and subordination, so that women can experience gender and race uniquely: a rich white American woman in Mexico City will experience these very differently than a poor African woman in Sudan (Zinn and Dill, 1996; Ruwanpura, 2008).

Although these theories allow for flexibility in allowing various people by race/gender/nationality/geography to hold relative power, and although this framework allows for changes in time and variations of how race and gender manifest by geography and history, the lack of a more structural analysis (one that can be predictive, for example) and the explanations of the mechanisms by which race and gender can affect socioeconomic outcomes can be limiting (Charusheela, 2013). The theories discussed below attempt to contribute to our understanding of how and why these mechanisms occur.

### *Sociological theories*

*Devaluation of work:* Sociologists believe that women's jobs can be devalued simply because women perform the work (England, 2005; Reskin, 1993). This can occur because jobs that women traditionally perform are seen as natural and thus not skilled (Reskin, 1985). Compensation practices can evolve to award higher pay to those who are the more powerful

workers or those who are more knowledgeable about these practices, often unionized men (Kim, 2000), or these compensation processes can have male-biases imbedded in them (Reskin, 1985). Devaluation can also be caused by externalities and free-riders, when all of the beneficiaries of caring work are not paying for the outcome of the well-adjusted child or other persons who are cared for, usually by women (England, 2005). In addition, if women's jobs are devalued, male employees may prevent women from entering their occupations if they believe their jobs may become at risk of similarly being devalued from having women perform their work (England, 2005). After all, if women can do the work, it may not be as skilled as some had thought.

Although this explanation is insightful, it is only applied to gender, not to the low-paid jobs that racial minorities hold. The question of how gender and race intersect, and why women of color have the lowest earnings and highest poverty rates, is left to other theories.

### *Socialization*

Some sociologists believe that segregated workplaces result from socialization. If employers have gendered notions about the appropriate jobs for men and women, they can follow the norms of employing women in traditionally female jobs and men in traditionally male jobs (England, 1985). Socialization can also influence employees, by subtly informing them from childhood through adulthood what jobs are appropriate for men, and which for women. From an early age, many girls are socialized to be caretakers and many are still encouraged to pursue typically female jobs like nurses and teachers. Thus women being aggressive, successful, smart, and working many hours away from her family is not as accepted as a man acting this way. Such socialization can explain why some jobs are acceptable for women, while others are not (England, 1985).

Yet although there is much agreement that socialization is indeed present, it does not explain the racial inequalities. In addition, many sociologists believe that socialization has little effect on the gendered outcomes (Reskin, 1993; England, 1985). Whereas some believe that these social and cultural roles are historical and not necessarily purposeful, it is difficult to believe that so many of the same attributes can be universal across cultures and countries without further explanation: if one is less educated, why is it usually women? If one is low-paid, why usually women? If one does housework, why women? Although Marxists posit that women were busy with child rearing so that men were the ones who had the time to govern—and they excluded women from governing, this is less likely a reason for modern day gender inequalities, when women can hire child care help and have fewer, and in some cases, no children, to care for.

### *Social similarity and social reproduction*

Kanter (1977) believes that in high risk, high paying jobs like upper-management, the nature of the work is difficult to define and job performance is often difficult to assess in the short term. In such high-stakes, uncertain environments, workers must work closely together and communicate clearly with each other, requiring a common language and understanding, often facilitated by social homogeneity. Given the competitiveness and nature of the work, discretion, trust and personal loyalty are important qualities for workers. Because those who are socially similar are more easily trusted, management grooms and hires those who are similar to them.

Thus homosocial reproduction occurs, with white men grooming and hiring others like themselves. With so few women and minorities, it is easy to stereotype these workers. In addition, women need to meet the expectations of how a woman is supposed to behave but concomitantly the work expectations of how men behave, all of which is difficult to accomplish (Kanter, 1977).

### *Psychological Theories*

Social identity theory and social categorization theory also posits that people want to be around others like them. However, this is not necessarily because of uncertainty and trust but is more broad-based. There is a homophily bias: people are more comfortable with others in their same socioeconomic/racial/gendered groups, and are biased against others they perceive as belonging to a different group (Thomas and Chrobot-Mason, 2013). Those in the out-groups are seen as inferior, and attitudes and behaviors toward members of these groups can justify and perpetuate inferior status (Dovidio and Hebl, 2013; Thomas and Chrobot-Mason, 2013).

