



## Occupational Segregation by Race and Gender, 1958-1981

Randy P. Albelda

*Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 39, No. 3. (Apr., 1986), pp. 404-411.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0019-7939%28198604%2939%3A3%3C404%3AOSBRAG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7>

*Industrial and Labor Relations Review* is currently published by Cornell University, School of Industrial & Labor Relations.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/cschooll.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION BY RACE AND GENDER, 1958–1981

RANDY P. ALBELDA\*

---

Studies of occupational segregation by gender reveal little change since 1958. By disaggregating annual data for 1958–81 by race as well as gender, however, the author shows that although white women's occupational distribution has remained stable relative to white men's, nonwhite women's distribution has changed dramatically, particularly relative to white women's. Regression analysis examines structural economic changes, relative educational attainment, and the business cycle as determinants of changes in the occupational distribution over the period 1962–81.

---

OCCUPATIONAL segregation has been documented extensively by both economists and sociologists, and evidence that it is directly related to earnings differentials has recently brought it greater attention than ever. The connection between earnings and occupational categories fuels the debates about and research on comparable worth.

All studies to date have focused primarily on the gender stratification of occupations, and have employed decennial census data (see, for example, Beller 1982; Blau and Hendricks 1979; England 1981). This method is deficient in two ways. Most important, it masks the large changes in the occupational distribution of nonwhite women within the post-World War II period by lumping all women together. Second, by examining only decennial data, analysts cannot adequately probe the cyclical nature of occupational distribution. Both of these problems are in part attributable to the lack of detailed annual occupational

data by race and gender. Data are available, however, which, although less than ideally detailed, shed light on some of the changes that have occurred since the late 1950s.

This paper identifies the trends in annual occupational segregation by race and gender over a 24-year period (1958–81). The data clearly reveal the changes in nonwhite women's occupational structure that have been ignored to date. Regression analysis is then employed to determine the relative importance of structural changes, the business cycle, and education in shaping occupational distributions by gender and race.

## The Data

As noted, one problem with studies on occupational segregation is the lack of specific, detailed data on occupations broken down by both race and gender. This study uses annual data provided by the Department of Labor that include a listing of 29 occupational categories by race and gender for the years 1958–81.<sup>1</sup> The index used to

---

\*The author, Assistant Professor of Economics at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, thanks Gerry DuGuay, Eileen Appelbaum, Mark Aldrich, and Vivien Sundland for helpful comments on earlier drafts.

---

<sup>1</sup>All employed workers are included in the 29 occupational categories. These categories include (on average) six occupations within the standard five major

measure occupational segregation is the index of dissimilarity developed by Duncan and Duncan (1955). Most studies of occupational trends use hundreds of occupational categories, but do not stratify their samples by both race and gender. Despite the small number of occupations employed in the present study, the indices yield results similar to the more detailed studies for census years.<sup>2</sup>

Let  $X_i^k$  and  $X_j^k$  be the percent distribution of groups  $i$  and  $j$  in occupation  $k$ , and  $\sum X_i^k = 100$ . Furthermore,  $i \neq j$ , where  $i, j$  are eight different demographic sub-groupings (1 = white men, 2 = white women, 3 = nonwhite men, 4 = nonwhite women, 5 = all men, 6 = all women, 7 = all whites, 8 = all nonwhites). The Duncan and Duncan index of dissimilarity is:

$$(1) \quad D_{i-j}^k = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K |X_i^k - X_j^k|}{2}$$

The value of the index indicates the percentage of workers in group  $i$  who must change occupations to achieve an occupational distribution identical to that of the workers in group  $j$ . The index is not weighted by type of occupation, so it does not allow judgments of the quality of occupational distribution—only the degree of occupational dissimilarity. When the index equals zero, there is no occupational seg-

Table 1. Duncan and Duncan Index of Dissimilarity by Race and Gender for Workers 16 Years and Older in All Occupations, 1958–81.

