Many have researched the effect of occupational segregation on race and gender gaps in pay, but few have examined segregation’s impact on promotions. This article uses the Panel Study of Income Dynamics to examine the effect of race and gender composition in the origin occupation on movement to a managerial position. Findings show that for men, percentage of women in the origin occupation positively affected the chances of men moving to a supervisory position and that Blacks were less likely than Whites to be promoted. For women, percentage of women and percentage of Blacks in the origin occupation significantly decreased chances of women attaining a management position. Subsequent analyses showed that Black men, Black women, and White women waited longer than did White men for the managerial promotions they received. The findings suggest the impact of a “glass escalator” for White men, a “glass ceiling” for others, and contradict the notion of a “declining significance of race.”
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White women, Black women, and Black men are disproportionately excluded from supervisory authority, resulting in lower pay for these groups (Kanter, 1977; Kluegel, 1978; Reskin & Ross, 1995; Wolf & Fligstein, 1979). Increased representation of minority groups in managerial positions is a necessary condition for achieving parity in work rewards.

Women have made some inroads into management. In 1970, 18% of managers were women; by 1990, two in five were women (Reskin & Ross, 1995). Olson and Frieze’s (1987) survey of the literature found small gender differences in starting salaries of master of business administration (MBA) graduates. Jacobs (1992) found that the ratio of women’s to men’s earnings among managers increased from 56.9% to 61.1% between 1969 and 1987.
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For Blacks, evidence of progress is mixed. The proportion of Black men in management increased from 1.3% to 6.7% between 1940 and 1970 (Farley & Allen, 1987) but fell back to 6.3% by 1984 (Jaynes & Williams, 1989). Black women showed a similar pattern, with an overall increase from .7% to 5.2% between 1940 and 1984 (Jaynes & Williams, 1989). Because Black men and Black women constitute only a small fraction of all managers, Blacks’ rate of entry into management exceeded that for Whites in the 1970s (Nkomo & Cox, 1990, p. 39). Given that one of the most controversial figures in sociology predicts a convergence of Black and White mobility chances (Wilson, 1980, 1989), these figures bear on important theoretical and policy questions regarding the status of African Americans in U.S. society.

Despite some progress, White women, Black women, and Black men continue to face barriers within corporations. Business magazines have documented the almost total absence of these groups from top positions within large firms (e.g., see Cordtz, 1994). The term glass ceiling suggests that despite their increased presence in corporations, White women, Black women, and Black men fail to attain top managerial positions in the firm.

Numerous studies indicate that women and men are allocated to different positions when entering a firm (Bielby & Baron, 1986; Kanter, 1977; Reskin, 1988; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993). Moreover, race and sex segregation account for substantial portions of the pay gap between White men and other groups (Baron & Newman, 1990; England, Farkas, Kilbourne, & Dou, 1988; England, Herbert, Kilbourne, Reid, & Megdal, 1994; Jacobs & Steinberg, 1990; Kilbourne, England, Farkas, Beron, & Weir, 1994; Sorenson, 1989; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993). Despite the value of these studies, their reliance on cross-sectional samples precludes an examination of career changes. Examining the impact of segregation on economic rewards at a single point in time cannot explicate the sorting process that maintains and exacerbates inequality over time. By definition, careers take place over time as individuals move between jobs, and movement from nonsupervisory to supervisory positions is often associated with income growth and career development.

Case studies and interview data suggest that segregation affects the chances of receiving a promotion (e.g., see Kanter, 1977; Williams, 1992). Although informative, these studies are subject to the criticism that they rely on relatively small (and possibly unique) samples. To draw the attention of policy makers, studies of inequality often must obtain representative samples of the labor force. A few studies do show a segregation effect on movement to a higher pay grade but with samples from a single firm (Hartmann, 1987; Paulin & Mellor, 1996) or from the public sector (DiPrete & Soule, 1988; Steinberg, Haignere, & Chertos, 1990). Samples from a single firm may not generalize to the labor force as a whole, however. In addition, economists
content that because government employers need not make a profit to survive, they will adopt pay and promotion policies that differ from those in the private sector (Filer, 1990).

I am unaware of a longitudinal study providing robust statistical evidence of the association between occupational segregation and managerial mobility using a representative sample of the labor force. That is the purpose of this article. Using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), I estimate a discrete-time hazard rate model to examine the managerial transitions of U.S. workers. Results from this analysis will assess the degree of similarity (or dissimilarity) between White men and other groups in the speed and process of ascending to managerial positions. Findings from this article will also bear on the enduring controversy of a declining significance of race. Below, I review prior research to develop testable hypotheses regarding race and gender differences in managerial promotions.

OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND MANAGERIAL PROMOTIONS

Whereas most studies fail to investigate the process of advancement to managerial positions, wage growth is an important correlate of authority mobility. Thus, this section reviews the sociological arguments linking occupational segregation with earnings. Most of the segregation literature is concerned with gender segregation. After an extended discussion of gender segregation, this section will conclude with a brief review of racial segregation.

