

ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (JUNE:319–344)

Race, Gender, and Workplace Power

James R. Elliott
Tulane University

Ryan A. Smith
The City University of New York

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Table 1.** Means and *t*-Tests for Successive Levels of Workplace Power
- Table 2.** Tests of Family-Status Effects in Predicting Workplace Power
- Table 3.** Testing for “Horizontal Reproduction”: Multinomial Regression Coefficients for White Men’s Log-Odds of Power and Interaction Coefficients for Group Differences from White Men
- Table 4.** Testing Hypothesis 5: Predicting Employment in Successive Levels of Power and Showing Differences with and without Homosocial Reproduction

Table 1. Means and *t*-Tests for Successive Levels of Workplace Power

Common Covariates with Workplace Power	Workers (n = 2,630)	Supervisors ^a (n = 511)	Managers ^b (n = 339)
Occupational SEI ^c			
Job Compensation			
Mean hourly wage (\$)	10.20	12.24***	15.61***
Mean log _e (hourly wage)	2.18	2.35***	2.60***
With sick leave (%)	56.7	68.4***	75.6*
With health insurance (%)	60.9	73.5***	81.4**
With retirement benefits (%)	50.3	61.1***	66.1
Job Complexity			
Talk face-to-face with customers/clients weekly (%)	58.1	69.3***	76.6*
Talk on phone with customer/clients weekly (%)	45.3	59.4***	78.6***
Read instructions or reports weekly (%)	59.7	75.1***	88.7***
Write paragraphs weekly (%)	40.0	55.6***	76.9***
Work with a computer weekly (%)	39.8	50.6***	66.8***
Who do arithmetic weekly (%)	52.1	72.3***	87.2***
Time needed to learn job fully (weeks)	26.9	39.0***	83.4***
Education and Work Experience			
Schooling (years)	12.3	13.1***	14.0***
With college degree (%)	32.0	41.9***	57.2***
Working with current employer (years)	5.4	6.9*	7.8*
With prior job-specific experience (%)	45.6	55.0***	57.8
Work experience since leaving school (total years)	15.1	16.7**	17.4
Ascriptive Context			
Working under white-male superior (%)	37.1	38.0	55.5***
Working alongside mostly white coworkers (%)	40.6	47.0**	55.8*
Male in occupation (%)	47.5	51.6**	58.1***
White in occupation (%)	57.5	58.9	64.6***

SEI = Socioeconomic Index

^a Statistical significance calculated from one-tailed *t*-tests of means of workers and supervisors.

^b Statistical significance calculated from one-tailed *t*-tests of means of supervisors and managers.

^c Occupational SEI was computed by Nakao and Treas (1992) using 1980 three-digit occupational codes in a manner consistent with Duncan's (1961) original computations. Because of changes in occupational codes between 1980 and 1990, in six instances we had to consolidate two 1980 codes used by Nakao and Treas into a single 1990 occupational code, wherein we took the mean SEI score of the two original (1980) codes (349/353; 368/369; 436/437; 673/674; 794/795; 804/805).

Table 2. Tests of Family-Status Effects in Predicting Workplace Power

Common Covariates with Workplace Power	Supervisor vs. Worker		Manager vs. Supervisor	
	B _n	(SE)	B _n	(SE)
Independent Variables				
Race-Sex Group				
White men [ref.]	—	—	—	—
Black men	.099	(.244)	-.102	(.340)
Latinos	-.001	(.278)	.127	(.393)
White women	.167	(.253)	.085	(.327)
Black women	-.011	(.230)	-.733*	(.347)
Latinas	.153	(.305)	-.844	(.523)
Family Status				
Married	-.034	(.283)	.460	(.343)
Children in the household	.456	(.305)	-.234	(.361)
Interaction Terms				
Black men x married	.498	(.404)	-.739	(.546)
Black men x children	-.575	(.437)	.485	(.584)
Latinos x married	.083	(.417)	-.616	(.557)
Latinos x children	-.032	(.432)	.711	(.570)
White women x married	-.396	(.381)	-.445	(.490)
White women x children	-.222	(.399)	-.038	(.512)
Black women x married	.130	(.361)	.243	(.501)
Black women x children	-.350	(.362)	-.113	(.505)
Latinas x married	.013	(.431)	.489	(.654)
Latinas x children	-1.116*	(.433)	.467	(.667)
Controls				
Education (years)	.043*	(.022)	.069*	(.033)
Work experience (years)	-.003	(.006)	.002	(.009)
Prior job-specific experience (0:1)	.378***	(.103)	-.081	(.153)
Organizational tenure (years)	.037***	(.009)	.013	(.012)
Establishment size (logged)	-.025	(.027)	-.034	(.040)
Public sector	.174	(.127)	-.816***	(.204)
Hours worked per week (logged)	.817***	(.199)	1.37***	(.348)
Sales/clerical occupation [ref.]	—	—	—	—
Professional/technical	.476**	(.145)	.715**	(.221)
Service	.426**	(.156)	-.173	(.273)
Craft/repair	.202	(.163)	-.157	(.261)
Constant	-5.811***	(.824)	-6.311***	(1.428)
Model χ^2 : 486.7 (54 df)				

Note: Data shown are multinomial regression coefficients. Each beta coefficient, B_n, is shown with standard error (SE) in parentheses. N = 3,480