Yet in- and out-groups change among workers and in different time periods, since social and historical context define these. In addition, workers often bridge different in- and out-groups: a female executive can be in an in-group because of her class status but in an out-group because she is a woman (Dovidio and Hebl, 2013; Thomas and Chrobot-Mason, 2013). Asian Americans can be admired for their success but are resented because they are still racial minorities—belonging to an out-group (Fiske et al., 2002). Social psychologists have found different stereotypes and perceptions towards Asian Americans (envy and admiration) than towards African Americans and Latinos (Fiske et al., 2002). These different perceptions and feelings are likely to affect behavior towards these groups and their job outcomes.

Many experiments have found that people were more cooperative, altruistic, and forgiving towards members of their own group. Moreover, group identity can arise not just from racial and gender identities but also from random assignments. These random assignments generate these same results of being more generous, forgiving and altruistic towards members of their (randomly assigned) groups (Chen and Li, 2009; Taifel and Turner, 1986). Moreover, simple tasks of working to solve a problem together can increase group cohesion and identity among otherwise random participants.

One group being in favor and others in relative disfavor is a powerful one. How groups become formed—and how they can be so universal—with minorities, immigrants, and women tending to be on the bottom of the socioeconomic hierarchy--is unclear, however.

### *Structural explanations*

Some scholars believe that the gendered social roles and hegemonic structures by race and gender are purposeful—they perpetuate the existing gender, race, and class hegemony of power (Miller, 1986). Some extend social roles to caste, race, and class, in which members of the subordinate groups are seen as inferior, substandard, or defective (in intelligence, social behavior). Because of these deficiencies, they are relegated to performing a limited number of roles, usually those that the dominants dislike (often those around refuse or the body). Thus they



work in the worst jobs, those that are less valued and low paying, and dirty. Because of the perception that they are not capable, they are seen as incapable of performing better jobs (Miller, 1986).

In contrast, the dominant groups are perceived as capable, intelligent, and normal, deserving the best jobs. Thus they work in the most valued jobs. Any subordinates who complain are punished, ostracized, or killed. Similarly, dominants who sympathize with such subordinates are likewise punished. The dominants control the culture, knowledge, and information, through what is taught in schools and what is aired through media, which legitimize the inequities and hierarchy of power. In this way, the social structure and gendered and racialized social expectations perpetuate the hegemony and power of the dominant group and are intended to do so. This viewpoint is powerful in explaining much consistent gender and racial inequality across the globe and across time (Miller, 1986; Reskin, 1988).

Some sociologists posit, therefore, that men as a group monopolize the desirable jobs that have high wages and career ladders for themselves (Reskin,1988); racially dominant groups can do likewise. Sex-segregation of jobs results from men resisting integration because doing so undermines differentiation and thus male dominance (Reskin,1988). By the dominant group using their power to advance and maintain their power, the gendered/racialized/classist socioeconomic hierarchy persists. These theories explain the universal distribution of occupations, earnings and power by race, sex, class, and caste.

But how can these change over time?

Historically, these have changed through increasing the power of the subordinates and thus relatively diminishing those of the dominants, through legal changes mandating equality, movements such as the women's and Civil Rights Movement (anti-Apartheid), and revolutions. In the US, legal changes mandating equal opportunity and affirmative action led to women and racial minorities gaining access to educational opportunities and professional jobs that were previously barred from them (Bergmann, 1996; Faludi,1991). These led to a growth in the proportion of middle class families among minorities. With access to the opportunities of the middle class, such families had access to educational opportunities, further entrenching their prodigy into middle class career opportunities. For women, opening medicine, law, and business schools to women allowed them entry into high paid jobs (Blau and Kahn, 2007).