Year	Men- Women	White- Nonwhite	Year	Men- Women	White- Nonwhite
1958	59.7	44.1	1970	58.7	30.3
1959	59.4	43.7	1971	58.3	29.3
1960	59.1	41.2	1972	58.6	27.1
1961	58.7	41.2	1973	57.9	25.6
1962	58.9	41.6	1974	57.8	24.7
1963	59.2	39.9	1975	57.8	24.5
1964	59.5	38.8	1976	56.7	23.5
1965	58.8	38.0	1977	55.8	22.7
1966	58.5	36.0	1978	54.9	22.2
1967	58.4	34.2	1979	54.3	21.0
1968	58.5	33.2	1980	53.5	21.0
1969	58.7	31.2	1981	52.6	20.4

Source: Compiled by the author using data from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: for the years 1958–77, *The Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1978*, Table 18, pp. 75–81; for the years 1978–79, *The Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1980*, Table 20, pp. 46–48; and for the years 1980–81, unpublished data.

regation, that is, the occupational distributions of worker groups  $i$  and  $j$  are identical. When the index equals 100, there is complete occupational segregation, that is, workers in groups  $i$  and  $j$  are never in the same occupations.

Table 1, which depicts the index of dissimilarity between men and women and between whites and nonwhites, indicates there were only small changes in occupational segregation by gender between 1958 and 1981, whereas the level of occupational segregation by race fell substantially over that period. These results hold few surprises and confirm findings based on decennial data.

More interesting results are obtained when these indices are computed for race and gender subgroups (Table 2). The indices in columns 1 and 6 of Table 2 suggest that the occupational distributions of all men and women have changed very little when race is held constant. The greatest change has been in the distributions of white and nonwhite women (column 5). In 1958, nearly 50 percent of nonwhite women would have had to move to different occupations in order to match the occupational

occupational groups listed by the Department of Labor (prior to its change in classification of occupations implemented in the 1980 census data and annual occupational data from 1983). For example, there are four occupations included within the sales and clerical occupational category: retail trade; all other sales; stenographers, typists, and secretaries; and other clericals. Occupation data used are from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1979:75–81, 1981:46–48, and unpublished data for 1980–81).

<sup>2</sup>England (1981) provides a summary of studies using the Duncan and Duncan index. She reports that Gregory Williams obtained an index of 64.9 for 470 occupations in 1960 and 61.6 for 670 occupations in 1970, whereas Francine Blau, using a constant subset of 183 occupations, measured dissimilarity as 74.1 in 1960 and 70.7 in 1970. Table 1 indicates the Duncan and Duncan index in the present study was 59.1 in 1960 and 58.7 in 1970. The paucity of occupational categories covered in this study probably accounts in large part for the lower degree of occupational segregation found.

Table 2. Duncan and Duncan Index of Dissimilarity by Race and Gender for Workers 16 Years and Older in All Occupations, 1958–81.

Year	Index					
	WM-WW (1)	WM-NWM (2)	WM-NWW (3)	WW-NWM (4)	WW-NWW (5)	NWM-NWW (6)
1958	60.3	40.0	69.5	60.0	49.9	54.1
1959	60.0	40.1	69.3	58.9	49.2	54.5
1960	59.6	38.4	67.2	57.3	46.8	54.0
1961	59.3	38.4	67.5	56.0	47.0	52.7
1962	59.4	38.9	66.4	56.3	46.7	53.6
1963	59.8	37.6	66.5	55.4	45.4	53.2
1964	59.9	36.4	66.3	55.6	43.2	55.1
1965	59.4	36.4	65.7	54.7	43.2	53.7
1966	59.0	34.4	65.6	53.6	41.3	53.2
1967	58.9	33.6	64.7	52.7	36.8	53.3
1968	59.0	33.3	63.9	52.7	33.7	53.8
1969	59.2	31.8	62.8	52.4	30.9	53.4
1970	59.1	31.1	62.8	52.1	30.0	54.5
1971	58.8	31.0	62.7	50.8	28.5	53.2
1972	58.9	29.0	62.5	51.7	26.3	54.5
1973	58.5	28.6	61.3	50.0	23.3	52.0
1974	58.4	26.7	61.3	49.8	23.7	52.0
1975	58.4	27.0	61.6	49.4	23.3	51.9
1976	57.2	26.9	60.9	48.4	21.8	51.2
1977	56.3	25.9	60.0	47.6	21.7	50.6
1978	55.3	25.9	59.0	47.3	20.1	50.1
1979	54.8	24.4	58.8	46.5	18.3	49.6
1980	54.0	24.9	58.6	46.0	18.3	48.7
1981	53.0	23.8	58.1	45.0	17.2	47.9

Note: WM = White Men, WW = White Women, NWM = Nonwhite Men, NWW = Nonwhite Women.  
Source: same as for Table 1.

distribution of white women. By 1981, this percentage had been reduced to 17 percent.

The occupational segregation between white and nonwhite men has also decreased greatly (column 2). These two groups also exhibited the least amount of occupational divergence at the beginning of the period under study. By contrast, the degree of occupational dissimilarity between white men and nonwhite women is the highest of any of the gender-race comparisons in all years (column 3).

