Prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, labor market inequalities linked to racial and sex distinctions were codified in law in many states and upheld by major U.S. social institutions. Title VII of the act eliminated white men’s state-sanctioned monopolization of the best jobs in the economy. While the language of the law was explicitly about providing racial minorities and women equal employment opportunities, the law was also designed to diminish white male labor market advantages. In 1966, where our analyses begin, white men held almost all private sector managerial jobs (91 percent). By 2000, the end of our observation period, white men account for approximately 57 percent of private sector managers. In this article, we address these changes and especially three core questions regarding long-term trends in managerial attainment of consequence to much work on stratification and employment: (1) Has white males’ access to managerial jobs declined? (2) Has female and minority access to managerial jobs improved? (3) Has Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) progress been widespread, as intended by the Civil Rights Act, or limited to less desirable sectors of the economy and segregated managerial roles?

By addressing the above questions, we contribute to the organizational stratification literature in three ways. First, using data collected by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), we document, for the first time, private sector workplace trends in managerial representation for white men, black men, white women, and black women from 1966 to 2000, net of the dramatic demographic shifts in labor supply. Second, we decomp-
pose patterns by industrial sector, revealing precisely where in the economy the most poignant changes have occurred and are occurring. Third, we gauge the role of workplace-level attributes themselves on managerial access. In this regard, we consider the implications of the demographic composition of nonmanagerial workers, the size of managerial hierarchies, and establishment size.

PRIOR RESEARCH

Declines in race and gender disparities in managerial representation are typically viewed as civil rights inspired progress. Consistent with this view, previous studies have found increases in access to authority and managerial occupations since the 1960s (Jaynes and Williams 1989; Krymkowski and Mintz 2007; Smith and Welch 1984; Weeden 1998). Other researchers are skeptical of this progress, suggesting that female and minority advances are likely taking place in the expanding low-wage service sectors of the economy (Reskin 1988; Reskin and Roos 1990) and in segregated authority roles where they manage similar others (Elliott and Smith 2001; Reskin and Ross 1992; Smith and Elliott 2002).

Even as white women, black men, and black women enter managerial jobs, labor market disparities persist. White men still have greater access to positions of authority than do women and male minorities (Jacobs 1992; Maume 1999; McGuire and Reskin 1993; Smith 1999; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993; Wilson 1997a). They receive greater monetary compensation for observed levels of authority than do other groups, and this effect is more pronounced at higher levels (McGuire and Reskin 1993; Smith 1999; Wilson 1997b). Moreover, when racial minorities and women gain managerial access, their authority is typically over workers with similar status characteristics (Cohen and Huffman 2007a, 2007b; Elliott and Smith 2001; Reskin and Ross 1992; Smith and Elliott 2002). Although women and racial minorities have seen an increase in access to positions of authority since the 1960s, these gains are not taking place as rapidly in the private sector as in government (Wilson, Sakura-Lemessy, and West 1999). Importantly, all of this research controls for sex and race differences in human capital, casting doubt on whether such inequalities merely reflect differences in individual qualifications.

The lingering inequalities, discussed above, are typically viewed as a product of unequal treatment in managerial allocation and compensation. Yet, because previous studies rely on individual survey data with little or no information on the workplace, it is entirely possible that employment segregation across firms and industries—firms and industries that vary themselves in authority structures—may be to blame as well. What is the organizational context in which managerial gains are being made? The possibility that female and minority access to managerial roles occurs in different workplaces than those where white men are concentrated has not been systematically examined.

SOURCES OF CHANGE IN MANAGERIAL COMPOSITION

We focus on three potential sources of post-1966 workplace-level trends in managerial access: shifts in labor force composition, industrial restructuring, and the rise of organizational sorting mechanisms.

LABOR FORCE SHIFTS

The dramatic compositional changes in the U.S. labor force over the past 50 years suggest that change in access to managerial jobs is not necessarily a zero-sum game. If either the economy or the demographic composition of the labor force had remained the same size since the 1960s, then increasing proportions of women and racial minorities in management jobs would provide a clear signal of progress. However, the economy did grow, as did the proportion of jobs classified as managerial; white men as a proportion of all labor force participants dropped dramatically as female, especially white female, employment surged (see Table 1). In 1966, white men accounted for about 62 percent of private sector employment. By 2000, they accounted for less than 38 percent. In 1966, approximately 91 percent of all managers in private sector EEOC-reporting workplaces were white men. This dropped to 57 percent by 2000. During the same period, however, the percentage of white men in the private sector who were managers rose from 10.5 to 14.7 percent—even as managerial representation for women and racial minorities
also increased. In the analyses that follow, we adjust managerial representation of each group in a particular organization by group representation in local labor markets to control for demographic shifts in the labor supply.

**INDUSTRIAL RESTRUCTURING**

The shift from goods to service production in the U.S. economy is now a well established fact. The emergence of the “new economy” has created a number of “good jobs.” The rapid growth of the service sector, however, has concomitantly produced a surplus of “bad jobs” that offer low-wages, a lack of job security, and few to no health or retirement benefits (Kalleberg, Reskin, and Hudson 2000; Reskin and Roos 1990; Sweet and Meiksins 2008). According to Kalleberg and colleagues (2000), one in seven jobs in the U.S. economy can be classified as a “bad job.” Few studies examine how these industrial shifts have influenced labor market stratification, and no studies of which we are aware analyze how these shifts have affected managerial representation by race and sex in particular.

Previous research conclusively shows considerable industrial variation in status segregation (Bridges 1982; Carrington and Troske 1998; Petersen and Morgan 1995). Tomaskovic-Devey and colleagues (2006) find that about a third of the observed changes in race and sex segregation between 1966 and 2003 can be attributed to the industrial restructuring of the U.S. economy during this period. There is less agreement, however, as to why these shifts encouraged desegregation. Moreover, we know practically nothing about how these changes affected access to managerial jobs. Reskin and Roos (1990) suggest that women and minorities are more
likely to find employment in the expanding service sector because those jobs are less desirable to white men. Social closure approaches to status segregation concur on this point, assuming that white men will attempt to monopolize more desirable jobs (Reskin 1988; Tilly 1998; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). The implication is that women and minorities may indeed gain access to managerial jobs, but largely in industries (or organizations) that pay managers relatively low wages.

