6 Race, Racialization, and Work

Evelyn Nakano Glenn

Historically, racial inequality has been expressed, created and maintained through racialized hierarchies in the labor market. In many settings, stratification along race lines is rather obvious. The higher one goes up the managerial and professional ranks – for example among chairs of corporate boards, CEOs, and head surgeons – the 'whiter' the occupants appear to be. By contrast, at the lowest levels – for example among maintenance workers, janitors, maids, and agricultural field laborers – the more people of color we see. Additionally, one can observe racial-ethnic concentrations in particular lines of work or business. In some cases, the specialization grows out of demand for racial-ethnic services or goods, for example Senegalese in Great Britain engaged in hair braiding or Turks in Germany running kebab restaurants. In other cases the specialization develops as racial ethnic immigrants find a niche and introduce others in their families and communities into the same line of work, for example Koreans and dry cleaning in Los Angeles, Vietnamese and nail salons in California. In other cases, workers from particular countries are recruited to fill specific labor needs, for example, Nepalese to work in construction in Qatar, Filipinas to perform housework in Western Europe, and Mexicans to do agricultural field labor in the United States. Racial stratification in the labor force is particularly important because employment status is directly related to income, degree of security, quality of housing, and access to education, healthcare, political representation, and many other aspects of well-being.

To go beyond everyday observation to actually gauge the extent of racial stratification in the labor force requires systematic collection and analysis of race and labor market variables. Government agencies, research institutes, and individual scholars have long focused on studying the relationship between race /ethnicity/gender and labor market measures using existing data sets or by collecting new data. Studies of occupational distribution of racialized minority and non-minority men and women have amply documented differences in occupational and sectoral concentration, particularly between those identified as 'White' and those identified as 'Black' or 'non-White'. Researchers have analyzed racial disparities at various scales from national to regional to local, and even at the level of individual firms. Generally, the finer the breakdown of job categories, the more apparent are the disparities. Findings from such studies have been important in documenting the existence of racial inequalities and tracking changes over time.

Additionally, researchers have sought to explain disparities by identifying factors (intervening variables), such as average differences in amount of education and experience, that might help account for part or all of the disparities. Generally, any differences remaining after these variables have been controlled for are considered to be attributable to racial discrimination. Findings from such studies have been used to argue for the need for laws and policies to combat discrimination and to assess the effectiveness of such laws and policies before and after their implementation.

Traditionally, as in the studies mentioned above, research on race and labor has treated race as an independent variable. That is, race is considered to be a pre-existing fact such that workers can be sorted into mutually exclusive racial categories. Then workers' 'race' can be correlated with other factual data, such as occupation, employment sector, and earnings. In some ways this approach is curious because historians and social scientists have demonstrated that racial identities and definitions of racial categories are unstable and shift over time. Indeed, it has become commonplace for sociologists to acknowledge that 'race' is a social construct that does not correspond to any meaningful biological referent. Rather, they understand race as a system of creating and categorizing human difference, discursively and materially.

Many social scientists and historians have adopted the influential racial formation framework of Michael Omi and Howard Winant (2015), for whom the term 'race' is used to refer to meanings, identities, and relationships organized around supposedly natural, even primordial, differences. Importantly, within this framework, race is understood as not solely or even primarily a characteristic of individuals. Rather, it is also a constitutive feature and organizing principle of collectivities, social institutions, historical processes, and social practices. Thus race is considered an organizing principle of corporations, workplaces, work policies, and shop-floor practices. As an organizing principle, race involves both cultural meanings and material relationships. That is, race is constituted simultaneously through deployment of racial rhetoric, symbols and images and through allocation of resources along racial lines. Therefore, an account of labor from the perspective of race requires looking at both representation and material relations.

That race is socially constructed and does not correspond to any biological referent does not mean that it has no real consequences. Indeed racial categories have concrete impacts on people's lives because, as David Freund (2003) notes, 'they've been used to discriminate and to distribute resources unequally and set up different standards for protection under the law. Both public policy and private institutional and communal actions have created inequalities based on race'.

Viewing race as socially constructed centers attention on ‘racialization', the processes by which individuals, groups, organizations, and cultural productions are assigned to racial categories and/or ascribed with racial meanings. This processual view of race is a counterpoint to the usual practice in the social sciences of treating race as a pre-existing social fact, especially in quantitative studies of racial disparities. In studies of labor market inequality, for example, researchers usually treat race as an independent variable to be correlated with or regressed against other variables. How categories such as Black and White were historically constituted and maintained through the organization of the labor market is not examined in these studies. Some social historians, however, have focused attention on just this issue. Labor historian David Roediger (2006b), describing his book on how Eastern and Southern European immigrant workers who occupied a ‘confused’ racial status in nineteenth-century America came to be considered White in the twentieth century, has opined:

> I think the big advantage we have now in scholarship on race in the last several decades is that we get to start from the fact that it's a biological fiction. So a term like racialization is just meant to say that race is not biological and is made in society. It describes the processes in which race is made, both by how groups of workers are slotted into jobs economically and are brought to nations under certain economic circumstances but also in the way that they're treated in terms of citizenship rights by the state. Mainly those two processes determine how workers get put into a certain category.

The social constructionist and racial formation conceptions of race parallel the development of social constructionist conceptions of gender, sexuality and even class. Thus it encourages an awareness that race never functions alone, but always in interaction with other vectors of difference, especially gender and class. This is particularly obvious in relation to work and labor markets, which are simultaneously structured according to principles of race, gender, and class. Further, ‘racialization’ functions in interaction with processes of gender and class formation to classify workers as racialized, gendered and classed beings, and workplaces as racialized, gendered, and classed spaces.

Given a social constructionist view of race and racialization in mind, there are certain key questions and issues that arise, and that will be dealt with in the remainder of this article:

- What are the historical origins of racial stratification of labor in the Western world and how have patterns of stratification persisted or changed?
- What are the contemporary forces in the global political economy that are renewing and/or reconfiguring racial stratification of labor?