The rapid convergence in the index of nonwhite and white women is of particular interest because it represents a major change in occupational distributions. A closer look at the labor force experiences of nonwhite women during the period under consideration reveals a dramatic shift of nonwhite women out of private household employment. Table 3 shows the per-

centage of both white and nonwhite women employed in domestic work from 1958 through 1981. In both cases the percentages have steadily declined since 1958, but the decline for nonwhite women has been particularly large. In 1958 over one-third of all nonwhite women were employed as domestics; by 1981, only one-twentieth of all nonwhite women worked in this occupation. Clearly this very large shift in nonwhite women's occupational distribution will affect the indices, regardless of which occupations nonwhite women are entering.

To account for the degree of occupational segregation among workers not employed in private households, the occupational distribution was reweighted as if these workers were not in the labor force, and the Duncan and Duncan index was recalculated to exclude domestics in all race-gender categories that include nonwhite

women. The results, shown in Table 4, therefore correspond to the indices in columns 3, 5, and 6 of Table 2 except for the exclusion of private household workers.

A comparison of Tables 2 and 4 shows that the exclusion of private household workers narrows the degree of change in the occupational distribution among white men and nonwhite women. Column 3 in Table 2 shows the index decreasing from 69.5 in 1958 to 58.1 in 1958, whereas the corresponding index in Table 4 (column 1) indicates a change from 62.6 to 56.8 over the same period. The index of dissimilarity for all nonwhite men and women not employed as domestics is slightly lower in 1981 than it was in 1958 even though it increased throughout the 1960s (column 3). Throughout the period, nonwhite women in occupations other than private household work were unlikely to be employed in occupations held by white or nonwhite men. Columns 1 and 3 in Table 4 highlight the lack of change in the occupational distributions between nonwhite women and white men despite nonwhite women's large movement out of domestic work during the period.

The index of column 2 of Table 4 indicates the degree of occupational dissimilarity for white and nonwhite women employed in all occupations except domestic work. In the beginning of the period

*Table 3. Percent Distribution of White and Nonwhite Women in Private Household Work, 1958–81.*

<i>Year</i>	<i>White Women</i>	<i>Nonwhite Women</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>White Women</i>	<i>Nonwhite Women</i>
1958	5.4	37.2	1970	3.4	17.5
1959	5.2	36.1	1971	3.2	16.5
1960	5.1	34.8	1972	3.0	15.2
1961	5.3	35.2	1973	2.9	12.9
1962	5.0	35.2	1974	2.5	11.3
1963	4.9	34.3	1975	2.4	10.6
1964	4.9	32.5	1976	2.2	9.4
1965	4.5	30.1	1977	2.2	8.9
1966	4.2	27.8	1978	2.2	7.7
1967	3.9	24.5	1979	2.0	6.8
1968	3.8	22.1	1980	1.9	6.5
1969	3.5	19.4	1981	1.9	5.4

*Source:* Same as for Table 1.

*Table 4. Duncan and Duncan Index of Dissimilarity by Race and Gender for Workers 16 Years and Older in All Occupations Except Household Work, 1958–81.*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Index</i>		
	<i>WM-NWW (1)</i>	<i>WW-NWW (2)</i>	<i>NWM-NWW (3)</i>
1958	62.6	40.0	48.5
1959	62.4	39.1	49.2
1960	61.4	36.6	47.1
1961	61.7	36.7	46.5
1962	60.8	35.4	46.9
1963	61.6	34.5	46.8
1964	61.7	32.3	49.4
1965	61.4	32.9	48.3
1966	61.5	31.5	49.0
1967	60.9	28.5	49.4
1968	60.5	26.4	49.8
1969	59.7	24.9	50.2
1970	60.4	24.0	51.1
1971	60.2	22.7	50.4
1972	59.6	20.5	51.6
1973	58.2	18.7	49.1
1974	58.8	19.9	49.6
1975	59.7	19.8	50.0
1976	58.9	18.6	49.4
1977	58.2	18.7	48.8
1978	57.3	17.5	48.4
1979	57.6	15.9	48.1
1980	57.0	16.0	47.3
1981	56.8	15.1	46.6

*Note:* WM = White Men; NWW = Nonwhite Women; WW = White Women; NWM = Nonwhite Men.