GENDER SEGREGATION AND CAREERS

Reskin and Roos (1990) provide a useful way to conceptualize segregation. They contend that workers rank jobs in terms of their desirability and rewards, whereas employers rank workers in terms of their skills and commitment to work. Men and women hold similar evaluations of jobs, but for discriminatory reasons, employers rank men ahead of women in the labor queue. Thus, the labor queue is essentially a gender queue, and sex segregation across jobs reflects stereotypical notions about the kinds of work that are appropriate for men and women. Reskin and Roos then draw on case studies to illuminate the process of redefining the sex type of jobs. Women move into “male” jobs either because market conditions force employers to reach down into the labor queue to hire women, or because men reevaluate and vacate jobs, thereby creating openings for women.
Although Reskin and Roos (1990) set out to explain changes in the sex type of jobs, their discussion reveals several ways in which men maintain their privileged position in the labor queue (see also Acker, 1990; Baron & Newman, 1990; Reskin, 1988). First, social closure processes describe the means by which men resist attempts at job integration. Through administrative rules and requirements for skill and experience, men effectively limit the pool of women competing for what may be considered the better jobs in the economy. By segregating women into female-typed jobs, men are free to compete among themselves for higher paying jobs that offer better career opportunities (Cockburn, 1991; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993). Those who do enter male-dominated occupations are harassed and isolated, which limits their effectiveness (Kanter, 1977) and drives some out of the job (Jacobs, 1989). Furthermore, the social closure argument contends that women are confined to short promotion ladders in which the few available supervisory opportunities are supervising other women doing routine work (Kanter, 1977).

Related to the social closure explanation is the status composition perspective, which contends that occupations with large numbers of female incumbents are devalued in the eyes of the organization. The jobs women hold are viewed as peripheral to the mission of the firm and require skills easily learned at home. Steinberg (1990) clearly demonstrates the impact of status composition processes in her analysis of comparable worth job evaluation schemes. She found that women received fewer points for the skills used in their jobs compared with the skills in men’s jobs, resulting in women’s lower pay. In addition, employers provide fewer training opportunities to women in female-typed occupations (Acker, 1990; Baron & Newman, 1990; Bielby & Baron, 1986; Cockburn, 1991; Reskin, 1988; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993). We may expect that low pay coupled with the denial of opportunity to grow professionally will result in stagnant career profiles.

Yet, these studies do not address the impact of occupational segregation on managerial promotions. Rather, Kanter (1977) provides a point of departure for understanding how the gender composition of an occupation affects the process of becoming a manager. Kanter found that much of what managers do is create and convey information. To accomplish their goals, effective managers must build rapport and secure the cooperation of diverse units in the firm. Managers prefer to interact with those who share their background and life experiences so as to build alliances and to reduce the chances of miscommunication. Because women are perceived as different, they are often overlooked when filling managerial positions.

In chapter 6 of her classic work, Kanter (1977) contends that opportunity is a characteristic of jobs, not people. In doing so, Kanter incorporates the
perspectives above. She found evidence of social closure when talented women with career ambitions were shunted off to clerical and office jobs to work beside other women. Once in these positions, Kanter described how the organization failed to train women, develop their skills, or give them visible jobs that would enhance their mobility. She found that most women in sex-typical jobs fail to move out of them. She was also interested, however, in the few instances when secretaries received promotions to management positions. She found that in their previous clerical jobs, women had not received the training or job assignments needed for competence in their managerial roles. Women’s subsequent failure as managers was viewed by the organization as further proof of women’s inability to manage. This crowding of women into sex-typical office jobs illustrates status composition processes. The firm’s neglect of these women led to stalled careers for most and ineffective performance in higher level jobs for the few who were promoted.

Although Kanter (1977) provides some valuable insights, her study does not examine gender differences in mobility using a multivariate framework. Her results suggest that segregation is largely responsible for women’s lack of authority mobility, but without controls for human capital and other factors, we cannot definitively conclude that this is the case. Others have examined the relative impact of demographic, human capital, and job-related factors in exercising authority on the job. Reskin and Ross (1995), for example, found that percentage of women present in the occupation determined the amount of discretionary authority. Their sample was restricted to those workers who had already attained managerial status, however. Thus, they did not examine gender differences in the process of entering management and the impact of segregation on this process. Similarly, Jacobs (1992) drew samples of managers from two national data sets and examined gender differences in earnings, working conditions, and attitudes. Jacobs found that from 1969 to 1987, the gender gap in wages closed slightly, whereas the authority gap remained the same. Nevertheless, Jacobs does not examine the impact of occupational segregation on transitions into management. Finally, Wolf and Fligstein (1979) found that occupation type (i.e., whether the job is female typed or not) affected supervisory authority in a general sample of workers. Unfortunately, their sample was cross-sectional (which precluded a study of career effects) and taken in 1975 (just as women were beginning to enter the ranks of management).

Although there is little work on the impact of occupational segregation on promotions into management, the literature suggests a negative effect. If men monopolize the best positions in the economy and female-typed jobs are devalued within organizations, then the chances that women will receive a managerial promotion should decline with percentage of women present in
the occupation. However, the impact of segregation may itself vary by gender, with men possibly benefiting from employment in female-dominated occupations, as suggested by Williams (1992, 1995).

Williams (1992) interviewed nurses, teachers, librarians, and social workers. She found that the construction of a male identity was problematic in these positions. Many men were viewed as deviants because they worked in occupations that required nurturing skills that women are believed to possess uniquely (England et al., 1994). In particular, clients preferred women to men for teaching their children, dispensing advice to welfare mothers, or giving sponge baths to patients. This preference was often expressed to supervisors, who resolved the situation by moving men to managerial positions and out of contact with the organization’s clients.

Coworkers also assumed that men were temporarily doing women’s work and were looking to move up. On one hand, many women welcomed male colleagues because they thought it might raise the status of the profession. On the other hand, they also partly agreed with clients who regarded these jobs as proper places of employment for women but not men. The prevailing assumption was that men are less capable than women of performing nurturing tasks and better suited to instrumental tasks, such as organizational planning and delegating authority. Moreover, men’s underrepresentation in these female professions also worked to their advantage. Because of the scarcity of male coworkers, men often bonded with their male supervisors. Sharing similar interests in so-called male activities (e.g., golf, home and car maintenance, etc.) resulted in the formation of mentoring relationships that fostered men’s transitions into management.