- What has research revealed about racial disparities in the labor market and about the structures and practices that create and maintain these disparities?
- How does race/ethnicity (in interaction with gender) shape peoples' experiences and interactions with others in the workplace?
- To what extent has racial discrimination been reduced or changed in the wake of civil rights struggles and the implementation of anti-discrimination policies? Has there been a shift to more indirect and subtle forms of racism?
- What are some of new directions for research that can respond to changes in ideologies about race and in the practices that maintain White privilege in the post-civil rights era?

PAST AND PRESENT FORMATIONS OF RACIALIZED LABOR

Prior to the modernization of employment relations, Western law and custom regulated the relation between worker and employer in ways that constrained the freedom of workers to withhold their labor or leave their positions. They also imposed obligations on employers to provide for the maintenance of the worker. These 'unfree' arrangements were broadly applicable to all workers and not restricted to racial 'others'. However, 'unfree' labor became associated with racial others as Europeans established colonial footholds – including settler colonies, such as the United States and Australia, and franchise colonies such as the British Raj and Dutch West Indies. To ensure a sufficient labor force particularly for the primary sector of the economy, clearing and cultivating land and extracting resources, and building roads and other infrastructure, colonists appropriated native labor or imported slave or bonded labor from Africa, Asia, and other regions. In such circumstances colonists established hierarchical labor systems that distinguished colonists from colonized and imported workers. Higher positions, such as shareholders, financial managers, and certain types of skilled or technical occupations were reserved for those of European origin, while lower level positions, such as field workers, ditch diggers, and common miners, were relegated to native or non-European imported labor.

The most important distinction, however, was that between so-called free workers and slave or bonded labor. The distinction between 'free' and 'unfree' was racialized, such that White became synonymous with 'free labor' and Black, Brown, Yellow was equated with 'slave/coolie/contract labor'. The democratic revolutions of the late eighteenth century eventually led to the overthrow of traditional arrangements, such as indentured service and master–servant apprenticeships, that constrained the

freedom of White workers. Yet, Black chattel slavery survived, and in some cases expanded in much of North and South America until the latter part of the nineteenth century, when Western societies, including settler colonial nations, legally abolished slavery, thus ending the formal association of color with bound labor. However, these societies did not ban legal and de facto segregation. Segmentation of the labor market along race as well as gender lines flourished and can be documented for societies that collected labor market data broken down by race and gender by examining patterns of over-representation and under-representation in occupations and industries. Within industries employing both White and racialized minority workers, jobs were segregated along racial lines, with managerial, skilled, and 'clean' and safe jobs reserved for Whites, and subordinate, manual, 'dirty' and dangerous jobs assigned to racialized minorities. Since labor markets were also segregated by gender, there were separate tiers of jobs for White women, White men, racialized minority men and racialized minority women.

About the same time that societies which historically had racially segregated labor markets were starting to institute reforms intended to promote greater equity and inclusion of women and racial minority workers, Western and northern European societies that had been more racially homogeneous began to develop more diverse labor forces through the institutionalization of transnational labor migration to fill labor demands in their growing economies. The Scandinavian countries entered into a Nordic labor agreement in 1954 to create a common labor market to foster labor migration between countries in that region. Labor migration from countries outside of Europe initially drew on colonial and post-colonial connections. For example, in the 1960s, Britain attracted Black migrants from India and Pakistan as well as Jamaica and other British colonies in the Caribbean. Then in the 1970s several western European nations, such as the Netherlands, West Germany, Belgium, and Austria, entered into bilateral agreements with countries in the Mediterranean region to regularize labor migration from Turkey and other countries in that region. Labor migration to western and northern Europe was ratcheted up in the 1990s via European Union enhancements of 1992–94, the end of communism and the spread of neoliberal globalization. Adding to employment-driven migration was the large-scale movement of peoples fleeing conflicts and war in southeastern Europe following the break-up of Yugoslavia. Serbs, Albanians, Bulgarians, Turks, Armenians, and Azeris were among those seeking asylum as well as jobs. As for the Americas, there has been a long history of labor migration from Central America and Mexico across a relatively porous United States border during times of economic distress. Late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century surges occurred in the wake of worsening poverty and political repression brought about by corrupt right-wing military-backed governments in Central America and economic turmoil in Mexico resulting from warfare among drug gangs, as well as continued persecution of indigenous

populations. Whereas earlier Latino settlements were concentrated in the American Southwest, a noticeable portion of these later migrants have moved on to the Midwest, Southeast and Northeast regions of the United States and, to a lesser extent, Canada. Adding to north–south migration were sizable cohorts from other parts of South America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean. By 2013, the U. S. Census Bureau estimated that about 54 million Hispanics lived in the United States, making up 17 percent of the total population and comprising the largest racial-ethnic minority (U.S. Census, 2014). Filling out the ranks of the non-White U.S. labor force were migrants and refugees allied with the U.S. during World War II, the Cold War, the Vietnam War, and other military excursions, such as Filipinos, Chinese, South Koreans, Vietnamese, Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians.

To be sure, some racialized labor migrants have been recruited to fill demands for trained and educated professionals that could not be met by native-born and trained residents. Examples include physicians and nurses in the healthcare sector and engineers and technical workers in the high-tech sector. However, the vast majority of labor migrants have been slotted into lower level manufacturing and service jobs, agricultural labor, and domestic service. The gender composition of labor migration has also changed, as migrant women are drawn by the availability of feminized jobs in elderly care, childcare, and housekeeping. The prevalence of migrants in certain jobs has led to the racialization of these jobs as ‘non-White’ and the people who do them as ‘colored’ or ‘not quite White'.