Another literature emphasizes the sex-typing of occupations as an inertial force inhibiting EEO progress (Charles and Grusky 2004). Here, industrial shifts toward services, and the accompanying growth in employment opportunities in these expanding sectors, are seen as possibly increasing white women’s, black men’s, and black women’s managerial opportunities. The sex-typing explanation suggests that these jobs were always more likely to be filled by women and minorities and simply grew faster than other managerial positions. Because managerial jobs were effectively all male in 1966, a sex- or race-typing explanation seems implausible; however, the inertial argument—that industry-specific growth in managerial jobs produced increased female and minority access to managerial roles in expanding industries—may still hold.

**Organizational Sorting Processes**

Under what circumstances did organizations integrate managerial jobs? The literature points toward three basic sorting processes relevant to our core theoretical questions: the status matching of managers to workers, the placement of women and minorities in lower-authority roles than those of white men, and the potential for formalization in employment screening to enhance diversity in managerial ranks.

Elliott and Smith (2001; Smith and Elliott 2002) suggest that subordinate group usurpation of dominant group managerial monopolies is most likely to occur when the workforce is disproportionately made up of minority or female employees. This pattern of managerial incorporation, which they refer to as “bottom-up ascription,” is interpreted as a limited reaction to demands for inclusion by women and racial minorities. When female or minority access to supervisory or managerial positions is achieved, it is thus often in the segregated sphere of supervising others within the same status group (Cohen and Huffman 2007a, 2007b). Given this argument, we expect that the post-1966 managerial gains made by white women, black men, and black women will happen in workplaces where similar others are employed in nonmanagerial positions.

Theories of intersectionality are increasingly prominent in recent sociological work on gender, race, and employment (Browne and Misra 2003). These theories emphasize the simultaneous negotiated reality of race, ethnicity, and gender and the multidimensional inequality realities that correspond to the interactional matrices of social statuses (Collins 1999; Glenn 2002). One critique of intersectional approaches is that they are most powerful at revealing subjective experiences but are less able to explicitly compare inequality of outcomes (Browne and Misra 2003). We suspect that part of the problem is that systematic observations of complex multigroup intersectional social relationships are relatively rare. In the analyses that follow, we explicitly model access to management as a function of the status distributions of subordinates. We fully expect a status matching of managers to nonmanagers as suggested by the bottom-up ascription account. We also expect to discover intersectional status hierarchies.

While most of the previous literature focuses on the barriers and limits to EEO advancement, some research suggests that EEO goals can be enhanced by increased formalization of personnel decision making. The logic is that discrimination, segregation, and limited access to managerial roles currently share a common set of proximate mechanisms—social network–based exclusion (Stainback 2008), in-group preferences in selection and mentoring (Kanter 1977), and cognitive bias in assessing the quality and skill of applicants (Gorman and Kmec 2007). Formalization of the candidate review process, including written job descriptions, public postings of job openings, panel reviews of candidates, and various due process procedures, such as formal yearly evaluations, may all reduce the causal influence of cognitive bias in information processing (Bielby 2000; Reskin 2000).

There is considerable cross-sectional support for this position in terms of reduced segregation, lower wage gaps, and increased female
and non-white access to managerial roles in more formalized personnel systems (Anderson and Tomaskovic-Devey 1995; Konrad and Linnehan 1995; Reskin and McBrier 2000; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). In a particularly well-executed longitudinal study, Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2006) examined organizational change in EEO linked to the adoption of specific human resource rules and procedures. They found that personnel practices that hold managers accountable for EEO progress tend to be more efficacious than programs that attempt to reduce stereotype bias through diversity training.

Although we do not have access to information on specific workplace policies, we do observe organizational size. It is well known that organizational size is correlated with the formalization of human resource practices (Marsden 1996). We might thus expect that larger workplaces will have EEO human resource practices that encourage female and minority access to managerial positions. Organizational size may also be important because it provides larger organizations with greater ability to create internal distinctions within the managerial ranks (Baron and Bielby 1986). Using the 1991 National Organizations Survey (NOS), we find fairly strong correlations between size and a measure of human resource formalization (.63) and between size and hierarchical distinctions among managers (.60).

While our data prohibit us from examining managerial distinctions within a specific workplace, it seems reasonable to assume that if either the formalization or the job title proliferation mechanisms were active, workplace size should be more strongly associated with increasing managerial representation for women and blacks than for white men.

Some research suggests that in response to EEO legislation, employers reclassified nonmanagerial jobs as managerial (see Jacobs 1992) and in some cases created new managerial jobs specifically for minorities to fill (Collins 1997). There is evidence that the percentage of managerial jobs in EEOC-reporting firms increased in the early years following the passage of the Civil Rights Act (Smith and Welch 1984; see also Table 1). It is entirely possible that some of the increased minority and female access to managerial jobs reflects this growth in managerial jobs (which happened primarily between 1966 and 1985). Workplaces with a higher proportion of managers within their division of labor clearly have more room to make status distinctions among managers, and they may even have created new managerial positions for women and minorities (Collins 1997; Elliott and Smith 2001). Workplaces with higher percentages of managerial jobs may thus be more strongly associated with managerial representation for white and black women and black men, compared with white men.

The effects of these organizational characteristics—segregated managerial roles, organizational size, and managerial intensity—should strengthen over time as exclusionary processes shift from white male monopolies over managerial jobs to locally negotiated inclusionary and exclusionary mechanisms.