Williams (1992, 1995) found that to improve workplace morale and customer relations, organizations promoted men in female-dominated occupations, a phenomenon she called the “glass escalator.” Williams also found that some men recognized the existence of the glass escalator, with some admitting that they opted for careers in female-dominated occupations because they provided a stepping stone to management status. Although Williams’s argument is provocative, it is based on interviews with 76 men and 23 women in four semiprofessions. There are no multivariate studies testing the predictive power of the glass escalator argument in a general sample of workers. This article provides such a test.

To summarize the argument thus far, there is much research showing that how an occupation is viewed by the organization varies with gender composition. As occupations become more “female,” they are increasingly viewed as depositories for female entrants into the firm. In these occupations, women find that their skills are overlooked and that they are denied training
opportunities. These dynamics result in lower pay and failure to attain managerial positions. But for men, increasing representation of women in an occupation poses problems for the organization’s clients and may disrupt workplace morale. To alleviate these strains, men are more likely to move to managerial positions as women’s presence in the origin job increases. Based on the literature cited above, the first hypothesis tested is as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Percentage of workers who are female in the origin occupation will negatively affect women’s chances of moving into managerial positions but positively affect men’s promotion chances.

RACIAL SEGREGATION AND CAREERS

Whereas the topic of racial segregation has drawn much less attention than gender segregation (Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993), there are indications in the literature that similar processes are at work. For example, there is little doubt that White men seek to exclude Black women and Black men as competitors for prestigious jobs, as suggested by the social closure argument (for a review, see Wilson, 1980). One way to minimize encroachment into privileged positions is to channel Black women and Black men into “racialized” jobs. That is, Black executives tend to be placed in liaison jobs linking the company to the Black community or to advocates for Black equality (Collins, 1983, 1993; Jones, 1986). In the public sector, this results in the concentration of Black women and Black men in agencies with Black clients, such as social welfare or corrections (Collins, 1993). In the private sector, Blacks are hired to market products to the Black community or run affirmative action programs (Collins, 1993). The problem with these assignments was summarized nicely by one of Jones’s (1986) informants:

Too often Black managers are channeled into The Relations as I call them—the community relations, the public relations, the personnel relations. These may be important functions, but they are not the gut functions that make the business grow or bring in revenues. And they are not the jobs that prepare an executive to be a CEO. (p. 89)

If this experience is typical, the channeling of Black workers into racialized jobs reserves the more visible and revenue-producing jobs (sales, marketing, product development, etc.) for Whites. Moreover, the impact of segregation will be magnified if there is evidence that the firm neglects or devalues jobs that are increasingly associated with minorities, as the status composition perspective suggests. Indeed, two studies found that supervisor ratings of
job complexity and skill requisites were lower when the job was held by large numbers of Blacks (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990).

These findings suggest a segregation effect in that Black women and Black men are hired into and then allowed to languish in racialized jobs. There is also evidence that the percentage of Blacks in a job reduces earnings (Baron & Newman, 1990; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993). Unfortunately, the evidence linking racial segregation with managerial transitions is sketchy at best. Paulin and Mellor (1996) found that percentage of minority workers in a job reduced the chances of moving to a higher pay grade, but the sample was drawn from a single firm, and the process of entering management was not examined. Another study looked at racial composition on promotions, but the sample consisted of current managers and did not assess how segregation affected movement into supervisory positions (Greenhaus et al., 1990).

Because of the lack of research on the subject, this article will examine the promotion effect of racial composition in the origin occupation. Unlike Williams’s (1992) discussion of the glass escalator, which posits that men move upward after working in female-typed jobs, there is no research indicating that Whites will similarly benefit from working in Black-dominated jobs. Thus, the devaluing effects of placement in a minority-typed occupation should affect all incumbents, suggesting the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Percentage of Black workers in the origin occupation will negatively affect the chances of entering management.

TESTING THE HYPOTHESES

Research suggests that employers evaluate worker characteristics differently depending on the gender of the incumbent (Acker, 1990; Reskin, 1988). For example, having a spouse or young children may signal stability in men but a potential work disruption in women (Rosenfeld, 1980). For this reason, the models will be analyzed separately by gender. Hypothesis 1 will be confirmed if the sign on the gender composition variable is positive for men and negative for women. Unfortunately, there were too few Blacks entering management to reliably estimate promotion models by race. Thus, Blacks and Whites will be pooled in gender-specific models that control for the race of the respondent. Hypothesis 2 will be supported if percentage of Black workers in the origin occupation is negative for men and women alike. Such a finding would suggest that rising levels of racial segregation reduce mobility chances for all workers.
In addition to the mobility effects of race and sex segregation in the origin occupation, this article examines the significance of the race coefficient in predicting managerial promotions. Wilson’s (1980, 1989) “declining significance of race” thesis suggests that expanded educational opportunities and the passage of antidiscrimination legislation have created unprecedented mobility opportunities for African Americans. Wilson claims that family background and social class are better determinants of access to good jobs than is racial identity per se. If Wilson is correct, the race effect on entering management should be insignificant.

Yet, if the race effect on managerial mobility proves to be significant, Wilson would reject the assertion that such a finding contradicts his thesis. Wilson (1989) contends that racial comparisons that include older Blacks are biased because older Blacks suffered discrimination in the past, which depresses their current rewards compared with Whites. Wilson goes on to assert that analyses limited to younger and better educated Blacks should show a convergence in mobility opportunities with their White counterparts. For this reason, supplemental analyses will examine the impact of race on managerial mobility among a sample of workers who entered the labor market after the passage of antidiscrimination legislation and who have attained success in school. Wilson’s argument will receive support if race insignificantly predicts mobility chances in this subset of workers (see Cancio, Evans, & Maume, 1996, for an elaboration of this approach in testing Wilson’s argument).