Further, labor migration has increased at the same time that new forms of labor exploitation have emerged. Deindustrialization and economic restructuring, according to Geoff Ely (2015), have ‘led to prevalence of low wage, deskilled, deregulated, deunionized, debenefitted, illegal, semi-legal conditions of work for which new migrants are perfectly fitted'. The worsening of labor conditions at the same time as the growing presence of immigrants from outside of western Europe has fueled racist exclusionary movements, much like the anti-Chinese exclusionary politics of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America were fueled by the influx of Chinese coinciding with the growth of monopoly capital, deskilling, and labor–management conflicts.

Only with civil rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s did some nations begin to establish anti-discrimination and fair employment laws and enforcement mechanisms. By the turn of the twenty-first century, the majority of Western countries had adopted such measures. Time series studies document a decline in the extent of segregation of the labor market from the 1970s to the 2010s, but also the continuation of racial disparities in occupational status, pay, and unemployment/non-employment. Racial disparities in the labor market, including inequality in occupational status, pay, and unemployment are pervasive and widespread throughout the world and have been well documented

through quantitative studies based on census and other survey data. However, because individual countries differ in their racial ethnic compositions, history of race relations, and racial classification systems, it is difficult to do justice to the array of findings in a short review. In terms of breadth, the most ambitious global surveys of findings have been undertaken by the International Labor Organization (ILO), which issued reports on various forms of labor inequality in 2003, 2007, and 2011. In their discussions of racial inequality, the reports focused particular attention on the disadvantaged positions of Blacks of African origin in many countries; indigenous peoples, particularly in the Americas; Roma /travelers in western Europe; and labor migrants from the global south working in the global north. The 2003 report points out that discrimination against a specific person may occur on multiple grounds, thus necessitating intersectional analysis to comprehend the experience of specific subgroups of persons, such as Black women. Discrimination on multiple grounds produces ‘specific experiences of discrimination', and also increases the severity or intensity of disadvantage (ILO, 2003: 27). All three reports also described local and national programs and policies designed to promote greater equality and inclusion (ILO, 2003, 2007, 2011).

Generally speaking, systematic data on race-based occupational segregation and racial disparities in earnings and unemployment are most abundant for the United States, but are also available for other countries, including Great Britain and Brazil. In all three countries, whites were more likely to be evenly distributed among occupational categories and to enjoy higher average occupational status, higher wages, and lower unemployment rates than racial ethnic minorities. For the purposes of illustration, it may be useful to hone in on the situation of Blacks of African origin in these three countries.

For the U.S., a great deal of research has highlighted occupational segregation by race, with a disproportionate concentration of African Americans in low-wage, low skilled occupations and their under-representation in well-paid skilled and professional fields. Occupational segregation in turn contributes to inequality in earnings and to higher rates of poverty among Blacks. However, it does not account for all earnings inequality: within any given occupational category, Blacks earn less than their White counterparts, particularly in jobs requiring university degrees (Dodoo and Takyi, 2002). Perhaps the most striking racial disparity is in unemployment. Since the 1950s, African Americans have had twice the unemployment rates of Whites, a pattern that persisted through 2015, when Black unemployment was 9.6 percent compared to 4.6 percent among Whites (Fairlie and Sundstrom, 1997; U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). Kenneth Couch and Robert Fairlie (2010) tested the ‘last hired, first

fired' hypothesis to explain higher Black unemployment using U.S. Current Population Survey data over a 20-year period. They found Blacks were more likely to be let go during an economic downturn, but that the patterns of hiring in an upturn were more complicated.

Similar patterns of racial segregation in the labor market and racial disadvantage in earnings and unemployment have been documented for Blacks of African or Caribbean origin in Great Britain through analyses of British Census data on 13 racial/ethnic groups for 1991, 2001, and 2011 (Catney and Sabater, 2015; Kapedia et al., 2015). Black Africans experienced the greatest degree of occupational segregation, having the lowest representation in managerial positions and skilled trades and a disproportionate concentration in personal service jobs, for example as nursing auxiliaries and assistants. Black African, Black Caribbean, and other racialized minorities were more likely to be employed in part-time jobs, which generally were more insecure and paid lower wages than full-time jobs. Black African and Black Caribbean men earn lower wages than White men largely due to their lower representation in better-paid occupations; however a small part of the gap is due to Blacks getting paid less for equivalent jobs (Brynin and Guveli, 2012; Metcalf, 2009). African-origin men have also historically suffered higher unemployment. Over the 20-year period between 1991 and 2011 Black Caribbean and Black African men aged 25–49 had about three times the unemployment rate of their White counterparts (Kapedia et al., 2015).

As for Brazil, where the majority of the population is of African origin, Blacks and Browns have been found to be severely disadvantaged vis-à-vis Whites (Garcia et al., 2009). In 2005, White men's earnings were almost double that of Afro-Brazilians, while White women's earnings were nearly double those of Afro-Brazilian women (Gradin, 2007). Racial differences in education, training, and experience are particularly stark in Brazil, accounting for much of the wage gap. On average, White women have more years of education than Black/Brown men and women, and consequently earn more than both groups. However, in occupations requiring university degrees, the race difference in remuneration falls to 15 percent (Saboia and Saboia, 2009), and Black/Brown men actually earn more than White women, indicating that gender disadvantage is particularly powerful (ILO, 2003). Rates of unemployment have historically been higher for Blacks/Browns than for Whites, but the gap has been smaller than in the U.S. or Great Britain (Telles, 2004). For example, in 2009, the unemployment rate for Blacks/Browns was 10.1 percent, compared to a rate of 8.2 percent for Whites. Moreover, once unemployed, Blacks/Browns tended to remain jobless for longer periods than Whites (ILO, 2011).