DATA: EEO-1 REPORTS

We use establishment-level data collected annually by the U.S. EEOC since 1966. These reports, known as EEO-1 Information Reports, contain establishment employment counts of sex by five racial/ethnic groups (white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American) distributed across nine broad occupational categories, as well as information on establishments’ industry and geographic location. Coverage includes all private sector firms with 100 or more employees (50 or more prior to 1983) and federal contractors with 50 or more employees (25 or more before 1983). Firms do not include data for temporary workers but do include leased and part-time employees. To make data handling easier, we drew a 20 percent sample of establishments located in the 48 contiguous U.S. states for 1966, 1971, and 1975 and then in five-year intervals through 2000.

The EEOC defines managerial jobs as administrative and managerial positions whose incumbents set broad policies, exercise overall responsibility for execution of these policies.

---

1 The occupational categories are officials and managers, professionals, technicians, sales workers, office and clerical workers, craft workers, operatives, laborers, and service workers.

2 Due to incongruent ethnic distinctions used in Hawaii and a lack of meaningful labor market areas in Alaska (and very few observations), we deleted establishments in these states prior to sampling.
and direct individual departments or special phases of a firm’s operations. Because the EEOC makes no distinctions between different managerial jobs within a workplace, we can expect both heterogeneity and segregation in managerial roles in large workplaces and in more managerially intensive workplaces.

Past research suggests that EEO progress in access to managerial jobs has been greater in the public sector than in the private sector. Among private sector firms, however, progress appears to have been greater and regulatory focus stronger for larger workplaces and firms. This sample is thus likely to overstate EEO gains relative to the entire private sector. Because no direct comparisons of larger private sector firms and public sector gains exist, we cannot say whether this sample is likely to show greater or fewer gains than in the public sector.

MEASURING ACCESS TO MANAGERIAL JOBS

Because the size and status composition of the labor force has changed, we evaluate time trends in status group access to managerial jobs by adjusting for the supply of those status groups. The labor supply of different groups can be expected to vary both temporally (e.g., demographic shifts in labor force participation) and spatially (the uneven geographic distribution of racial groups).

We measure the representation of status groups in managerial jobs relative to their representation in local labor markets. We calculate a representation measure similar to Sokoloff (1992) but improve precision by observing the race-sex composition of managers in workplaces (as opposed to occupations) and using local (rather than national) labor supply to adjust for changes in labor force composition:

\[
\text{Managerial Representation} = \frac{X_{it}}{X_{jt}},
\]  

where \(X_{it}\) is the proportion of status group members (e.g., white men) in managerial jobs within establishment \(i\) in year \(t\), and \(X_{jt}\) is the proportion of status group members in local labor market \(j\) in a given year \(t\). To calculate the race-sex composition of the local labor market, we sum employment across all establishments in the EEO-1 reporting universe in commuting zone \(j\) for a specific year \(t\). Commuting zones are aggregations of counties, are not confined to state boundaries, and are calculated based on decennial census surveys documenting the distance individuals travel to work from where they live (Tolbert and Sizer 1996).

Equivalent to an odds ratio, a managerial representation value of 1 indicates that the race-sex allocation of managerial jobs at the establishment level matches the race-sex distribution of the local labor market. A value under 1 means that the status group is underrepresented in management, and a value over 1 means that a status group is overrepresented based on the race-sex composition of the local labor force. This measure controls for the local labor supply of potential workers. We should be clear that given the nature of our workplace-level data, we cannot distinguish between theories of labor market discrimination and skill-based explanations for these trends. Hence, we cannot demonstrate conclusively that over- or under-representation reflects discriminatory behavior. Given the past literature on individual-level managerial representation that does adjust for human capital differences, it seems reasonable to assume that both mechanisms are present across the period and that discrimination has declined since 1966, when managerial jobs were almost entirely filled by white men.

---

3 We use 1990 commuting zone boundaries for consistency purposes.
4 We also considered using odds ratios where we would examine the odds of one status group being in management versus another. Doing this, however, means we would lose organizations that did not contain employees of each race-sex comparison group. Furthermore, and perhaps most fundamental to our measurement strategy, the previous literature does not sufficiently account for the changing composition of the labor market in considering managerial trends. We also experimented with using a simple proportion of each group in managerial jobs and controlling for the local labor market composition on the right-hand side of our equations. Substantive results for industrial and organizational processes were equivalent. Time trends were not, since this is a zero-sum approach to measurement and so by definition shows the same misleading decline in white male representation and exaggerated growth in other groups displayed in Figure 1.
TIME TRENDS IN MANAGERIAL REPRESENTATION

Figure 1 reports the observed time trends in access to managerial jobs for black and white men and women relative to their representation in local labor markets. The unit of analysis is the workplace, the physical location in which people work. These are trends in national average managerial representation in establishments owned by private sector firms with 100 or more employees (50 or more prior to 1983).

Notably, white males’ advantage in access to managerial jobs actually increased in the initial period after the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This occurred because employers immediately hired new groups, particularly blacks, into nonmanagerial jobs. Even more remarkable is that white male managerial representation in private-sector managerial positions has not declined at all since the 1970s. White men are consistently overrepresented in private-sector managerial jobs, at nearly 160 percent of their representation in the local labor force during the 1971 to 2000 period.\(^5\)

White women’s representation in managerial jobs climbed steadily after 1966, and by 2000, it was approaching proportional representation (1.0). From nearly total exclusion, black male and black female managerial representation improved through the 1970s, stalled during the 1980s, and began to inch up again in the 1990s. This pattern has been reported for black-white segregation indices in the past and has been interpreted in terms of the political retreat from equal opportunity regulation beginning with the Reagan administration (Stainback 2006; Stainback, Robinson, and Tomaskovic-Devey 2005). By 2000, black male and black female managerial representation was still lower than their representation in the private-sector labor force, by 44 and 66 percent, respectively.