The key component in changing patterns of subordination/domination is accessing power. Absent this, however, individuals often had access to privileged jobs and careers through having relatively higher power through their class status. In the twentieth century, women from the upper class could more easily attain an Ivy League education and if they chose to do so, work. Where countries allowed racial minorities to likewise become affluent, these too had relatively more access to privileged educations and jobs through the opportunities their class brought. In this way studies have found that class, more than race, can matter (Conley, 1999). The education, social networks, and job opportunities that class provides can mitigate barriers that gender and race may bring. Thus although minorities and women can suffer implicit biases, class can help overcome these (Conley, 1999). In this framework, access to power, through revolution, movement, organizing, and legal mandates can change patterns by race and gender.

But class can also mitigate race and gender, offering more opportunities within the gender and race structures of particular countries and in particular time periods (Conley, 1999).

## CONCLUSION

Mainstream economics has not adequately explained gender, race, and especially, the intersection of gender and race, because it relies too much on market mechanisms. Mainstream economics has separate theories of how gender affects earnings (less time worked and different job preferences) and how race affects earnings (lower productivity through worse education outcomes). Missing from this analysis and even from neoclassical critics is how gender and race interact for women of color. In addition, having different explanations for different traits is unsatisfactory; instead, having general and structural explanations for inequalities that are common world-wide and throughout history is needed (Reskin, 2003).

Fortunately, those in other disciplines—philosophy, law, gender studies, multicultural studies, psychology, and biology have contributed to this area. There have been many theories of why gender and race discrimination occurs across many fields. This article finds that although many of these explanations have resonance—including socialization, homosocial reproduction, and identity theory, it is difficult to explain world-wide patterns of women and racial and ethnic minorities always being on the bottom. Thus structural explanations that include explanations of domination and subordination are important in explaining how societies allocate jobs, earnings, and wealth, and in perpetuating these inequalities. Societies change when subordinates, through laws, legal decisions or movements, gain power and are able to reduce their subordination and increase their class status.

## References

- Abowd, John M. and Mark R. Killingsworth (1985), 'Employment, wages, and earnings of Hispanics in the federal and nonfederal sectors: methodological issues and their empirical consequences', in George J. Borjas and Marta Tienda (eds), *Hispanics in the US Economy*, Orlando, FL: Academic Press, pp. 77-124.
- Becker, Gary S. 1971. *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, Ella, L.J. Edmonson, Toni C. Denton and Stella Nkomo (1993), 'Women of color in management: toward an inclusive analysis,' in Ellen A. Fagenson (ed.), *Women in Management: Trends, Issues, and Challenges in Managerial Diversity*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 105-130.
- Bergmann, Barbara R. 1996. *In Defense of Affirmative Action*, New York: Basic Books.
- Bertrand, Marianne and Seth Mullainathan (2004), 'Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination', *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991-1013.
- Binder, Melissa, Kate Krause, Janie Chermak, Jennifer Thacher and Julie Gilroy (2010), 'Same work, different pay? Evidence from a US public university,' *Feminist Economics*, 16(4), 105-135.
- Blackburn, McKinley L. (2004), 'The role of test scores in explaining race and gender differences in wages', *Economics of Education Review*, 23(6), 555-576.