Much research has also been directed at uncovering the mechanisms (intervening variables) that account for racial disparities in the labor market aside from employer discrimination. As indicated previously, a

sizable portion of differences in occupational status can be attributed to average group differences in education, training, experience and other kinds of human capital. These differences, in turn, grow out of other forms of discrimination, especially housing segregation and ghettoization. The quality of local schools varies considerably in White-majority and -minority neighborhoods. Thus housing segregation prevents racial minorities from acquiring high quality education, job training, and employment experience. Additionally, since labor markets are highly localized, residential segregation and concentration may also limit the industries and occupations that are readily accessible to those living in areas of racial ethnic concentration. In addition to distance, the lack of access to transportation may make it doubly difficult for those living in minority areas to commute to good jobs in predominately White areas.

Sociological and economic theories to explain race/ethnic inequality in employment rates, occupational attainment, and pay are more or less the same as those used to explain gender inequality in the labor force. Orthodox individualistic theories focus on presumed characteristics or deficiencies of disadvantaged groups that lead to their concentration in lower level jobs. For example, economist Gary Becker's (1959) theory of human capital hypothesizes that racial/ethnic workers bring lower average levels of valuable characteristics such as education, skills, and experience, while economist Thomas Sowell's (1985) culture of poverty thesis posits that some racial ethnic groups bring undesirable attitudes and behaviors, such as lack of a work ethic, that hamper them in the labor market, while other groups bring cultural attributes that foster success in the labor market.

Still, when differences in human capital are controlled for, racial disparities remain, such that, for example, at every education level, Blacks or Browns are disproportionately located in lower level, lower paying occupations than Whites with comparable levels of education. Becker's (1959) theory of discrimination attributes these remaining disparities to unwarranted preference on the part of employers for members of some racial ethnic groups and/or dislike of members of other groups. In Becker's formulation, such employers are indulging their ‘taste for discrimination'. This preference may stem from conscious or explicit bias or from unconscious or implicit bias.

From a Marxist perspective, employers should want to employ the cheapest workers for every job in order to maximize profits. Thus, favoring White men for certain jobs might seem irrational. To explain race segregation, Marxist theories turn to class conflict, with some theorists focusing on capitalists’ desire to create divisions among workers along race lines to undercut class solidarity, while others focus on White (male) workers’ desire to forestall or reduce competition from racialized minorities by having them excluded from desirable jobs (see Reich, 1981). In circumstances where White workers have

leverage, for example to disrupt production, employers may accommodate them by reserving higher skilled, cleaner, more secure, and better paid jobs for dominant-group workers. Additionally, worker organizations and politicians who represent White working-class interests have often mobilized to bar or reduce entry of racialized (im)migrants into the metropole. It can be argued that capitalists would prefer to use lower wage workers regardless of race, but cannot fill all positions with minority workers. By reserving and limiting high wage work to White male workers they gain labor peace by diverting worker resistance toward opposition to racial minorities. At the same time, labor market segregation leads to the crowding of minorities into fewer occupations, driving down wages in those occupations and thus further disadvantaging minority workers. White workers gain (arguably a Pyrrhic victory) by securing a monopoly on better jobs and a higher social status, that is, by enjoying what social historian David Roediger (2007) dubbed the ‘wages of whiteness'.

There are also structuralist approaches, such as dual labor market theory – both Marxist and non-Marxist – that posit the existence of separate and unequal labor markets, a primary market consisting of skilled, well-paid, and secure jobs, and a secondary market made up of unskilled, low-paid and insecure jobs. According to these models, White workers are more likely to be tracked into the primary market, while workers of color are more likely to be tracked into the secondary market. Workers in the secondary market tend to remain stuck there, sometimes for their entire working lives because of lack of entry points and/or barriers (including experience in the primary labor market) (Gordon, 1972; Saint Paul, 1997). In a related vein, some theorists point to the role played by internal labor markets within firms (Doeringer and Piore, 1971). For example, firms may recruit from specific pools of possible workers (for example graduates of particular schools or training programs) that contain few, if any, people of color.

New racial theorizing is expanding the range of explanatory frameworks. One area of theorizing has been whiteness studies, of which David Roediger has been a pioneer, particularly as it relates to historical and contemporary labor studies. Up until recent times, studies of race and race relations have focused on the problems and disadvantages of Blacks and racial others. Critical whiteness scholars have brought attention to whiteness as not only constructed in opposition to racial others, but as an assumed and invisible norm against which racial others are judged as deficient. In this line of thinking, whiteness has been the unnamed status that carries the privileges of citizenship, civil rights, and legal standing. Those lacking White status are in varying degrees non-citizens, lacking full rights and standing, which makes them more exploitable and expendable in the labor market.

Michael Omi and Howard Winant (2015) have identified the ‘racial state’ as a powerful player in the racialization of groups previously not thought of in racial terms. The state has power to shape the racial

structuring of the labor force through its governance of immigration and naturalization. Laws are mostly used to exclude groups that would be racialized as non-White in the receiving country, but they can also be used to recruit non-White workers for particularly devalued jobs and under restrictive conditions that limit their mobility and close off citizenship. For example, some affluent countries have instituted guest worker programs that recruit immigrants to enter for a limited period of time and only to provide needed labor in a particular sector, such as agricultural field labor, construction, or live-in domestic service. Guest workers may not be allowed to change employers or become permanent residents. Another example is the arrangements for 'refugees' that allow entry, work permits and long-term residency, but that keep the migrants in a liminal status that does not offer a path to citizenship. These kinds of special programs serve to racialize the workers as not-White by treating them as a 'cheap' labor force whose members do not have to be fully integrated or recognized as full members of the nation.

In order to uncover the meso- and micro-level mechanisms that create and maintain racial segregation of jobs, and exclusion of racial minorities from positions of authority, researchers have turned to qualitative methods such as participant observation and open-ended interviews. Feminist researchers have led the way in carrying out research on gender inequality in the workplace and on the experience of women in male-dominated workplaces. Joan Acker (1990) developed the concept of gendered organizations to describe the way masculine ideals shape organizational structures and practices. Later, she and some race scholars began to point out that organizations are simultaneously raced and gendered (Acker, 2006; Omi and Winant, 2015). Thus, standards for competence, professionalism, and job performance are those that define White manhood, thereby excluding White women and people of color.