INDUSTRIAL RESTRUCTURING

Figure 2 disaggregates managerial representation trends by 11 broad industrial sectors. Panels a to f show trends for the “old economy” sectors of agriculture, forestry and fishing, mining,
Figure 2. Sector-Specific Managerial Representation Time Trends by Race-Sex, 1966 to 2000
constructions, nondurable manufacturing, durable manufacturing, and wholesale trade. In each of these sectors, white men are overrepresented in managerial jobs, and this overrepresentation has increased since 1966. Marginal gains for women and blacks occurred simultaneously with this increased access to managerial employment for white men. White men are between 1.5 and 2.5 times more likely to be managers in these industries, compared with their representation in the local labor force. White women and black men are about half as likely to occupy managerial jobs in these industries, compared with their distributions across local labor markets across all years. Black women show limited or no gains at all in these old economy sectors.

Panel g shows the observed time trends for the transportation, communications, and utilities sector. The white male trend displays a less stable advantage, rising from 1.6 to 1.8 between 1966 and 1980 and remaining relatively flat between 1980 and 2000. We do not find the marked gains for white men that we did in the old economy industries in panels a to f. The gains for white women, black men, and black women, however, are all substantial. These groups start with virtually no managerial access in 1966, but through 2000 each shows a different positive trajectory. White women make a sharp jump between 1966 and 1971, but they do not gain representation in managerial jobs until 1980, when the trend shows another sharp increase. White women continue to exhibit gains through 2000. Black men make steady progress during the entire period, and, if the trend continues, will reach expected representation by 2010. Black women, the most underrepresented group, improved markedly only in the 1980 to 1985 period and exhibit little change before or since.

The retail, producer services, and personal services industries (panels h, i, and j) display a stable overrepresentation of white men in management positions, although the ratio is lower than in the previous sectors, with representation levels between 1.4 and 1.6. We also find considerable gains for white women, black men, and black women. White women and black men are slowly approaching their labor force–based expected managerial representation. Black women, while making progress from 1966 to the early 1980s, show little progress since, and they actually lost relative managerial representation in the personal services sector in the 1980s.
They began to improve their representation again only in the late 1990s.

Finally, the social services sector (panel k) is the only sector to show declines in managerial representation for white men. White men begin the period slightly overrepresented, increase their representation by about 20 percent from 1966 to 1971, and then fall over time, becoming underrepresented in the 1990s. In 2000, white females were about 1.7 times more likely to be in managerial positions in the private social services sector than expected based on their local labor force participation. Black men make initial gains from 1966 to 1971, and then their representation stabilizes from 1971 to 2000; they remain about half as likely to hold managerial jobs in this sector compared with their labor market representation. Black women make gains from 1971 to 1975, stall in the 1980s, and begin to increase slowly in the 1990s. By 2000, the black female managerial representation level in private-sector social services was at .69, and, given their dual trends, black women’s representation may have surpassed white men’s by 2005.

White women, black men, and black women all gained increased access to managerial jobs in the retail and service sectors. These sectors are the fastest growing and among the largest in the U.S. economy. In terms of employment growth, the EEO-1 reports reveal that between 1966 and 2000, the retail sector grew the most rapidly (630 percent), followed by personal services (449 percent), producer services (427 percent), and social services (210 percent). Across all sectors, EEOC-reporting private sector employment grew by only 59 percent. White women approach parity in the retail and service sectors, black men in only the transportation, communications, and utilities sector. Black women are severely underrepresented in managerial positions in all sectors.

White males’ private sector managerial representation is extraordinarily stable across industrial sectors and time, showing erosion only in the social services sector. In the industries where white male managerial monopolies are high and increasing, employment growth has been modest or negative. These slow-growth sectors include construction (73 percent), wholesale (87 percent), and agriculture, farming, and fishing (117 percent). Absolute employment declines have been seen in mining and extrac-

tive (–16 percent), nondurable manufacturing (–3.5 percent), and durable manufacturing (–15 percent). Hence, white male managerial monopolies remain strongest in the older, slow- or no-growth sectors of the economy. With the exception of agriculture, these are also among the higher-wage sectors of the economy (see Table S1 in the Online Supplement on the ASR Web site: http://www2.asanet.org/journals/asr/2009/toc071.html).

In summary, (1) except for white men, there is substantial sectoral heterogeneity in long-term trends in access to managerial jobs, (2) white male overrepresentation is greater and rising in older economic sectors, (3) white female, black male, and black female gains are greatest in specific sectors of the service economy, and (4) some change, particularly for white and black women, is driven by changes in the industrial structure.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

We now turn our attention to the associations between organizational characteristics and group access to managerial positions. Our basic modeling strategy is to estimate managerial representation using a set of explanatory variables measured at the workplace level, including the race-sex composition of nonmanagerial employees, establishment size, and the percentage of managerial jobs in the organization. We calculate managerial representation as described previously, although to satisfy OLS assumptions of normal distributions, we use the natural log of managerial representation in the statistical estimates.

We exclude organizations with no managers and organizations located in commuting zones where managerial representation is structurally impossible. For example, in a commuting zone with no black women, all organizations in that commuting zone would be removed from the sample for black female managerial representation.6 In less than 1 percent of workplaces,

6 We experimented with further controls for the random probability of segregation associated with very small group size in specific commuting zones. This measure never improved model fit because it is both controlled in the measurement of the dependent
managerial representation values exceeded 10. In these extreme cases we top-coded the value to 10. The substantive conclusions do not differ with the adjustment or exclusion of these relatively rare cases.