- Blau, Francine D. and Marianne A. Ferber (1991), 'Career plans and expectations of young women and men: the earnings gap and labor force participation', *Journal of Human Resources*, 26(4), 581-607.
- Blau, Francine D. and Lawrence M. Kahn (2007), 'The gender pay gap: have women gone as far as they can?', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1): 7-23.
- Castilla, Emilio J. (2011), 'Gender, race, and the new (merit-based) employment relationship', *Industrial Relations*, 51(S1), 528-562.
- Charusheela, S. 2013. "Intersectionality," Chapter 3 in Deborah Figart and Tonia Warnecke, Eds, *Handbook of Research on Gender and Economic Life*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. Pp. 32-45.
- Chen, Yan and Sherry Xin Li. 2009. "Group Identity and Social Preferences," *American Economic Review*, 99(1): 131-157.
- Christiansen, Kimberly. Forthcoming. "He-Cession? She-Cession? The Gendered Impact of the Great Recession," *Review of Radical Political Economics*.
- Conley, Dalton. 1999. *Being Black, Living in the Red: Race, Wealth and Social Policy in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Darity, William A., Jr. and Patrick L. Mason (1998), 'Evidence of discrimination in employment: codes of color, codes of gender,' *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2), 63-90.
- DeNavas-Walt, Carmen, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith. 2013. *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2012*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Dovdio, John F. and Michelle R. Hebl. 2013. "Discrimination at the Level of the Individual: Cognitive and Affective Factors," Chapter 2 in Robert L. Dipboye and Adrienne Colella, Eds., *Discrimination at Work: The Psychological and Organizational Bases*. Abingdon, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- England, Paula. 2005. "Gender Inequality in Labor Markets: The Role of Motherhood and Segregation," *Social Politics*, 12(2): 264-288.
- Faludi, Susan. 1991. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Figart, Deborah M. and Tonia L. Warnecke, Eds. 2013. *Handbook of Research on Gender and Economic Life*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Fischer, Mary J. and Douglas S. Massey (2004), 'The ecology of racial discrimination', *City and Community*, 3(3), 221-241.
- Fiske, Susan T., Amy J.C. Cuddy, Peter Glick, and Jun Xu. 2002. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6): 878-902.
- Foner, Philip S. 1974. *Organized Labor and the Black Worker, 1619-1973*. New York: Praeger.
- Fortin, Nicole M. (2007), 'The gender wage gap among young adults in the United States: the importance of money vs. people', Vancouver: University of British Columbia, unpublished paper.
- Gill, Andrew M. (2001), 'Incorporating the Causes of Occupational Differences in Studies of Racial Wage Differentials', *Journal of Human Resources*, 24(1), 20-41.
- Goldin, Claudia and Celia Rouse. 2000. "Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of 'Blind' Auditions on Female Musicians," *American Economic Review*, 90: 715-741.
- Goldsmith, Arthur H., William A. Darity, Jr. and Jonathan R. Veum (1998), 'Race, cognitive skills, psychological capital and wages', *Review of Black Political Economy*, 26(2), 9-21.