Some professions or workplaces are dominated by White males so that women and people of color may constitute a small numerical minority. In the late 1970s, Rosabeth Kanter (1977a) attributed the problems faced by women executives to their position as tokens, that is as a small fraction of those in high positions in the corporate hierarchy. As tokens, they suffer from hypervisibility (which increases performance pressure), marginalization (which decreases influence and power), and isolation (which cuts access to mentoring and useful information). The concept of tokenism has subsequently been applied to racial minorities in White-dominated organizations. For example, Ada Harvey Wingfield (2013) conducted in-depth interviews with 42 Black lawyers, physicians, engineers, and bankers in the United States. Wingfield argues that Black professional men experience only partial tokenization because their visibility may create undue performance pressures, but may also make them better known by co-workers. They also report their being able to engage in talk about sports and other masculine interests with their White male colleagues.

Meta-studies have analyzed findings from multiple qualitative studies to address the question of why there are fewer and fewer White women and people of color as one goes up the levels of authority (Smith, 2002; Elliott and Smith, 2004). These meta-studies indicate that besides direct discrimination by those in positions of power to hire and promote, two other mechanisms may play critical roles. First, minorities tend to be excluded from informal social networks which provide valuable career information and mentoring that their White male colleagues receive. Elliott and Smith (2004) point out:

> Research on this subject generally shows that work-related networks help workers gain skills, acquire legitimacy, and climb promotional ladders (Bridges and Villemez, 1986; Campbell and Rosenfeld, 1985; Podolny and Baron, 1997) and that these resources are important because most employees' job training and career development come from informal instruction rather than continuing education and explicit on-the job training.

Second, those in positions of high authority tend to pick others who are like themselves to work under them. Since the upper ranks of authority are predominately White males, they tend to prefer White males. Rosabeth Kanter (1977b) referred to the practice of promoting similar others as homosocial reproduction because it tends to replicate the ascriptive characteristics of those holding power over successive generations. According to Kanter, the preference for similar others for high-prestige, high-reward positions is due to the high degree of uncertainty involved and the reliance on trust and personal discretion required. In such circumstances, those in power feel there will be greater predictability and clear communication if those below them are like themselves.

In terms of the complex relations across race and gender lines, attention has been focused on the special problems faced by women of color. A familiar canard is that Black women may be favored over Black men for professional employment, both because they are seen as less threatening and because they can be counted twice for purposes of meeting diversity goals (e.g. Epstein, 1973). However, researchers have attempted to refute this conception and have argued that women of color are not advantaged relative to Black men, but are merely less disadvantaged in relation to men of their race than are White women in relation to White men (e.g. Benjamin, 2005; Fulbright, 1986). Moreover, women of color experience special problems, one of which is 'racialized sexual harassment'. Black women in the U.S. have been found to be more likely to report being sexually harassed at work than White women. In an interview study involving 65 African American women police officers, they recounted frequent incidents of sexual harassment by both Black and non-Black colleagues or superiors. Their descriptions of incidents

indicated they were targeted not just as women, but as ‘Black women'. However, because of their precarious position in a male-dominated macho occupation, they were reluctant to report the incidents to superiors (Teixera, 2002). Most studies of racialized sexual harassment have been conducted in the U.S.; however, a small study was conducted in Great Britain involving 17 subjects that the researchers identified as ‘Black Asian’ and ‘Minority Ethnic’ (FAME) women. These women were chosen because they had experienced or witnessed sexual harassment in their workplaces. They described such incidents, saying that often they had been harassed by men of their own racial ethnicity. However, less than a quarter had reported these incidents to superiors because of ‘fear of job loss, reprisals from male family members, and negative organizational consequences’ (Fielden et al., 2010).

NEW AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As stated previously, newer understandings of race as being socially constructed have thrown into question the fixity of race and have emphasized the processes by which individuals and groups become racialized. The processual constructionist approach to race offers alternatives to studying the relationship between race and labor via the usual practice of treating race as an independent variable that affects or determines a person's occupational status, pay, unemployment rates, and other indices of inequality. Instead, we can begin to look at race sometimes as a dependent variable that is influenced by social factors, such as changes in work status or racialization processes in the workplace. We can examine, for example, how upward or downward mobility in the labor force influences both others’ perception of one's race and one's own racial identity.

Research in this area has been pioneered by Aliya Saperstein and Andrew M. Penner (2012), who analyzed two national longitudinal data sets to assess the extent of change in an individual's racial classification as defined by others and their racial self-identity over a 23-year period. Focusing particularly on individuals who were classified as White or Black in 1979, Saperstein and Penner found a small but identifiable subgroup whose racial classification and/or identity changed over that period. In examining social status changes that were correlated with changes in race, they found a number of negative events that were associated with changes from White to Black in racial classification and/or self-identified race, including being below the poverty line, being incarcerated, and being unemployed for a period of more than four months. Demonstrating the complex interactions of gender and race, Penner and Saperstein (2013) later reported differential impacts of social status on changes in racial identity. For example, they found that while falling below the poverty line decreased both men's and women's odds of being classified as White, the effect was stronger for men, presumably because of the

societal emphasis on men's responsibility as breadwinners. The findings indicate that racial discrepancies in occupational status, earnings, and unemployment may be magnified by racializing successful people as White and unsuccessful people as non-White.