DATA, DESIGN, AND MEASURES

DATA

Data for this study come from the PSID, a representative, longitudinal survey (Institute for Social Research, 1992) in which year-to-year attrition rates are low. The PSID originated in 1968, collecting information on all members of 5,000 families to determine changes in the fortunes of American families. The sample selected for this article consists of Black and White adults between the ages of 18 and 62 in 1981. Hispanics were excluded from the analysis because there were not enough Hispanics included in the early years of the PSID.¹

Selection into the initial sample in 1981 was conditional on several factors. First, individuals were included if they were working for an employer in a nonmanagerial occupation (to examine transitions into management).
Second, exclusively self-employed individuals were deleted from the sample because the concept of a managerial promotion is inappropriate when the individual is both the boss and a worker. Third, members of the armed forces were excluded because they do not participate in a labor market.

**ANALYTIC DESIGN**

By comparing respondents’ occupations across survey years, the analyst can detect movement into managerial positions. The PSID changed the wording on important variables (e.g., employer and job tenure) in 1989; to remain consistent across all years of the study, work histories were examined through the 1988 survey year. Thus, this article examines job changes over the calendar years 1981 to 1987. A discrete-time hazard rate model is used to model career experiences (Allison, 1984; Teachman, 1983). The strategy in event history analysis is to estimate the probability of receiving a managerial promotion for each person year of exposure to the risk of experiencing the event. This entails treating each year as if it were a sample and pooling the seven samples of workers at risk of moving into management.

Workers were defined as being at risk for receiving a managerial promotion if they worked in a nonmanagerial job and were paid by an employer. Beginning in 1981, workers were followed until they experienced a career transition, such as a managerial promotion, or a move to unemployment or self-employment (see below). At this point, the worker is no longer in the risk set and is dropped from the analysis. Thus, the number of cases contributing to the pooled data set decreases each year. Respondents excluded from the initial sample in 1981 (i.e., nonworking respondents or those exclusively self-employed) could enter the risk set in later years if they met the selection criteria (i.e., worked in a nonmanagerial job for an employer for pay). Like those selected in 1981, these workers remained in the risk set until they experienced a career transition. The total number of person years in the 1981 to 1987 pooled data set was 8,534 men and 7,778 women.

After pooling the 7 years of observations, the analyst specifies a logistic regression equation, which models the log odds of entering a management position between year, \( t \), and year, \( t+1 \). Because tenure is controlled, the model estimates the log odds of receiving a promotion given the failure to have been promoted at an earlier duration. Results from this model approximate a discrete-time hazard rate model, which easily accommodates time-varying covariates (Allison, 1984; Teachman, 1983).
THEDEPENDENTVARIABLE:
ENTRYINTOMANAGEMENT

At the beginning of any year, all workers in the risk set worked for an employer in a nonmanagerial occupation, as classified by the Census Bureau’s 1970 three-digit standard occupation classification codes. In year\(^{t+1}\), workers who worked in managerial positions (i.e., occupation codes 201 through 245) received a 1 on a binary variable signifying entry into a management occupation; all other workers received a 0. Conceptualizing managerial promotions in this way raises two methodological issues.

First, in the past, the Census Bureau treated many job titles as technical or sales positions, although they involved managerial duties. In 1970 (and in 1980), the Census Bureau reserved the term \textit{manager} for professional occupations (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980). For example, branch managers at a bank were coded as managers, whereas branch managers at shoe stores were coded as sales positions. Thus, by defining managerial transitions with census occupational definitions, this article is implicitly examining moves into professional occupations that have management duties. For our purposes, this coding scheme is advantageous in that this article attempts to model what is popularly meant by the term \textit{glass ceiling}—that is, movement into positions at the apex of the occupational hierarchy.

A second measurement issue is that besides receiving a managerial promotion, workers can move to several alternative destinations, including unemployment, withdrawal from the labor force, or self-employment. In addition, workers can receive salary promotions without changing jobs. It is possible to give each of these destinations scores of 1 on separate binary dependent variables and analyze these transitions using a competing-risks model (Hachen, 1988). The challenge for the analyst is to define mutually exclusive destination states on the dependent variable with enough cases in each destination to sustain a rigorous analysis. To simplify matters, then, this article will only analyze entry into a management position on the belief that such moves represent unique career transitions with significant effects on later achievement (Harlan, 1989). Elsewhere, I analyze career transitions resulting in salary increases or job exits (Maume, 1999).

OCCUPATIONALSEGREGATION

Both the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the PSID use census-defined standard occupation classification codes at the three-digit level of detail. The 1981 CPS provided information on the demographic composition
of occupations (Institute for Social Research, 1982). Percentage of female workers and percentage of Black workers in each occupation were calculated, and the values merged onto the occupations held by PSID respondents.

Readers are no doubt aware that jobs are grouped into occupations. That is, the term job describes an actual position in a firm or industry; the term occupation is defined as a collection of jobs that have similar skill requirements and duties. Whereas occupations are abstract labels to describe locations in the economy, jobs are specific activities that people perform. When studying sex segregation in the economy, there is a concern that analyses of occupational segregation (rather than job segregation) may be misleading. Indeed, some sex-integrated occupations (e.g., retail sales clerk) consist of many sex-segregated jobs (e.g., men selling golf clubs and women selling earrings). Quantitative research clearly shows lower levels of sex segregation measured at the occupation level compared with segregation measured at the job level (for a review, see Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993).