- Graham, John and Steven Smith (2005), 'Gender differences in employment and earnings in science and engineering in the US', *Economics of Education Review*, 24(3), 241-54.
- Hartmann, Heidi. 1981. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism," Ch 1 in Lydia Sargent, Ed., *Women and Revolution*. Boston: South End Press.
- Heckman, James J. (1998), 'Detecting discrimination', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2), 101-116.
- Hewlett, Sylvia Anne, Carolyn Buck Luce, Lisa J. Servon, Laura Sherbin, Peggy Shiller, Eytan Sosnovich, and Karen Sumberg. 2008. "The Athena Factor: Reversing the Brain Drain in Science, Engineering, and Technology." *Harvard Business Review Research Report* No. 10094.
- Joy, Lois (2003), 'Salaries of recent male and female college graduates: educational and labor market effects', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 56(4), 606-21.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (1993), *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books.
- Kim, Marlene. 2000. "Employers' Estimates of Market Wages: Implications for Discrimination," *Feminist Economics*, 6(2): 97-114.
- Kim, Marlene. 2007. "Race and Gender Penalties in the Earnings of Black Workers," *Industrial Relations*, 48(3): 466-88.
- Kim, Marlene. 2012. *Unfairly Disadvantaged? Asian Americans and unemployment during and after the Great Recession (2007-10)*. Economic Policy Institute. Washington, DC. April 5, 2012. <http://www.epi.org/publication/ib323-asian-american-unemployment/>
- Kim, Marlene. 2013. "Race and Ethnicity in the Workplace," Chapter 14 in Deborah M. Figart and Tonia L. Warnecke, Eds., *Handbook of Research on Gender and Economic Life*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- King, Deborah K. (1995), 'Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: the context of a black feminist ideology', in Beverly Guy-Sheftall (ed.), *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought*, New York: The New Press, pp. 294-317.
- Lawler, John J. and Johngeok Bae. 1998. "Overt Employment Discrimination by Multinational Firms: Cultural and Economic Influences in a Developing Country," *Industrial Relations*, 37(2): 126-153.
- Leicht, Kevin T. (2008), 'Broken down by race and gender? Sociological explanations of new sources of earnings inequality', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 237-55.
- Levine, David I. 1988. "Editorial," *Industrial Relations*, 37(2): 121-3 plus Data Appendix.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Garvey Lundy (2001), 'Use of black English and racial discrimination in urban housing markets: New methods and findings', *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(4), 452-469.
- McKernan, Signe-Mary, Caroline Ratcliffe, Eugene Steuerle, and Sisi Zhang. 2013. *Less Than Equal: Racial Disparities in Wealth Accumulation*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Milkman, Katherine L., Modupe Akinola, and Dolly Chugh. 2012. "Temporal Distance and Discrimination," *Psychological Science*, 23(7): 710-717.
- \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. "What Happens Before? A Field Experiment Exploring How Pay and Representation Differentially Shape Bias on the Pathway into Organizations." Mimeo.
- Miller, Jean Baker. 1986. *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Moss, Philip and Chris Tilly. 2001. *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill and Hiring in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Munnell, Alicia H., Geoffrey M.B. Tootell, Lynn E. Browne, and James McEneaney (1996), 'Mortgage lending in Boston: interpreting HMDA data', *American Economic Review*, 86(1), 25-53.
- Neal, Derek A. and William J. Johnson (1996), 'The role of human capital in earnings differences between black and white men', *Journal of Political Economy*, 104(5), 869-93.
- Neumark, David (1999), 'Wage differentials by race and sex: the roles of taste discrimination and labor market information', *Industrial Relations*, 38(3), 414-445.
- O'Neill, June E. (1990), 'The role of human capital in earnings differences between black and white men', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 4(4), 25-45.
- O'Neill, June E. (1994), 'The gender gap in wages, circa 2000', *American Economic Review*, 93(2), 309-14.
- O'Neill, June E. and David M. O'Neill (2005), 'What do wage differentials tell us about labor market discrimination?', Cambridge, MA: NBER Working Paper, no. 11240.
- Phelps, Edmund S. 1972. "The Statistical Theory of Racism and Sexism," *American Economic Review* 62(4): 659-61.
- Ragins, Belle Rose, Bickley Townsend, and Mary Mattis (1998), 'Gender gap in the executive suite: CEOs and female executives report on breaking the glass ceiling', *Academy of Management Executive*, 12 (Feb.), 28-42.
- Reich, Michael. 1981. *Racial Inequality: A Political-Economic Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Reskin, Barbara. 1988. "Bringing the Men Back in: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work." *Gender and Society* 2(1): 58-81.
- . 1993. "Sex-Segregation in the Workplace, Annual Review of Sociology, 19: 241-270.
- . 2003. "Including Mechanisms in Our Models of Ascriptive Inequality: 2002 Presidential Address," *American Sociological Review*, 68(1): 1-21.
- Riach, Peter A. and Judith Rich (1991), 'Testing for racial discrimination in the labour market', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 15(3), 239-56.
- Ruwanpura, Kanchana N. (2008), 'Multiple identities, multiple discrimination: a critical review', *Feminist Economics*, 14(3), 77-05.
- Smith, Ryan (2012), 'Money, benefits and power: a test of the glass ceiling and glass escalator hypotheses', *Annals of the American Academic of Political and Social Science*, (639), 149-172.
- Solberg, Eric J. (2004), 'Occupational assignment, hiring discrimination, and the gender pay gap', *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 32(1), 11-27.
- Squires, Gregory D. and Jan Chadwick (2006), 'Linguistic profiling: a tradition of the property insurance industry', *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(3), 400-415.
- Taifel, Henri and John C. Turner. 1986. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior," Chapter 1 in William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel, Eds., *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Thomas, Kecia M. and Donna Chrobot-Mason. 2013. "Group-Level Explanations of Workplace Discrimination," Chapter 4 in Robert L. Dipboye and Adrienne Colella, Eds., *Discrimination at Work: The Psychological and Organizational Bases*. Abingdon, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Trejo, Stephen J. (1997), 'Why do Mexican Americans earn low wages?', *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(6), 1235-1268.
- Turner, Margery Austin, Stephen L. Ross, George C. Galster, and John Yinger (2002), *Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets*, Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

- US Bureau of Labor Statistics. Current Population Reports, P60-245. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weinberger, Catherine and Lois Joy (2007), 'Relative earnings of black college graduates', in Marlene Kim (ed.), *Race and Economic Opportunity in the Twenty-First Century*, London: Routledge, pp. 50-72.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca and Bonnie Thornton Dill (1996), 'Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism', *Feminist Studies*, 22(2), 321-331.