A next step for researchers could be to study processes of racialization – that is, how race is made salient and how ‘race appropriate’ demeanor might be produced through workplace rules and interaction. A model in the case of production of gender is Leslie Salzinger's (2003) study of four maquiladora plants in Mexico, each of which used gender in distinctly different ways to ‘constitute’ their workers as gendered beings. For example, one factory was set up in such a way that young women were encouraged to use their femininity to compete for the sexual attention of male supervisors, while in another women and men were clothed in gender neutral smocks and caps and treated as ‘masculinized’ workers. In considering the production of race in the workplace, we can start with the fact that minority workers are more often employed in large organizations to do ‘race work', to oversee equal employment and diversity initiatives, or to engage in outreach to minority communities (Wingfield and Alston, 2014). An examination of the effects of doing such work on the visibility of race, the salience of racial stereotypes, and racialized interactions would be enlightening.

Another new research direction has been to pay greater attention to race as not made up of mutually exclusive categories, such as Black, White, and Red as in the United States, but as a continuum as in the case of Brazil and many Latin American countries. In the former case, race has been viewed as a matter of ancestry, with the White category being seen as made up of those with exclusively European ancestry, while the Black category is made up of all those with any trace of African ancestry. In the latter (Latin American) case, race is more a matter of physical appearance – skin color, hair texture, facial features – than ancestry. Siblings with the same mother and father may be considered to be of different races. Abundant research in Brazil has documented the significant relationship between skin tone and inequality, including differences in labor-related disparities such as earnings, rates of unemployment and occupational status (e.g. Arcand and D'Hombres, 2004; Loureiro et al. 2004; Lovell, 2006; Monk, 2013; Telles, 2004).

As for the United States, research on skin tone differences has long been studied in the context of social relations in the African American community. However, the diversity in status among people classified as Black has been overshadowed by differences between those classified as Black and those classified as White (Herring, 2002). More recently, researchers have focused on the larger societal implications of skin tone in the United States, including its role in socioeconomic inequality (e.g. Goldsmith et al., 2006; Wade et al., 2004). At least one researcher (Gullickson, 2005) has found a decline in skin tone

differentials in the post-Civil Rights era among an undifferentiated male and female survey sample. However, another researcher (Keith, 2009), using the same survey data, but differentiating the sample by gender, found significantly higher occupational status among lighter toned women. The relationship between skin tone and occupational status was not monotonic, however, in that 'Very Dark Brown' women actually did better than 'Dark Brown' women.

In one of the most recent studies, Ellis Monk (2013, 2014) used data from a 2001– 2003 national survey that included skin tone as a variable and found significant relationships between socioeconomic measures and skin tone. Darker skin was negatively associated with educational level, but not with being employed. Unlike studies based on earlier surveys, Monk discovered that skin tone was not a significant predictor of occupational status for Black women. However, for men, 'very dark skin' had particularly negative effects: male 'respondents with "very dark skin" had 73% higher odds of having a less prestigious occupation than all other respondents even after controlling for their age, education, and other sociodemographic controls' (Monk, 2014). Monk suggests that the apparent greater bias against this group currently than in the past may be due to a shift to greater dependence on White gatekeepers in now-integrated workplaces than in the past. Thus the tendency of Whites to associate dark skin with criminality may have a particularly negative impact on darker skinned Black men in the labor market. These continuities and changes point to the need for more attention to skin tone and other sources of diversity *within* racial categories that affect labor outcomes.

Still another development has been the rise and triumph of color-blind ideology as the dominant mode of racism. Unlike overt racist attitudes and actions, such as refusal to hire minorities that may be challenged and addressed, color-blind racism presents particular difficulties because it is based on denial and avoidance. Color-blindness is the belief among Whites that the society has progressed so that people of color are no longer discriminated against and that they themselves are not racist (Bonilla-Silva, 2009). In the workplace, color-blind racism takes the form of denying the existence of institutionalized racism. In her study of racial dynamics in a large corporate law firm, Jennifer Pierce (2012) found White male lawyers were discomfited by or hostile toward race conscious policies of inclusion, such as affirmative action, on the grounds that such policies were no longer needed because of social progress and that neither the firm nor they themselves were racist. 'In this professional milieu, like many others, the ideology of meritocracy is the central frame of reference for explaining success and disparaging failure …Within these meritocratic workplace cultures, there is no acceptable language for stories about structural inequality, such as institutionalized racism'. The only two Black male attorneys the firm had ever hired reported many small acts of discrimination, such as colleagues ignoring their comments in

meetings, forgetting lunch dates, losing a report that took a long time to research, and being given an assignment in an area that was unfamiliar. Both eventually quit. Long after one of the Black lawyers had left the firm, the White attorneys said he didn't fit in, his clothes were too flashy, he was demanding and abrasive, and they had doubted his qualifications from the beginning. By denying the existence of systematic racism and their own involvement in marginalizing and excluding racial others, the White lawyers were also constructing themselves as innocent.

In this climate, direct questions about prejudiced beliefs and motives on the part of employers and managers are unlikely to be fruitful. Further, racial bias is expressed in less observable ways. As Douglas Massey (2007: 54) points out, ‘when pushed by the federal government to end overt discriminatory practices, [Whites] are likely to innovate new and more subtle ways to maintain their privileged position in society'. Thus it has become more challenging to demonstrate the continuing significance of race in employment and to uncover discriminatory practices. One interesting method that offers possibilities is the field audit. Field audits are an innovative method adopted in the 1960s to uncover the extent of housing discrimination, especially in the wake of fair housing legislation in cities in the United States. Fair housing groups would send matched White and racial ethnic applicants (generally actors and actresses) to look at apartments that were advertised as available for rent. They found ample instances of discrimination. Racial ethnic applicants were routinely told by agents that an apartment in a predominately White area was no longer available; subsequently, matched White applicants who came later were told the apartment was available and were invited to apply (Yinger, 1995).