For practical reasons, analysts will continue to study inequality using occupation data because most data sets lack information on specific jobs. This does not mean, however, that occupation-level analyses are without merit. Indeed, Stone (1995, pp. 417-419) provides two compelling reasons for using occupation to study sex segregation. First, Stone draws from Reskin and Roos (1990), who assert that sex segregation is maintained by institutional and attitudinal processes. Institutional factors refer to actions men take to protect specific jobs against female encroachment (similar to the social closure perspective reviewed above). At the larger level of occupations, however, people form attitudes and stereotypes about work that is appropriate for men and women. Inevitably, women’s work is devalued in terms of status, pay, and career potential (similar to the status composition perspective). Because knowledge of specific jobs is limited, people develop career aspirations and make choices with occupations in mind. Studying segregation at the occupation level, therefore, reveals much about attitudinal forces that define the sex typicality of groups of jobs and the impact this has on individual careers.

Second, Stone (1995) contends that when comparing results from analyses of sex segregation at the job level to those at the occupation level, there are more similarities than differences. For example, Jacobs and Lim (1995) compared 56 countries to examine trends in occupational segregation and found similar results at different levels of aggregation. In research on wage inequality, results from job level analyses found that segregation accounts for approximately one half of the gender gap in wages (Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993), whereas analyses using occupation data attribute one third of the wage gap to segregation (England et al., 1988, 1994; Sorenson, 1989). Whereas
analyses using detailed data should show larger effects, Stone concludes that results from analyses using occupation-level data will parallel those using job-level data. Therefore, if this study finds significant composition effects on managerial mobility, the effects are probably smaller than would be the case if segregation had been measured at the job level.

ADDITIONAL PREDICTORS

A worker’s family situation was controlled in this article with two binary variables; marital status (1 = married), and the presence of a preschool-age child in the family. In addition, because Rosenbaum (1979) found that older workers are less likely to receive a promotion, the age of the respondent was controlled. Obviously, better educated respondents enjoy greater opportunities in the labor market, so a binary measure of the attainment of a college diploma was controlled (the PSID lacks a ratio measure of educational attainment). In addition, work attachment may affect the chances of entry into management; thus, the models include a control for hours worked during the year.

Workplace factors may also affect the rate of entry into management. For example, controls were introduced for a worker’s tenure in the current job and real hourly wage. Kanter (1977) and Rosenbaum (1979) both contend that companies locate star performers early in their careers and promote them; thus, employer tenure should be negatively related to the chances of promotion into management. Similarly, if companies reward individuals they want to promote to management (Kanter, 1977), the origin wage may positively influence such moves.

Because movement within the occupational structure is more likely to be short distance than long distance (Blau & Duncan, 1967), the type of occupation in year t is controlled. Specifically, workers in professional and in sales/clerical positions received scores of 1 on separate binary variables; the reference category consisted of workers in blue-collar positions.

Some analysts claim that men’s jobs require greater skills and more specialized training than women’s jobs, and this determines job rewards rather than the demographic composition of the occupation (Tam, 1997). To control for this argument, an index tapping the skill and training requirements of the occupation was created. The fourth edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Institute for Social Research, 1983) provided information on job requisites. Several measures were recorded, including the skill requirements (work with data, reasoning skills, language skills, math skills, numerical aptitude, and general intelligence) and length of specific vocational preparation for a job. The items chosen to create the index were selected in a manner
consistent with England et al. (1994), and the index was created by summing item \( z \) scores. After aggregating across jobs, the composite score for the occupation’s cognitive skill requirements was matched to the occupation of the PSID respondent.

Analysts have also shown that industrial structure affects the creation of promotion ladders (Baron, Davis-Blake, & Bielby, 1986). The model estimated below includes controls for employment in government or in the manufacturing sector. Government employment is often associated with placement in an internal labor market. Moreover, government hires and promotes with affirmative action guidelines in mind, possibly benefiting women (Collins, 1983; but see Steinberg et al., 1990). Firms in the manufacturing sector create job ladders that promote wage mobility but maintain a rigid distinction between line and staff positions (Sennett & Cobb, 1972) that may slow the rate of movement into supervisory positions. In addition, unions assist in the creation of promotion ladders, which increase salaries, but they also may observe the distinction between line and staff positions (Baron et al., 1986). Thus, a binary control for union membership will be included in the analysis.

The model also includes controls for events occurring over time that may affect promotion chances. For example, workers may experience a birth in their families; these workers received a score of 1 on a binary predictor. In addition, Felmlee (1982) found that women increased their economic standing by changing employers, suggesting the need to control for changing employers during the year (coded as 1). The calendar year in which a case contributes to the pooled data set was also controlled to allow for the possibility that promotions to management vary with economic conditions. During the observation period, the economy improved from a deep recession (1981-1982) to a period of mild but sustained growth (1985-1987). Finally, the models include a predictor—the number of years a person appears in the pooled risk set—as a control for unobserved heterogeneity (Teachman, 1983).