*Source:* Same as for Table 1.

there was substantial occupational dissimilarity. For example, in 1958, 40 percent of all nonwhite women not employed as private household workers would have had to change occupations in order to match white women's occupational distribution in all occupations except domestic work. When domestic work is included, the figure climbs to 49.9 percent (see column 5 of Table 2).

The concentration of nonwhite women in household employment accounts for 20 percent of the degree of occupational dissimilarity in 1958. That is, most of the nonwhite women who were not employed in domestic work at the beginning of the period of investigation also were not employed in the same occupations held by

white women. The data provided here indicate that the rapid convergence of white and nonwhite women's occupational distributions is not attributable simply to the movement of nonwhite women out of household work, as is often argued. The index in column 2 of Table 4 decreases almost as much and as rapidly as the index computed with household workers (column 5 in Table 2), which suggests that the convergence occurs over the period as a result of the *integration* of nonwhite women into occupations most often held by white women.

### Determinants of Occupational Segregation

The limitations of the annual data available for a time series study such as this dictate that any explanatory model can be only tentatively tested. Aggregated data for certain important variables, such as average years of continuous work experience, are not available, and the relatively small number of observations of the dependent variable limits the number of explanatory variables that can be used effectively in a regression analysis. The analysis presented here is nevertheless worthwhile, because it is one of the first to address even tentatively the determinants of occupational segregation by race and gender on a year-by-year basis.<sup>3</sup>

Human capital models make occupational distribution a function of choice (labor-leisure or income now-income later trade-offs or both), dependent upon the skills each individual chooses to acquire.<sup>4</sup> Such models predict that differential human capital acquisitions along gender and race lines can result in occupational segregation (see Polachek 1976, 1979). Dis-

crimination models, on the other hand, although they too might rely on educational differences to account for differential occupational distributions by gender,<sup>5</sup> interpret human capital acquisitions like education not as a proxy for individual choice but as a function of other sociological and economic factors such as class background and gender-specific socialization (see, for example, Bowles and Gintis 1976; Meyer and Maes 1983). Education, according to this interpretation, serves as a screening credential, and as such might not serve to narrow occupational distribution dissimilarities among all subgroupings.

To test if differences in education are related to occupational segregation, I employ an index of educational attainment ( $E_{i-j}$ ), computed by the same means used to obtain the index of occupational dissimilarity.<sup>6</sup> In a human capital model, as educational distribution becomes more equal ( $E_{i-j}$  approaches zero), so should the distributions of occupations for all subgroupings. Therefore, the coefficient on this variable should be positive and should consistently affect occupational distribution for all subgroupings. In the discrimination model, such a pattern may or may not obtain.

The major advantage of the annual data analyzed here is that they provide a chance to test for cyclical variations in occupational distribution by race and gender. The cyclical variable to be used in this model is a general unemployment rate ( $1/U_{gen}$ ).<sup>7</sup> Unemployment rates are used rather than other cyclical measures (such as GNP and

<sup>3</sup>Ideally, some measure of job experience should have been used, particularly—as Mincer (1974) argues—in measuring the human capital of women. Unfortunately these data are not available by race and gender for all the years under consideration. Education distribution should be useful in predicting changes in racial wage differentials.

<sup>4</sup>The levels of education included are: less than five years of elementary school, five to eight years of elementary school, one to three years of high school, four years of high school, one to three years of college, and four or more years of college. The data are from the U.S. Department of Labor (1982:775–78).

<sup>7</sup>This variable is the aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons working part-time for economic reasons as a percent of the potentially available labor hours. The inverse is employed to detect small changes in this rate. Data are from the U.S. Department of Labor (1982:560).

<sup>3</sup>This study is part of a larger work that examines the reasons for wage convergence of white and nonwhite women in the post-World War II period (Albelda 1983, 1985).

<sup>4</sup>If human capital and preference schedules are distributed normally across the population, then occupational distributions among groups should be the same. For critiques of the construction of preference schedules and human capital theory of occupational segregation, see Blau and Jusenius (1976), Darity (1982), and England (1982).

investment) because they measure the impact of institutional variables such as seniority, which may affect whites and nonwhites and men and women differently over the cycle. When labor markets are tight (that is, when the unemployment rate is low), women and nonwhites might be integrated into occupations from which they have historically been excluded. Conversely, in slack periods, women and nonwhites should be fired or not hired in those jobs, because their seniority and experience are low. Therefore the predicted sign for  $1/U_{gen}$  is negative.