The necessity of using live applicants, of course, means that there may be unidentified individual variations other than race – such as demeanor or speech patterns – that might affect landlord responses. However, the frequent usage of paper and electronic application processes in employment offers the possibility of careful control of non-racial variations. Two recent field audit studies of racial discrimination in hiring were carried out in eight cities in Great Britain and in three localities in the United States. The British study was conducted by researchers from the National Centre for Research on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions (Wood et al., 2009). The researchers set up an elaborate matrix in order to send out three sets of applications that were equivalent; one from a man or woman with a recognizably White native British name, and two from a man or woman with a stereotypically Black African, Black Caribbean, Chinese, Indian, or Pakistani name. ‘Success’ was defined as receiving a positive response – an offer of an interview or request for further information. One of the main findings was that applications with a White name were more likely to receive a positive response: ‘Of

the 987 applications with a White name, 10.7 per cent received a positive response, compared to 6.2 per cent of the 1974 applications with an ethnic minority name' (Wood et al., 2009). Another way to express the difference was the rate of success. An ethnic minority job seeker would have to send 16 applications to get a positive response, while a White job seeker would have to send only 9 applications.

The American study received a great deal of media attention because it added to previous American field audit studies (e.g. Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2004) by varying the prestige of the university from which applicants had received their degrees. The researcher, Michael Gaddis (2015), focused on internet job advertisements requiring electronic applications for positions requiring a college degree. He created applications from matched pairs of ostensibly Black and White male and female applicants who listed a degree either from a high-status private university (e.g. Harvard) or from a solid, but less selective, public university (e.g. University of Massachusetts, Amherst). Otherwise, the only other difference was the first name on the application. These names had been shown in tests to be widely understood to be African American or European American from high-status, middle, or low-status backgrounds. Gaddis reported:

> White candidates with a degree from an elite university have the highest response rate (17.5 percent), followed by black candidates with a degree from an elite university (12.9 percent) and white candidates with a degree from a less selective university (11.4 percent), and finally black candidates with a degree from a less selective university have the lowest response rate (6.5 percent).

These findings are interesting because they show that for Blacks, earning a degree from a prestigious university rather than a middle-level university more than doubles the chances of a positive response. However, Blacks with prestigious degrees still are about only two-thirds as likely to receive a positive response as Whites with equivalent credentials. In fact, they were only slightly more likely to receive a positive response than Whites with lesser credentials. These latter findings are important because improving human capital/credentials is often touted as the way for minorities to catch up to Whites. Obviously, education does help lift minorities, but not to the level of Whites with equivalent education.

The new directions that have been described in this final section indicate the need to raise awareness of the continuing significance of race as an organizing principle in the labor market. They also point to contemporary changes that have altered the ways and means by which White racial privilege is

maintained. Researchers will have to continue to innovate in order to be able to expose the workings of racism, and to bring attention to hidden structures and ostensibly race-neutral practices that help to create and maintain racial disparity and discrimination in the labor market.

References

Acker, J 1990, ‘Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations', Gender & Society, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 139–150.

Acker, J 2006, ‘Inequality regimes: gender, class, and race in organizations', Gender & Society, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 441–464.

Arcand, JL and D'Hombres, B 2004, ‘Racial discrimination in the Brazilian labour market: wage, employment and segregation effects', Journal of International Development, vol. 16, pp. 1053–1066.

Becker, G 1959, The Economics of Discrimination, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Benjamin, L 2005, The Black Elite: Still Facing the Color Line in the Twenty-First Century, 2nd edn, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.

Bertrand, M and Mullainathan, S 2004, ‘Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal?' American Economic Review, vol. 94, pp. 991–1013.

Bonilla-Silva, E 2009, Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States, 3rd edn, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD.

Bridges, WP and Villemez, WJ 1986, ‘Informal hiring and income in the labor market', American Sociological Review, vol. 51, pp. 574–582.

Brynin, M and Guveli, A 2012, ‘Understanding the ethnic pay gap in Britain', Work, Employment and Society, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 574–587.

Campbell, KE and Rosenfeld, R 1985, ‘Job search and job mobility: sex and race differences', in Research in the Sociology of Work, vol 3, eds Simpson, RL and Simpson, IA, JAI Press, pp. 147–74.

Catney, G and Sabater, A 2015, Ethnic Minority Disadvantage in the Labour Market: Participation, Skills, and Geographical Inequalities, Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available from http:www.jrf.org.uk/publications/ethnic-minority-disadvantage-labour-market [5 June 2015].

Couch, KA and Fairlie, R 2010, ‘Last hired, first fired? Black-white unemployment and the business cycle', Demography, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 227–247.

Dodoo, FNA and Takyi, BK 2002, ‘Africans in the diaspora: black-white earnings differences among America's Africans', Ethnic and Racial Studies, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 913–941.

Doeringer, PB and Piore, MJ 1971, Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis, D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, MA.

Eley, G 2015, ‘Racialization, difference and the politics of working-class formations', New Left Project. Available at: http://www.newleftproject.org/index.php/site/article_comments/racialization_difference_and_the_politics_of_working_class_formation [15 May 2015].

Elliott, JR and Smith, RA 2004, ‘Race, gender and workplace power', American Sociological Review, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 365–386.

Epstein, CF 1973, ‘The positive effects of a double negative: explaining the success of black professional women', American Journal of Sociology, vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 912–935.

Fairlie, RW and Sundstrom, WA 1997, ‘The racial unemployment gap in long-run perspective', American Economic Review, vol. 8, pp. 306–310.

Fielden, SL, Davidson, MJ, Woolnough, J and Hunt, C 2010, ‘A model of racialized sexual harassment of women in the UK workplace', Sex Roles, vol. 62, pp. 20–34.

Freund, D 2003. ‘What is the difference between race and ethnicity?' Available at http://www.pbs.org/race/000_About/002_04-experts-03-02.htm [2 February 2015].

Fullbright, K 1986 ‘The myth of the double-advantage: black female managers', in Slipping Through the Cracks: The Status of Black Women, eds Sims, MC and Malveaux, JM, Transaction Publishers, Piscataway, NJ, pp. 33–45.