Previous cross-sectional research suggests that women and racial minorities tend to gain access to managerial positions with control over others with similar status distinctions (Elliott and Smith 2001). We therefore include 10 establishment-level race-sex composition groups as a percentage of nonmanagerial jobs in these models. These nonmanagerial percentages include percent white male, white female, black male, black female, Hispanic male, Hispanic female, Asian male, Asian female, Native American male, and Native American female. In each of the models, we allow the reference category for the race-sex composition of nonmanagerial employees to match the managerial representation of the status group we are examining. For example, the reference category in the black male managerial representation models is percent black male nonmanagers. Negative coefficients indicate that as the percentage of nonmanagers of a given status group increases, managerial representation declines. Similarly, positive coefficients can be interpreted as increasing managerial representation for a given status group. We are particularly interested in the relative size and sign of these coefficients, as these will be fairly direct tests of who is managing whom. If all coefficients are negative, it will confirm the bottom-up ascription prediction that status groups are most likely to manage members of their own status group. The relative size of these coefficients will reveal how likely status groups are to manage other groups, thus giving us a metric of the intersectional manager–employee relationships between status groups.

We reason that increased female and black access to managerial jobs is likely to happen in larger establishments and establishments with relatively more managers. Larger establishments are more likely to have formalized personnel practices and the capability to make greater managerial distinctions. Our models include establishment size, measured as the natural log of total establishment employment. We also include percentage of jobs at the establishment classified as managerial. At establishments with many managers, managerial roles are more likely to have low spans of control, limited authority, and more hierarchical distinctions among them—the types of managerial jobs the literature suggests women and blacks are more likely to attain.

The analysis that follows is designed to accomplish three tasks. First, we provide a clear test of the bottom-up ascription perspective to ascertain whether status groups appear to manage similar others in the workplace over time. Second, we examine intersectionality theory by mapping out the social position and distance of each status group, revealing a hierarchy of race-sex distinctions in U.S. workplaces. Third, we see if female and minority managerial representation is greater in larger organizations and those with potentially more elaborate managerial hierarchies.

**BOTTOM-UP ASCRIPTION AND INTERSECTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS**

In the white male managerial representation models (Table 2), the coefficients for all nonmanagerial status groups are negative. Because the reference category is white men, this result demonstrates that white men are most likely to manage other white men, confirming the central bottom-up ascription prediction.

We can examine the intersectional relationships among groups by looking at the relative status distance of other workforces from white male managers. The negative influence of the status composition of nonmanagers on white male representation is much larger for female than male racial/ethnic groups. This suggests that white men are more likely to manage men of all races than they are to manage women. There is very little status distance between white male managers and male workers of all races and ethnicities. In fact, white men are as likely to manage Asian and black men as they are to manage white men, and the coefficient for Hispanic men, while statistically significant, is very small (−.005).

White women are also most likely to be represented in managerial jobs when managing similar others. Next closest are all women of color, suggesting again that there is a sex seg-
The segregation principle in white women’s access to managerial roles in which white women become managers of all women. Increasing percentages of men of all races in nonmanagerial jobs are associated with increased social distance from white female managers. Asian men are somewhat closer to white female management (–.025) than are other men (–.045 to –.053). These results suggest that white women benefit primarily from racial but not sex privilege; these findings are thus consistent with both sex segregation and bottom-up ascription accounts of managerial access.

Black men are most likely to gain access to managerial positions in workplaces with a greater percentage of white women (–.080) and white men (–.084) in nonmanagerial jobs. Black men appear to benefit primarily from their gender privilege over black women and are otherwise restricted in the workforces they manage. The managerial sex segregation principle appears quite weak in governing black male access to managerial roles.

Similar to the other groups, black women are most prone to enter management in workplaces with higher proportions of black women among nonmanagers. The next closest group is Asian women (–.043). All other nonmanagerial groups are relatively distant from black female managers. Black women are least likely to manage in workplaces with large proportions of Hispanic or white male workers. Black women primarily manage other black women. The managerial sex segregation principle seems to be stronger than it is for black men, since black women are more likely to manage all

### Table 2. Race-Sex Managerial Representation (ln) in Private Sector U.S. Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race-Sex Composition of Nonmanagerial Workers</th>
<th>White Male Managerial Representation</th>
<th>White Female Managerial Representation</th>
<th>Black Male Managerial Representation</th>
<th>Black Female Managerial Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>–.033***</td>
<td>–.004*</td>
<td>–.075***</td>
<td>–.043***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>–.029***</td>
<td>–.007***</td>
<td>–.031***</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>–.019***</td>
<td>–.017***</td>
<td>–.069***</td>
<td>–.069***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Female</td>
<td>–.056***</td>
<td>–.022***</td>
<td>–.072***</td>
<td>–.080***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>–.013***</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>–.080***</td>
<td>–.082***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>–.001</td>
<td>–.025***</td>
<td>–.044***</td>
<td>–.076***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>–.001</td>
<td>–.047***</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>–.079***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>–.005***</td>
<td>–.045***</td>
<td>–.065***</td>
<td>–.088***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Male</td>
<td>–.024***</td>
<td>–.053***</td>
<td>–.084***</td>
<td>–.084***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>–.049***</td>
<td>–.077***</td>
<td>–.087***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment Size(ln)</td>
<td>.143***</td>
<td>.764***</td>
<td>.805***</td>
<td>.509***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Managerial Jobs</td>
<td>.016***</td>
<td>.048***</td>
<td>.052***</td>
<td>.035***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (1966 reference)</th>
<th>White Male Managerial Representation</th>
<th>White Female Managerial Representation</th>
<th>Black Male Managerial Representation</th>
<th>Black Female Managerial Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>.151***</td>
<td>.203***</td>
<td>.281***</td>
<td>–.069***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>.173***</td>
<td>.771***</td>
<td>.602***</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>.189***</td>
<td>1.420***</td>
<td>.783***</td>
<td>.164***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>.170***</td>
<td>1.890***</td>
<td>.790***</td>
<td>.270***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>.144***</td>
<td>2.203***</td>
<td>.732***</td>
<td>.320***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>.099***</td>
<td>2.474***</td>
<td>.770***</td>
<td>.405***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.056***</td>
<td>2.670***</td>
<td>.862***</td>
<td>.531***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>–.076***</td>
<td>–.584***</td>
<td>–.340***</td>
<td>–.168***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>233,248</td>
<td>233,250</td>
<td>232,462</td>
<td>231,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two-tailed).
female status groups (except Native American women) than any male group. These estimates treat this intersectional process as time invariant. There are good reasons to expect that this is not the case. After all, in 1966, nearly 91 percent of all private sector EEOC-reporting managers were white men. Immediately after the Civil Rights Act, the bottom-up ascription process was necessarily weak. With the erosion of state-supported status inequality, we expect to see the development of the pattern of bottom-up ascription represented in these estimates of managerial to nonmanagerial workforces—a race-sex matching process. To examine this expectation more directly, we estimated cross-sectional models for 1966, 1985, and 2000 (see Table S2 in the Online Supplement). Not surprisingly, the estimates for 1985, roughly the middle of the observation period, were very similar to those reported in Table 2.