The final two variables employed are indicators of trends over time. These variables are intended to capture the effect of changes over time in the relevant laws and in the structure of the economy. Occupational segregation should decrease as legislation makes discrimination illegal and as more women and nonwhites enter the labor force in service and clerical jobs—the fastest-growing occupations over the time period considered. This variable, then, is a proxy for changes in civil rights and affir-

mative action legislation as well as changes in the demand and supply of labor over the period, and is not directly attributable to human capital acquisition or cyclical trends in the economy. The first time variable is a vector (*TIME*) of 1 through 24, and its coefficient is negative when there has been a decrease in occupational segregation over the period. The second time variable is a vector (*TIMESQ*) that is the square of *TIME*. This explanatory variable tests for nonlinearity in the occupational distribution trends. If occupational convergence (divergence) is more rapid in the earlier part of the period, the sign of this coefficient should be positive (negative).

Table 5 presents regression results. Each observation is one year; the constraints on educational data dictate that observations can be made only for the years 1959, 1962, and 1964–81. Due to correlated error terms often associated with time series regression analysis, a Cochrane-Orcutt transformation was performed on the regression. This method drops the first observation of all variables, limiting the number of years

Table 5. Determinants of Occupational Segregation by Gender and Race for Workers 16 Years and Older in All Occupations, 1958–81.

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	<i>Constant (C)</i>	<i>Education Index (Ei-j)</i>	<i>General Unemployment (1/Ugen)</i>	<i>Time (TIME)</i>	<i>Time2 (TIMESQ)</i>	<i>R-Squared Durbin-Watson</i>
1. WM-WW	4.015 (57.47)**	-.0212 (-0.94)	-.0149 (-1.98)	.0168 (5.98)**	-.0007 (-9.55)**	.983 2.00
2. WM-NWM	3.051 (15.87)**	.2136 (4.18)**	-.0434 (-2.52)*	-.0296 (-8.60)**	.0003 (2.70)*	.997 2.75
3. WM-NWM	4.215 (78.32)**	.0011 (0.08)	-.0350 (-4.37)**	-.0107 (-4.04)**	.0000 (0.62)	.985 2.20
4. WW-NWM	4.135 (27.63)**	-.0264 (-0.74)	-.0073 (-0.57)	-.0056 (-2.02)	-.0002 (-3.06)**	.992 2.28
5. WW-NWW	3.475 (10.58)**	.2347 (3.00)*	-.1980 (-4.58)**	-.1028 (-8.83)**	.0015 (4.85)**	.994 1.81
6. NWM-NWW	3.881 (33.11)**	.0071 (0.15)	-.0116 (-0.71)	.0136 (3.75)**	-.0007 (-6.25)**	.957 2.18
7. Me-Wo	3.921 (66.30)**	.0096 (0.46)	-.0185 (-2.49)*	.0176 (7.26)**	-.0008 (-11.15)**	.984 2.35
8. Wh-NW	4.001 (16.08)**	.0626 (0.93)	-.0828 (-3.10)**	-.0900 (-9.02)**	.0015 (5.13)**	.989 2.42

Notes: WM = White Men, WW = White Women, NWM = Nonwhite Women, NWW = Nonwhite Women, Me = All Men, Wo = All Women, Wh = All Whites, NW = All Nonwhites.

T-statistics are in parentheses. 12 degrees of freedom.

\*Significant at the .05 level (two-tailed test).

\*\*Significant at the .01 level (two-tailed test).

under observation to 20. The logarithms of all variables were used except for TIME and TIMESQ.

The explanatory power of all the regressions is strong, suggesting that examination of changes in the racial composition of occupations over this period can be very fruitful. One noteworthy finding consistent with the results of previous studies is that the gender division of the occupational structure has not been reshaped over the period under consideration; this is evident from the size and sign of the time coefficients on equations 1, 6, and 7 (white men and women, nonwhite men and women, and all men and women). In fact, once education and the business cycle are held constant, the dissimilarity between men's and women's occupational distributions is positively correlated with time. That is, the structural changes have *impeded* the occupational convergence for men and women. The opposite is true of the racial distribution of occupations. Equations 2, 5, and 8 indicate that the changes measured in the time variables can explain the decrease in racial occupational segregation, particularly at the beginning of the period.

Educational convergence is statistically significant in equations 2 and 5 (white and nonwhite men, and white and nonwhite women). When gender is held constant, the data reveal that educational attainment has helped nonwhites make inroads into traditionally white occupations. This finding neither confirms nor rejects the choice and discrimination hypotheses. It does suggest that disaggregating data on occupational patterns by race and gender reveals some important distinctions.