**Table 1. Unemployment Rates in the US**

	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
White	4.4	4.1
African American	8.9	8.5
Asian	5.6	4.4
Hispanic	5.3	6.5

Note: Data are for those 25 years and older for April 2014. Data are not seasonally adjusted.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Table A-29. Unemployed persons by marital status, race, Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, age, and sex. [www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat29.pdf](http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat29.pdf).

**Table 2A. Selected Occupations by Gender and Race**

	Percent of Total Employed		
	women	black	Hispanic
Total	47	11.2	15.6
Management occupations	38.2	6.5	8.5
Chief executive	26.8	2.9	4.3
Computer and information systems managers	28.6	5	4.3
Personal financial officers	25.7	6.5	5.2
computer and mathematical occupations	26.1	8.3	6.3
architecture and engineering occupations	14.1	5.5	7.5
astronomers and physicists	-	-	-
astronomers and space scientists	-	-	-
chemists and materials scientists	39	7.3	12.3
judges, magistrates, judicial workers	35.6	7.8	6.3
dentists	30.8	4.7	7.2
physicians and surgeons	35.5	6.4	3.8
aircraft mechanics and service technicians	2.2	7.9	9

Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics. Table 11. Employed persons by detailed occupation, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. [www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm](http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm)

**Table 2B. Selected Occupations by Gender and Race**

	Percentage of total employed		
	women	black	Hispanic



social worker	80.3	21.9	13.3
preschool, kindergarten teachers	97.8	12.1	12.9
elementary, middle schools teachers	81	9.4	9.8
librarians	84.1	7.7	5.1
teacher assistants	89.2	14.5	16.6
nurses	90.1	10.5	6.5
nursing, psychiatric, home health aides	89	36.4	14.9
security guards	20.4	26.5	17.1
food prep workers	55.8	12.7	29.3
combined food prep and serving	65.3	16.4	16.1
dishwashers	20.6	15.6	37.9
janitors, building cleaners	32.6	18.4	30.3
maids and housekeeping cleaners	87.7	16.8	44.3
childcare workers	94.8	13.2	22.4
personal care aides	84.2	22.1	19.7
cashiers	71.7	18	21.3
receptionists	92.2	11	18.4
secretaries, administrative assistants	94.4	9.3	10.5
farming, fishing, forestry occupations	21.7	5.6	42.8
construction laborers	3.6	6.8	44.3
assemblers and fabricators	37	16.5	19.6
bakers	59.8	9	25.9
pressers, textile, garment, related materials	55.7	27.6	52.6
packaging, filling machine operators, tenders	51.5	19.7	37.4
driver/sales workers and truck drivers	5.2	15.3	18.9
parking lot attendants	12.9	22	37.9
industrial truck and tractor operators	6.2	20.7	30.9
cleaners of vehicles and equipment	15.4	21.2	33.1
packers and packagers, hand	49.4	18	37.7

Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics. Table 11. Employed persons by detailed occupation, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. [www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm](http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm)

**Table 3. Race and gender earnings disparities in the US, 2012**

	<u>Percentage of earnings of women compared to</u>	
	<u>Same race/ethnicity men</u>	<u>White men</u>
White women	81%	81%
Black men		76%
Black women	90%	68%
Hispanic men		67%
Hispanic women	88%	59%

Source: Author's tabulations from Table 37, Median weekly earnings of full-time wage and salary workers by selected characteristics, 2012. [www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat37.pdf](http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat37.pdf)

**Table 4. Poverty rates of families by race and female-headed households**

	<u>Poverty rate all families</u>	<u>Female-headed families</u>
White alone, non-Hispanic	7.3	41.2
African-American	25.7	41.2
Hispanic (can be any race)	24.6	42.8
Asian American	9.6	20.4

Note: Except for Hispanic, races are those that are non-Hispanic and only that race. Female-headed households are those with no male adult present.

Source: US Department of Commerce. US Bureau of the Census. *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2012*. Table B-1. Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic origin: 1959 to 2012.