In 1966, white men managed all groups. White women were more likely to be managers in workplaces with minority female workers than in ones with white female workers. Similarly, black men were more likely to be managers in workplaces with black female labor forces than in those with black male labor forces. Thus, in 1966, the process of bottom-up ascription was not yet operating. Rather, in 1966 the few black men and white women who became managers did so in workplaces where they had race or gender status advantages over the nonmanagerial workforce. On the other hand, the estimates for 2000 are quite similar to those for 1985, suggesting that there was very little aggregate change in the social distance between managerial and non-managerial workforces after 1985, and that the process of bottom-up ascription and the current intersectional ranking of demographic groups were more or less institutionalized by 1985.

Table 3 arrays the estimates from 2000 to illustrate the contemporary relative social distance of employee status groups from white male, white female, black male, and black female managers. This visual depiction provides a more nuanced understanding of social distance and relative access to managerial jobs. White men manage other men nearly equally, followed at some distance by white women, then women of color. Compared with white male managers, white female managers' variability in social distance from nonmanagerial groups increases. White women manage other women, but they are particularly likely to manage white and black women. White women manage Asian men more than other men and are relatively distant from managing black, white, and particularly Hispanic men. The sex segregation of management is quite clear for white women and men in these estimates of relative social distance, although white male managers' social distance from female employees is quite a bit less than white female managerial social distance from male employees (with the exception of Asian male employees).

Black male and black female managers display a much greater average social distance from all nonmanagerial status groups than do white managers of either sex. In 2000, black men were most likely to manage other black men and least likely to manage white men or women. Black women were most likely to manage other black women and were quite far from the next closest category of nonmanagers, Asian women. Black women were least likely to manage white men. Practically speaking, black men and black women became managers primarily through a process of bottom-up ascription. Although there is an intersectional pattern, with black men least likely to manage white women, and black women least likely to manage white men, the more striking pattern is their relatively large social distance from all groups other than their own.

A counter-interpretation might be that employers prefer managers with industry-specific experience, so white women and racial minorities gain access to managerial roles in
industries in which they are a large proportion of nonmanagerial employees. While there may be some merit to this explanation, the relative social distance between groups makes it clear that it is not simply composition at work. The relative status placement suggests a strong tendency for white men to manage all men, as well as a distribution of white female and black male managers to nonmanagers that has a racialized and gendered structure. In addition, this basic pattern holds even with a fixed effect for industry, which substantially reduces the plausibility of this explanation.

These patterns reveal the importance of intersectionality in two ways. First, each of the four groups examined has a unique set of relationships with all other groups. White male managers are socially close to all nonmanagerial sex-race workgroups, white women are socially close to all female work groups, black male managers are socially close only to black male workers, and black female managers are not socially close to any group of nonmanagers other than black women. Second, these patterns help explain the temporal pattern of managerial change since 1966. White men are socially eligible to manage all status groups. This helps explain why they have been so resilient in maintaining their access to managerial jobs. White women have made the most consistent and dramatic gains since 1966, reflecting their routine management of all women. Thus, increased female labor force participation, joined with the sex segregation principle in managerial assignment, has driven white female managerial gains. Black men, while now legally encouraged to enter management, accomplish this socially when they manage other black men and, to a lesser extent, black women. Black men’s gains in access to management are constrained in practice by a race segregation principle. The only constituency for black female managers appears to be black female workers, thus severely limiting their available venues for managerial inclusion, particularly because they must compete with white men, white women, and, to some extent, black men for these jobs. Given these intersectional social relationships, it is not sur-

Table 3: Relative Social Distance in 2000 of Status Groups from White Male, White Female, Black Male, and Black Female Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Distance of Nonmanagerial Workforces</th>
<th>Managerial Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Black Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Asian Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03</td>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>Black Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>Asian Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08</td>
<td>Asian Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table includes only the nonmanagerial workforces as a reference to the managerially represented groups.
prising that black women have made such limited managerial gains.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

We expect that access to managerial jobs is enhanced for all status groups in larger workplaces and in workplaces with relatively more managers, and these effects should be most pronounced for women and racial minorities. Looking across models (Table 2), we find support for these expectations. White men are more likely to be found in managerial roles in larger establishments and in establishments with a higher proportion of managers. White women’s access to managerial jobs is also greater in larger establishments and establishments with higher percentages of managers, but coefficients are five and three times larger respectively. Size and percentage of managers at an establishment are similarly powerful for understanding black male managerial representation. These organizational characteristics are also positively associated with black female managerial representation but have less of an impact than they do for white women or black men. Coefficients, however, are still larger by factors of three and two, respectively, compared with white men. These results strongly suggest that EEO managerial gains were not even across all workplaces, but were more likely to occur in larger and more managerially intensive workplaces. We reason that larger establishments are more likely to have formalized personnel practices and the capacity to make greater distinctions within managerial hierarchies. In addition, managerial roles at establishments with many managers are more likely to have low spans of control, limited authority, and more hierarchical distinctions. Given our measures, we cannot conclude which of these mechanisms is more powerful.