**FINDINGS**

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics on variables in the analysis. Table 2 presents the determinants of moving from a nonmanagerial to a managerial occupation. Logit coefficients can be interpreted as the change in the log odds of moving into management given a unit increase in a predictor. The bottom of Table 2 shows the number of men and women who actually moved into
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (coded 1)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool-age child (coded 1)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a birth during year (coded 1)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College educated (coded 1)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked in year (in hundreds)</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wage (1980 dollars)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years tenure in job</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in manufacturing (coded 1)</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employment (coded 1)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union presence at work (coded 1)</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional occupation (coded 1)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales occupation (coded 1)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in pooled data set</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar year</td>
<td>82.55</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>82.58</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed employers during year (coded 1)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive skills index</td>
<td>–.11</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>–4.39</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female workers in occupation</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>23.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Black workers in occupation</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of person years</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>34.64</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (coded 1)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool-age child (coded 1)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a birth during year (coded 1)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College educated (coded 1)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked in year (in hundreds)</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wage (1980 dollars)</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years tenure in job</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in manufacturing (coded 1)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employment (coded 1)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union presence at work (coded 1)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional occupation (coded 1)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales occupation (coded 1)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in pooled data set</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar year</td>
<td>82.80</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed employers during year (coded 1)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive skills index</td>
<td>–.60</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>–3.99</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female workers in occupation</td>
<td>72.66</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>70.96</td>
<td>25.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Black workers in occupation</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of person years</td>
<td>4,643</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
managerial occupations and provides information on the fit of the model to the data.

In many instances, the determinants of mobility are the same for men and women. For example, job attachment (i.e., annual hours worked) and higher pay both increase the chances of attaining a supervisory position. In addition, although the manufacturing sector creates internal labor markets that fosters wage mobility (Baron et al., 1986), employment in manufacturing reduces the chances of receiving a managerial promotion as does membership in a union. Similarly, there is some evidence that unobserved heterogeneity is present in this sample: The more years workers remain in the risk set, the lower their chances of receiving a managerial promotion.

### TABLE 2: Logistic Regression Model of Entry into Management, Workers Ages 18 to 62, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1981 to 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Logit Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Logit Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black (coded 1)</td>
<td>-.732**</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.020**</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (coded 1)</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool-age child (coded 1)</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a birth during year (coded 1)</td>
<td>-.412</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College educated (coded 1)</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked in year (in hundreds)</td>
<td>.035****</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.107****</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wage (1980 dollars)</td>
<td>.044****</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.069****</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years tenure in job</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.061**</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in manufacturing (coded 1)</td>
<td>-.340**</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-1.113****</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employment (coded 1)</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union presence at work (coded 1)</td>
<td>-1.032*****</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.686**</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional occupation (coded 1)</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>-.528</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales occupation (coded 1)</td>
<td>.478***</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number years in pooled data set</td>
<td>-.669****</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.380****</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar year</td>
<td>.210***</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed employers (coded 1)</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Skills Index</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female in occupation</td>
<td>.011****</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.006**</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black in occupation</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.054****</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .05. *** p < .01. **** p < .001.
Table 2 shows some gender differences in the promotion process. First, age is positive and significant for women but not men. Either older women are better able than younger women to demonstrate their skills in the workplace (Reskin, 1988), or age is no barrier to men’s promotion chances (Krecker, 1994). In addition, employer tenure negatively influences women’s promotion chances but not men’s. This suggests that unlike women, men with long record of service to their employers are still candidates for a managerial promotion (Krecker, 1994). Finally, men use clerical and sales positions as a stepping stone into management, whereas women do not, and men’s movements into management are more responsive to economic conditions (i.e., the year variable) than is the case for women.

Turning to the variables of interest, occupational segregation interacts with gender in determining managerial promotions. In support of Hypothesis 1, men are more likely to move into management as the percentage of females in the origin occupation increases; for women, the effect is the opposite. Among men, each 10% increase in the percentage of female workers in the occupation increases the chances of attaining a managerial position by 11.06%, \((e^{0.01} - 1) \times 100 \times 10 = 11.06\). The positive effect of gender composition provides strong support for the argument that men working in female-typed occupations enjoy the benefits of a glass escalator. According to Williams (1992, 1995), men in female-dominated occupations are mismatched to the gender-stereotypical expectations of their occupations. Tensions resulting from this arrangement are relieved by promoting men into management. On the other hand, women in female-dominated occupations are subject to the devaluing effects of segregation. Once placed in female-typed occupations, women are less likely to receive the training and job assignments that enhance career mobility (Baron & Newman, 1990; Reskin, 1988). Table 2 shows that among women, each 10% increase in the percentage of females in an occupation slows the rate of entry into management by 6%, \((e^{-0.06} - 1) \times 100 \times 10 = -5.98\). These results are the first from a national sample supporting the contention that the effect of gender segregation on managerial promotions differs for men and women.

Hypothesis 2 receives partial support in that percentage of Blacks in the origin occupation reduces women’s chances of receiving a managerial promotion; for men, the impact is not significant. On the other hand, the race of the respondent has no impact on the likelihood of becoming a manager for women, but it has a strong negative effect for men. Black men are 52% less, \((e^{-0.732} - 1) \times 100 = -51.91\), likely than White men to attain a managerial position, once relevant personal and job-related factors are controlled. These findings clearly indicate that ascriptive traits and segregation patterns combine to produce different mobility trajectories by race and gender.
The results above suggest that women are crowded into female-typed occupations, which hampers career development. Because Black and White women are equally harmed by prevailing patterns of segregation in the labor force, racial identity is inconsequential in determining mobility chances for women. That is, the ill effects of crowding and devaluation are experienced by White and Black women alike, such that race matters little in differentiating the promotion chances of women. Black men, on the other hand, are more evenly distributed across occupations than women are. Thus, the mobility impact of the racial composition of occupations is negligible for men. Yet, Black men must be concerned with interpersonal dynamics and forming alliances in the workplace to ensure their success (Jones, 1986). Because they do not share the background and outlooks of current management (i.e., White men), Black men are less likely to be promoted into their ranks, which many attribute to racial discrimination.

There is some empirical support for these arguments. First, occupational segregation is higher for women than Black men. In their analysis of census data, Reskin and Cassirer (1996) compared segregation by race, gender, and ethnicity. They found that the index of dissimilarity (the number of people that would have to change jobs to integrate the occupational hierarchy) between White men and White women was 54.9 and was 62.7 for White men and Black women. For Black men, however, the index was only 31.5.