The coefficient on the business cycle variable has the predicted sign in all the equations, and is significant in all but equations 1, 4, and 6 (white men and women, white women and nonwhite men, and nonwhite men and women). This result suggests that the business cycle, particularly fluctuations in unemployment, does affect the degree of occupational dissimilarity.

### Conclusion

This paper has shown that although changes in the gender stratification of

occupations have been minor since the late 1950s, racial stratification has changed substantially. This latter trend has not been documented before and merits more attention than it has been given by analysts of occupational segregation. Both educational attainment and the business cycle have significantly contributed to the lessening of occupational segregation by race, but not by gender. In addition, this study suggests that major structural changes in the economy over time have led to occupational convergence by race. Most dramatic has been the significant convergence of the occupational distributions of nonwhite and white women. That convergence took place not because—but in the context—of the decreasing participation of nonwhite women in private household labor.

Relative changes in the educational distribution and the business cycle help explain changes in occupational distributions, particularly racial distributions (when gender is held constant). The latter findings suggest that the current explanations of occupational distribution could benefit from incorporating race into their models. Furthermore, the important effect of the business cycle on nonwhite occupational status implies that employment policies could have important implications for the movement toward more equal distribution of occupations for nonwhites and whites (although not necessarily for men and women).

The time trend variables strongly suggest that there have been changes in the racial composition of the sexual division of labor that cannot be explained by cyclical or individual behavior. Changes reflected in economic activity and the structure of industrial relations in the period under consideration, such as the expanding role of the government in employment and employment policies, the growth in demand for nonunionized labor, and the unprecedented growth in service and clerical jobs, are obvious candidates for exploration. Each has brought a large demand for female workers in jobs that women have historically performed and can provide a consistent explanation of the gender divisions of jobs, the ability of nonwhite women to leave domestic work, and the large increase in female labor force participation

rates over the period. This study's findings suggest that changes in white versus non-white and male versus female labor mar-

kets, especially changes in the occupational structures of those groups, over the entire postwar period warrant close examination.

## REFERENCES

**Albelda, Randy P.**

- 1986 "Nice Work If You Can Get It: The Segmentation of Black and White Women Workers in the Post World War II Period." *Radical Review of Political Economics*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (forthcoming).  
 1983 "Black and White Women Workers in the Post World War II Era." Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

**Beller, Andrea H.**

- 1982 "Occupational Segregation by Sex: Determinants and Changes." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 371-92.

**Blau, Francine D., and Wallace E. Hendricks**

- 1979 "Occupational Segregation by Sex: Trends and Prospects." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 197-210.

**Blau, Francine D., and Carol L. Jusenius**

- 1976 "Economists' Approaches to Sex Segregation: An Appraisal." In Martha Blaxall and Barbara Reagan, eds., *Women and the Workplace: The Implications of Occupational Segregation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 181-89.

**Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis**

- 1976 *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.

**Darity, William A., Jr.**

- 1982 "The Human Capital Approach to Black-White Earnings Inequality: Some Unsettled Questions." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 72-93.

**Duncan, Otis, and Beverly Duncan**

- 1955 "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 210-17.

**England, Paula**

- 1982 "The Failure of Human Capital Theory to Explain Occupational Sex Segregation." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 358-70.  
 1981 "Assessing Trends in Occupational Sex Segregation, 1900-1976." In Ivar Berg, ed., *Sociological Perspectives in Labor Markets*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 273-95.

**Meyer, Peter J., and Patricia L. Maes**

- 1983 "The Reproduction of Occupational Segregation Among Young Women." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 115-24.

**Mincer, Jacob**

- 1974 *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: NBER, distributed by Columbia University Press.

**Polachek, Solomon W.**

- 1979 "Occupational Segregation Among Women: Theory, Evidence, and a Prognosis." In Cynthia Lloyd, Emily Andrews, and Curtis Gilroy, eds., *Women in the Labor Market*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 137-57.  
 1976 "Occupational Segregation: An Alternative Hypothesis." *Journal of Contemporary Business*, Vol. 5, pp. 1-12.

**U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics**

- 1982 *Labor Force Statistics Derived From the Current Population Survey: A Databook, Volume I*. BLS Bulletin No. 2096. Washington, D.C.: GPO.  
 1981 *Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1980*. BLS Bulletin No. 2070. Washington, D.C.: GPO.  
 1979 *Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1978*. Bulletin No. 2000. Washington, D.C.: GPO.