Again, these estimates assume that the effects of size and percentage of managers were constant over time. But since almost all managers were white men in 1966, it stands to reason that they increasingly became mechanisms of incorporation after 1966. If this is the case, we would expect that these coefficients should strengthen over time, and they do. For all groups, both coefficients strengthen between 1966 and 1985 and are roughly stable thereafter (see Table S2 in the Online Supplement). Furthermore, as early as 1966 we observe that the very limited female and minority access to managerial jobs was already more likely in larger establishments with more managerial jobs. By 1985, however, this effect was substantially stronger. After the Civil Rights Act, state-sanctioned status exclusion was replaced by organizational sorting practices that led to female and minority gains in organizations that had the scale and managerial intensity to create social distinctions among managers. In organizations with more formalized personnel policies, this may have reduced exclusionary bias.

COUNTERFACTUAL TREND ANALYSES

Figure 3 presents the observed time trends in managerial representation with solid lines, as well as three counterfactual time trends that our models suggest would have occurred if there were no industrial or spatial shifts in the economy or if the organizational sorting mechanisms had not come to operate.

What would the time trend in managerial representation have been if the industrial or spatial distribution of economic activity had not changed since 1966? We estimate this first counterfactual trend by observing the coefficients for time in a model that also includes fixed effects for industrial and geographic composition. We measure industry with the three-digit standard industrial classification (SIC) code, containing about 450 categories. We measure local labor markets with Tolbert and Sizer’s (1996) commuting zones (approximately 700 geographic units).

---

8 There are many interesting patterns in these data for groups whose managerial representation we are not directly examining in this article. Asian male workers seem less socially distant from black men than do other men. Asian women are similarly close to black female managers. Conversely, Native American nonmanagers are particularly distant from all same-sex managers. We look forward to more nuanced examinations of these relationships, as well as examinations of other status groups’ managerial representation.

9 We measure industry with the three-digit standard industrial classification (SIC) code, containing about 450 categories. We measure local labor markets with Tolbert and Sizer’s (1996) commuting zones (approximately 700 geographic units).
We estimate similar models that control for the organizational variables examined in Table 2 (labeled “if no changes in organizational sorting”). The third counterfactual trend includes both sets of variables and is labeled “if no change in either” (counterfactual estimates available from the authors on request).

The most striking finding in the first panel (White Males) is that if there had been no change in the industrial composition of EEOC reporting workplaces, white male managerial representation would have grown considerably from 1966 to 1980 and remained high thereafter. This result is consistent with the sectoral disaggregation discussed earlier. Similarly, if the organizational sorting processes of bottom-up ascription increased sex segregation in managerial location for white men and women, and if other groups had not received increased access to larger workplaces with more employees and complex managerial hierarchies, white males’ monopoly over managerial positions would have grown in the post-1964 period. Of course, these sorting mechanisms did change, and it is precisely because of these changes that other groups have gained access to managerial jobs.

Since 1966, white women have made the strongest advance into managerial jobs of any group. If there had been no industrial or spatial shifts in economic activity, white female managerial representation would have been 32 percent lower in 2000. If the observed organizational characteristics had not come to govern managerial attainment, white women’s gains in access to managerial positions would have been 42 percent less. A substantial part of the trend (26 percent) is not accounted for by either characteristic, suggesting there is also a process of increasing similarity of white women to white men in the circumstances under which they become managers. As with white men, there are no strong temporal patterns within these trend lines. White women’s access to man-

---

10 Although these models include fixed effects for labor market shifts, they play a small role in the empirical estimates.
managerial jobs has grown fairly steadily since the early 1970s.

Black males made dramatic gains between 1966 and 1980, and this trend is not influenced by either the rise of organizational sorting characteristics or industrial restructuring. During the initial post-Civil Rights Act period, black male gains were widespread across the economy. After 1980, both the emerging organizational sorting characteristics and industrial shifts produced most of the incremental observed gains in black male managerial employment. Of these, organizational sorting characteristics are more important, accounting for 30 percent of net gains. Industrial shifts account for an additional 10 percent of observed changes. The rapid growth in black male representation in managerial jobs that occurred before 1980 accounts for almost all of the change in black males’ representation in managerial jobs net of these two generic mechanisms. While today it appears that some white women are entering managerial jobs on terms similar to those of white men, the same process occurred for black men prior to 1980. Since 1980, black males’ managerial gains have been limited as a result of bottom-up ascription and internally-segmented managerial hierarchies in large organizations.

Black women have made only small gains since 1966 in their observed managerial representation. Net of industrial or spatial shifts in the economy, black women made no gains at all before 1975, weak gains through 1985, and almost none since. If there had been no industrial or spatial shifts in economic activity since 1966, black women would have been at only .27 of labor market parity by the year 2000, 29 percent lower than the observed 2000 level of .38. The counterfactual trend line “if no changes in organizational sorting” is nearly flat after 1980, even though almost all real gains for black women happened after 1980. Clearly these mechanisms were very important for providing black women with access to managerial roles. Together, industrial or spatial shifts and organizational variables explain almost all (85 percent) of black women’s increased managerial access since 1966.

This counterfactual exercise suggests that both industrial or spatial shifts and the rise of organizational sorting practices have produced increased access to managerial jobs for white women, black men, and black women. If both processes had not happened, white men’s access to managerial jobs would have grown substantially, even as they became a smaller proportion of the labor force. About 42 percent of white women’s marked gains in access to managerial jobs arose from the shift in organizational practices, often within sex-segregated industries that were already receptive to them as workers. White women made notable gains net of these factors, suggesting that they increasingly gain access to managerial jobs on terms with, or in organizations similar to those of, white men. Much of black men’s access to managerial jobs prior to 1980 was also not a function of industrial or spatial shifts or changes in organizational sorting mechanisms. After 1980, almost all of black men’s gains resulted from their increased access to large organizations, complex managerial hierarchies, and workplaces where they managed other black men. Black women made only weak gains, practically all of which are due to the shift to a lower-wage service sector and increased access to large organizations, complex managerial hierarchies, and workplaces where they primarily manage black women.