Despite lower levels of occupational segregation, Black men often suffer discrimination in seeking managerial positions. The latest research contends that particularistic criteria are used in promotion decisions. That is, subjective evaluations of a candidate’s ambition and loyalty (among other things) are important determinants of receiving a managerial promotion. Black men received lower ratings on these dimensions after controlling for measures of human capital and job performance (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Mueller, Parcel, & Tanaka, 1989; Wilson, 1997). These findings lead to claims that Black men are unable to reach the pinnacle of their organizations because of the presence of a glass ceiling (Collins, 1993; Jones, 1986).

To summarize the argument thus far, women (both Black and White) are crowded into sex-typical occupations, in which their work efforts are devalued and ignored, causing their careers to lag behind White men’s. Compared with women, Black men and White men are more likely to work in the same general occupation. But Black men are also more likely than White men to receive low evaluations from their supervisors and suffer from blocked mobility opportunities. The slower rate at which Black men, Black women, and White women advance to managerial positions is what many mean by the term glass ceiling. By contrast, White men are not only spared the frustrations of contending with the glass ceiling but enjoy the benefits of enhanced
mobility chances (the *glass escalator*) as the percentage of females in the origin occupation rises.

The existence of a glass escalator for White men and a glass ceiling for everyone else can be illustrated by examining race and gender differences in the speed of ascendance to managerial status. This is accomplished by substituting the race- and sex-specific means on predictor variables (from Table 1) into the models in Table 2. By allowing tenure to vary, the models predict the log odds of promotion at each year of tenure. In addition, the gender composition of the occupation is set at 90 to approximate employment in a female-dominated occupation. After transforming the predicted log odds to predicted probabilities, the cumulative product of 1 minus the duration-specific promotion probabilities yields a survival curve (Teachman, 1983). Plotting the survival curve against duration in the job will show how long the typical respondent waits for a managerial promotion when employed in female-dominated occupations. Figure 1 below presents these plots.

Working in a female-dominated origin occupation enhances mobility for White men. Figure 1 predicts that after 12 years, 56% of White men will be waiting for a promotion, meaning that 44% will have been promoted and exited the risk set. By contrast, after 12 years, 83% of Black men, 85% of White women, and 93% of Black women remain in the risk set waiting for a promotion. Moreover, these curves should be viewed in light of Rosenbaum’s (1979) finding that an early promotion (in the first 3 to 5 years) is essential for receiving promotions later in the career. In this sample, 21% of White men had received a managerial promotion by the end of the fifth year, compared with less than 10% of Black men, Black women, and White women. Figure 1 affirms the argument above: White men who work in female-typed occupations receive the benefits of a glass escalator into management, whereas Black men and women are victimized by the glass ceiling.

**THE DECLINING SIGNIFICANCE OF RACE**

William Wilson criticizes empirical tests of race differences in rewards because they fail to eliminate past discrimination from current comparisons. That is, older Blacks suffered discrimination in the past, the effects from which are reflected in their lower rewards relative to Whites. Wilson (1989) insists that younger Blacks entering the labor market after the passage of civil rights legislation should enjoy parity with Whites in career rewards (but see Cancio et al., 1996). This should especially be true for educated Blacks, with valuable skills to offer to employers.

Wilson’s argument is tested by limiting the sample to those who fit the age and educational profiles of those for whom the significance of race should be
declining. First, the sample is restricted to those who were between the ages of 18 and 39 years of age when they were at risk of receiving a managerial promotion between 1981 and 1987. The oldest of this group (39-year-olds in 1981) would have entered the labor market in 1960 if they began their careers at age 18. The majority of respondents, however, began their careers after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Then, in Panels 2 through 4, increasingly restrictive educational criteria are imposed on these young workers; because respondents in Panels 2 through 4 are subsets of those included in Panel 1, the number of person years declines.

Table 3 shows the net effect of being Black on the log odds of receiving a managerial promotion after imposing various age and educational restrictions. In the first panel, the sample is restricted to younger respondents. Among those between the ages of 18 and 39, the effect of race is marginally significant in the pooled analysis, insignificant for women, but significant for men. These findings mirror closely those shown in Table 2, which included older workers. Thus, the race gap in managerial promotions cannot be explained away by including in the main sample those who may have suffered discrimination in the past.

Panels 2, 3, and 4 in Table 3 impose successively higher educational restrictions on the age group shown in panel 1. Panel 2 includes young workers with at least a high school diploma. In this subset, being Black significantly reduces men’s chances of attaining a management position in the pooled model and among men. Panel 3 further restricts the sample to young workers with some college training; we see that Black men still lag behind
White men in reaching management. Among college graduates, however, the effect of race on promotion chances is eliminated (Panel 4). Only by limiting the sample to young college graduates can we find evidence that race is declining in significance. Given that young college graduates constitute less than 10% of the African American population (Farley & Allen, 1987), this article concludes that skin color continues to inhibit the career development of large numbers of Blacks.

### SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This article began by noting the increasing representation of White women, Black women, and Black men among the ranks of managers. It is estimated that women’s entry into management accounts for one fourth of the decline in occupational segregation since 1970 (Jacobs, 1992). Although still underrepresented among the ranks of managers, Blacks’ rate of entry into
management exceeded that of Whites in the 1970s (Nkomo & Cox, 1990). From these trends, some may be tempted to argue that White women, Black women, and Black men are reaching parity with White men in their career development.