Gaddis, SM 2015, ‘Discrimination in the credential society: an audit study of race and college selectivity in the labor market', Social Forces, vol. 93, no. 4, pp. 1451–1479.

Garcia, M, Marques, L, Nopo, H and Salardi, P 2009, ‘Gender and racial wage gaps in Brazil: evidence using a matching comparisons approach'. Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, DC.

Goldsmith, A, Hamilton, D and Darity, W 2006, ‘Shades of discrimination, skin tone and wages', American Economic Review, vol. 96, no. 2, pp. 242–245.

Gordon, D 1972, Theories of Poverty and Underemployment: Orthodox, Radical and Dual Labor Market Perspectives, Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.

Gradin, C 2007, ‘Why is poverty so high among Afro-Brazilians? A decomposition analysis of the racial poverty gap', The Journal of Economic Development, vol. 45, no. 9, pp. 1426–1452.

Gullickson, A 2005, ‘The significance of color declines: a re-analysis of skin tone differentials in post-civil rights America', Social Forces, vol. 84, no 1, pp. 157–180.

Herring, K 2002, ‘Bleaching out the color line? The skin color continuum and the tripartite model of race' , Race and Society, vol. 5, pp. 17–31.

International Labor Organization 2003, Time for Equality at Work, Report of the Director-General, International Labour Office, Geneva.

International Labor Organization 2007, Equality at Work: Tackling the Challenges, Report of the Director-General, International Labour Office, Geneva.

International Labor Organization 2011, Equality at Work: The Continuing Challenge, Report of the Director-General, International Labour Office, Geneva.

Kanter, R 1977a, ‘Some effects of proportions on group life: skewed sex ratios and responses to token women', American Journal of Sociology, vol. 82, no. 5, pp. 965–990.

Kanter, R 1977b, Men and Women of the Corporation, Basic Books, New York.

Kapadia, D, Nazroo, J and Clark, K 2015, ‘Have ethnic inequalities in the labour market persisted?', in Ethnic Identity and Inequalities in Britain: The Dynamics of Diversity, eds Jivraz, S and Simpson, L, Polity Press, Bristol, pp. 161–179.

Keith, V 2009, ‘A colorstruck world: skin tone, achievement, and self-esteem among African American women', in Shades of Difference: Why Skin Color matters, ed. Glenn, EN, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Loureiro, PRA, Carneiro, FG and Sachsida, A 2004, ‘Race and gender discrimination in the labor market: an urban and rural sector analysis for Brazil', Journal of Economic Studies, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 129–143.

Lovell, PA 2006, ‘Race, gender, and work in Sao Paulo, Brazil, 1960–2000', Latin American Research Review, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 63–87.

Massey, D 2007, Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Metcalf, H 2009, ‘Pay gaps across the equality strands: a review', Research Report 14, Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Monk, EP Jr. 2013, Color, Bodily Capital, and Ethnoracial Division in the U.S. and Brazil, PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.

Monk, EP Jr. 2014, ‘Skin tone stratification among black Americans, 2001–2003', Social Forces, vol. 92, no. 4, pp. 1313–1337.

Omi, M and Winant, H 2015, Racial Formation in the United States, 3rd edn, Routledge, New York.

Penner, AM and Saperstein A 2013, ‘Engendering racial perceptions: an intersectional analysis of how social status shapes race', Gender & Society, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 319–344.

Pierce, J 2012, Racing for Innocence: Whiteness, Gender and the Backlash Against Affirmative Action, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Podolny, JM and Baron, JN 1997, ‘Resources and relationships: social networks and mobility in the workplace', American Sociological Review, vol. 62, no. 4, 673–693.

Reich, M 1981, Racial Inequality: A Political-Economic Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Roediger, DR 2006a, Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White, Basic Books, New York.

Roediger, DR 2006b, ‘Understanding racism today: an interview with David Roediger', Political Affairs. Available at http://www.politicalaffairs.net/understanding-racism-today-an-interview-with-david-roediger/[5 March 2015].

Roediger, DR 2007, The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class, 3rd edn, Verso, New York and London.

Saboia, AL and Saboia, J 2009, ‘Whites, blacks and *brown* in the labor market in Brazil: a study about inequalities', Review of Black Political Economy, vol. 36, pp. 127–135.

Saint-Paul, G 1997, Dual Labor Markets: A Macroeconomic Perspective, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Salzinger, L 2003, Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico's Global Factories, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Saperstein, A and Penner, AM 2012, ‘Racial fluidity and inequality in the United States', American Journal of Sociology, vol. 118, 676–727.

Smith, RA 2002, ‘Race, gender, and authority in the workplace: theory and research', Annual Review of Sociology, vol. 28, pp. 509–542.

Sowell, T 1985, The Economics and Politics of Race: An International Perspective, Quill House Publishers, Fort Mill, SC.

Teixera, MT 2002, ‘“Who protects and serves me?”: a case study of sexual harassment of African American women in one U.S. law enforcement agency', Gender & Society, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 524–545.

Telles, E 2004, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015, ‘Employment situation summary'. Available at: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm [5 July 2015].

Wade, JT, Romano, M and Blue, L 2004. ‘The effect of African American skin color on hiring preferences', Journal of Applied Social Psychology, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 2550–2558.

Wingfield, AH 2013, No More Invisible Man: Race and Gender in Men's Work, Temple University Press , Philadelphia, PA.

Wingfield, AH and Alston, RS 2014, ‘Maintaining hierarchies in predominantly white organizations: a theory of racial tasks', American Behavioral Scientist, vol. 58, pp. 274–287.

Wood, M, Hales, J, Purdon, S, Sejersen T and Hayllar, O 2009, ‘A test for racial discrimination in recruitment practice in British cities', Research Report No. 607, Department for Work and Pensions, UK.

Yinger, J 1995, Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.