CONCLUSIONS

Our central empirical conclusion is that white males’ managerial representation has changed very little over time in the older and more desirable sectors of the economy, while gains for white women, black women, and black men are circumscribed to the growing economic sectors of the economy and in larger workplaces where they typically manage similar others.

At least two alternative historical scenarios could have taken place. First, white men, even as they declined as a proportion of the labor force, could have monopolized nearly all of the managerial jobs in the economy. If this had happened, 26 percent of white men would have been managers in 2000, substantially more than their actual representation of 14.7 percent. A second scenario could have more closely followed the intentions of the Civil Rights Act, in which the proportional share of managerial jobs held by white men would actually decline, allowing more progress for women and racial minorities. In fact, the percentage of white men in managerial jobs rose from 10.5 to 14.7 percent. If white men held only their proportional
share of private sector managerial jobs in 2000, only 10.7 percent would have been managers and almost a million additional managerial jobs would have been available for other groups to fill. This would have been a profound redistribution of labor market rewards and opportunities.

In actuality, during the post-Civil Rights Act period, managerial representation was particularly responsive to the rise of the low-wage service sectors—especially in workplaces with a large, potentially internally segregated, managerial workforce—and the matching of supervisors to workers of the same or other marginalized status groups. Some managerial jobs may have been created directly in response to groups’ demands for equal—or at least new—opportunities. White women increasingly realized a racial privilege over other women. Black men primarily manage other black men, but they realized a weak gender privilege over black women. Black men face a clear color line in access to managerial jobs because they are least likely to manage white female or white male workforces. Black women’s access to managerial roles is profoundly limited; it is typically tied to the management of other black women, and establishment size and the size of the managerial workforce have weaker effects than are observed for white women or black men. This set of results is broadly consistent with the literature on the role of the service economy in providing managerial opportunities for women and minorities, bottom-up ascription, the limited authority of female and minority managers, and the notion that intersectional processes between status groups can create unique configurations of opportunities and disadvantages for specific groups.

Our results provide an interesting contrast with Charles and Grusky’s (2004) suggestion that the preexisting occupational sex-typing of service work might lead to desegregation. While it is clear that the emerging service sector has been a more welcoming terrain for white and black women and black men, this trend obviously does not reflect a sex- or race-typing of managerial jobs in these sectors prior to the Civil Rights Act. In 1966, almost all managerial jobs in all sectors were filled by white men. When the Civil Rights Act was enacted in 1964, managerial jobs were clearly sex-typed as male in all sectors of the economy, except perhaps private-sector social services, where white women were already well represented. Occupational sex-typing is thus not a promising explanation for these trends. On the other hand, the process of bottom-up ascription suggests that the sex- or race-typing of nonmanagerial employees in the service industries was an important prerequisite for the observed managerial advances. Charles and Grusky’s (2004) sex-typing hypothesis is thus a reasonable description of labor–manager relationships, even though it does not hold for managerial occupational sex integration.

Increasing managerial representation for women and racial minorities has not eroded white males’ preexisting managerial representation. Despite industrial, geographic, and demographic shifts leading to female and racial minorities’ increasing access to managerial jobs, white males continued to maintain relatively stable, even increasing, access to managerial jobs throughout the post-civil rights era. Our intersectional results suggest that to the extent that white males lost relative status advantages, it is in their monopoly of managerial roles over women. In their place, white women have taken the lead role in managing all women.

Our conclusions might be strengthened if we could examine more proximate mechanisms leading to managerial composition. Kalev and colleagues (2006) show that a fairly detailed examination of personnel practices linked to managerial representation is possible. For policy reasons it is certainly important to identify the contemporary mechanisms that encourage and discourage workplace EEO. Tilly (1998) cautions, however, that actors can be quite resilient in finding new mechanisms to install old status distinctions. That a higher proportion of white men were managers in the private sector in 2000 than in 1966 suggests exactly such resilience in the face of legislative and political change. In this sense, the mechanisms

---

11 While it is beyond the scope of this article to formally test this idea, we did estimate models to see if the rise in the proportion of all managerial jobs between 1966 and 1985 was simply a function of changes in the industrial or size distributions of workplaces. It was not, leaving open the possibility that the rise was a response to EEO demands for increased inclusion.
identified in this article that now promote female and minority access to managerial jobs—bottom-up ascription, organizational sorting characteristics, and industrially segregated managerial roles—are also the mechanisms that reinstalled white male managerial dominance after state-sanctioned exclusion ended. It appears that Tilly was right: the proximate mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion change to reestablish the causal connection between status characteristics and opportunities.

The counterfactual exercises suggest that black men made strong gains prior to the development of these new sorting mechanisms but circumscribed ones since. White women, on the other hand, started more slowly but have made more continuous gains, and much of this is due to the new organizational sorting mechanisms. Together, these patterns suggest that to the extent that the Civil Rights Act forced white men to reduce their social distance from other groups, the color line has endured even as between-sex segregation waned for whites. In fact, in other research we show a resegregation of white women from women of color during this same period (Tomaskovic-Devey and Stainback 2007). It appears that W. E. B. DuBois’s prophetic pronouncement in 1903 that the “problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line” will continue to operate as a barrier to equal employment opportunity well into the twenty-first century.

We have only skimmed the surface of the status dynamics present in U.S. workplaces. We now have a good sense of trends in managerial access for these four groups and their connection to industrial and spatial restructuring, bottom-up ascription, and the observed organizational characteristics, but that leaves many avenues open for future research. For example, how and where do the organizational processes of bottom-up ascription, intersectional status hierarchies, and managerial distinctions change over time? We do know that early in the post-Civil Rights Act period all of these mechanisms were absent or weak, simply because all groups except white men were effectively excluded from managerial positions. The basic question of where in organizational space social change has occurred is now open. What variation exists in industry and locality change trajectories? What drives the trajectories of change? Where does resegregation happen?

Finally, are there any completely desegregated social locations?
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