The findings of this article suggest otherwise. Examining work histories between 1981 and 1987 from the PSID, this article assessed the likelihood of reaching managerial status. The extent of gender and racial segregation in the origin occupation significantly slowed women’s progress in reaching supervisory positions. This stands in stark contrast to the experiences of men who enjoyed enhanced mobility opportunities as the percentage of females in the origin occupation increases (i.e., the glass escalator). However, the effectiveness of this glass escalator is much lower for Black men, who receive fewer managerial promotions than do White men. Finally, consistent with the image of a glass ceiling, women and minorities wait longer for promotions they do receive than is the case for White men. Unlike past studies, these findings on the impacts of occupational segregation on managerial promotions come from a large representative sample of the U.S. labor force.

This study does have some limitations, however, that suggest the need for additional research. First, it is possible that women and Blacks promoted to management are really “glorified clerks” with little authority or influence (Jacobs, 1992; Reskin & Roos, 1990). By using the census definition of manager (given to those in professional jobs), this article measured the likelihood of mobility to the top of the occupational hierarchy. Even so, data limitations precluded an examination of authority mobility or control of the firm’s resources. If White women, Black women, and Black men are achieving parity with White men, they should be taking positions with numerous subordinates and affecting the profitability of the firm. Hachen (1990) examined authority mobility with retrospective data, but he did not explicitly include segregation in the origin occupation as a predictor. Other studies have examined women’s and Blacks’ exclusion from authority hierarchies in a cross-sectional design (Mueller et al., 1989; Steinberg et al., 1990; Wilson, 1997), but research examining transitions into authority-conferring positions is lacking. Clearly, this is a topic in need of further research.

Second, this article examined work histories in the early 1980s for Blacks and Whites. As such, new forms of inequality emerging in the 1990s could not be detected in this study. For example, White women have made progress in entering traditionally male jobs. In doing so, African Americans and Latinas take traditionally female jobs vacated by White women (Reskin, 1999). Changing patterns of segregation are partly responsible for the growing wage gap between White women and other disadvantaged groups (Browne, 1999). But, in addition, the growing presence of White women in the labor force
(who are better educated than other groups of women) is also partly responsible for wage inequality among women (England, Christopher, & Reid, 1999). Examining how ethnicity, human capital, and occupational segregation affect the process of reaching managerial positions in more recent samples of women should also be a priority of future research.

Finally, research is needed on whether women and minority men stay in management once they have reached these positions. Because White men regard managerial positions as their turf, there is ample documentation of their rejection of minority coworkers, resulting in lower commitment for women and Blacks (e.g., see Jackson, Thoits, & Taylor, 1995; Jacobs, 1989; Kanter 1977). With regard to gender, Jacobs (1989) argues that opportunities for employment in male-dominated occupations have increased, but men’s resistance to women’s presence has resulted in nearly as many women leaving these jobs. This pattern of revolving doors for women has resulted in only a slight decline in occupational segregation since 1970. Studies that examine exit rates from management positions are also needed to determine whether the career profiles of Black men, Black women, and White women resemble those of White men.

NOTES

1. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) rectified this situation in later years by adding a Hispanic subsample in 1990. The study begins observing workers in 1981 because the PSID began recording occupation at the three-digit Standard Occupational Classification level of detail in that year. The more detailed occupational coding is needed for accurately assessing the degree of segregation in a person’s occupation. The presence of older workers in the sample is important because inequality in career dynamics may occur at later ages (Olson & Frieze, 1987; Rosenfeld, 1980). Finally, sample members were either household heads or spouses; other adult household members were excluded because the PSID failed to ask extensive questions about their labor force situations.

2. To verify this point in the data, the hourly wage in year $t+1$ was compared to the wage in year $t$. When workers entered management, their real wage increased by 20.2% compared with only a 10.7% increase for those who changed jobs but did not enter management (data not shown).

3. Included in the measure of hourly wage are earnings, bonuses, and paid overtime; excluded from the measure are income from investments, monetary gifts from family and friends, and transfer income. A handful of observations had values of less than $2 or more than $75 an hour. Rather than deleting these cases, they were recoded to these values. Wages were indexed to 1980 prices to adjust for inflation during the period.

4. To test for nonlinear associations with promotions, squared terms for age, tenure, and wage were entered into the models. These squared terms were insignificant predictors of movement into managerial positions. In addition, controls for region, metropolitan residence, and the educational attainment of parents were insignificant predictors of managerial mobility. All of these variables were dropped from the analysis.
5. Several different levels of detail in capturing industry effects on career mobility were examined. For example, in the manufacturing sector, durable goods production was distinguished from nondurable goods. In addition, several service-sector dummy variables were entered in the model (keeping personal services as a reference group). In all cases, these supplemental analyses produced similar results to those shown in Table 2 (available to readers on request).

6. Gender differences in the effect of gender composition of the occupation on managerial mobility were verified in a pooled model that included an interaction term (Gender × Percentage of Females in the Origin Occupation). Similarly, gender differences in the effect of racial segregation on mobility chances were verified in a pooled model including an interaction term. Results from these analyses are available on request.

7. The results in Table 2 may be questioned because the sample includes part-time workers. If men are more likely than women to work full-time, this could affect the determinants of attaining a supervisory position. To examine this possibility, the models were reanalyzed after excluding part-time workers. First, the sample was restricted to respondents who worked 2,000 hours during a given year (i.e., an average of 40 hours per week for 50 weeks). At this threshold, the results were similar to those presented in Table 2 for men, but the number of women entering management relative to sample size was too small to provide reliable results. Alternative thresholds for full-time work were tried at 1,750, 1,500, and 1,000 hours worked per year. At these thresholds, the results were similar to those shown in Table 2 (available on request).
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