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3. Testing for "Horizontal Reproduction": Multinomial Regression Coefficients for White Men's Log-Odds of Power and Interaction Coefficients for Group Differences from White Men

Key Variables and Model Statistics	Differences among White Men ^a		Differences from White Men			
			Black Men ^b		Latinos ^b	
	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor
Network assistance (0:1)	-.462 (.283)	.443 (.351)	.743 (.420)	-.717 (.577)	.928 (.477)	-1.100 (.609)
Years of education	.008 (.060)	.079 (.080)	.123 (.087)	.129 (.125)	.052 (.071)	-.010 (.093)
Total work experience	.002 (.015)	.005 (.019)	.012 (.021)	.001 (.030)	-.040 (.023)	.020 (.030)
Prior job-specific experience (0:1)	.467 (.282)	-.187 (.347)	-.025 (.402)	-.438 (.537)	-.211 (.407)	.543 (.530)
Years with employer	.053* (.023)	.024 (.025)	.001 (.033)	-.013 (.039)	.118 (.044)	-.038 (.051)
Ascriptively similar coworkers (0:1)	.060 (.281)	-.077 (.340)	-.072 (.417)	.234 (.572)	-.052 (.407)	.489 (.531)
Constant	-5.619* (2.174)	-7.4178 (3.124)	-3.715* (1.624)	-5.931* (2.460)	-4.477* (1.732)	-8.068* (2.563)
Model χ^2 (df)	89.4 (24)		147.7 (38)		169.7 (38)	
N	442		829		888	

	Differences from White Men					
	White Women ^b		Black Women ^b		Latinas ^b	
	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor
Network assistance (0:1)	.443 (.407)	-.415 (.522)	.785* (.362)	1.255* (.641)	.553 (.469)	-.505 (.721)
Years of education	.035 (.083)	.057 (.115)	.126 (.077)	-.003 (.123)	.163* (.077)	-.056 (.117)
Total work experience	-.008 (.021)	.002 (.028)	.003 (.019)	-.034 (.030)	.031 (.021)	-.068 (.039)
Prior job-specific experience (0:1)	.084 (.409)	-.011 (.521)	.066 (.352)	.006 (.517)	-.477 (.446)	-.061 (.705)
Years with employer	.023 (.035)	-.027 (.041)	-.037 (.028)	-.021 (.038)	-.008 (.042)	.061 (.059)
Ascriptively similar coworkers (0:1)	-.222 (.404)	.027 (.510)	-.441 (.360)	-.028 (.551)	-.627 (.470)	.002 (.763)
Constant	-3.647* (1.492)	-9.052* (2.360)	-4.696* (1.557)	-8.428* (2.591)	-7.555* (1.825)	-5.787* (2.708)
Model χ^2 (df)	169.5 (38)		256.3(38)		229.0 (38)	
N	916		1,186		894	

Note: Data shown with standard errors in parentheses. Indicators of employment context include number of workers in the respondent's establishment (logged), public sector (0:1), hours worked per week (logged), and occupational location (professional/technical, craft/repair, service, clerical/sales [o]ref.[c]). Samples include only workers entering new jobs within five years of the survey. Our "horizontal" measure of homosocial reproduction, "group-concentrated job," takes a value of 1 if a respondent works with mostly coethnic coworkers in an occupation that, locally, consists of mostly workers of the same sex; otherwise, the indicator takes a value of 0.

^a $\log[\text{Pr}(\text{Level}_n)/\text{Pr}(\text{Level}_{n-1})] = a + b_1[\text{Network}] + b_2[\text{Education}] + b_3[\text{Total}] + b_4[\text{Prior}] + b_5[\text{Tenure}] + b_6[\text{Similar Superior}] + \sum_i b_i[\text{Employment Context}_i]$; coefficients b_1 through b_6 reported, along with a .

^b $\log[\text{Pr}(\text{Level}_n)/\text{Pr}(\text{Level}_{n-1})] = a + b_1[\text{Network}] + b_2[\text{Education}] + b_3[\text{Total}] + b_4[\text{Prior}] + b_5[\text{Tenure}] + b_6[\text{Similar Superior}] + b_7[\text{Race-Sex}] + b_8[(\text{Race-Sex}) \times \text{Network}] + b_9[(\text{Race-Sex}) \times \text{Education}] + b_{10}[(\text{Race-Sex}) \times \text{Total}] + b_{11}[(\text{Race-Sex}) \times \text{Prior}] + b_{12}[(\text{Race-Sex}) \times \text{Tenure}] + b_{13}[(\text{Race-Sex}) \times \text{Similar Superior}] + \sum_i b_i[\text{Employment Context}_i]$; coefficients b_8 through b_{13} reported along with a ; "[Race-Sex]" refers to the specific group being compared with white men.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed test.

Table 4. Testing Hypothesis 5: Predicting Employment in Successive Levels of Power and Showing Differences with and without Homosocial Reproduction

Key Variables and Model Statistics	Black Men ^a		Latinos ^a	
	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor
(HR) Ascriptively Similar Superior (0:1)	.087 (.356)	2.919 (3.834)	.126 (1.495)	.564 (2.148)
HR x Network Assistance (0:1)	.842 (.817)	.275 (1.393)	-.445 (.832)	.937 (1.199)
HR x Years of Education	.144 (.163)	-.275 (.241)	-.011 (.098)	-.016 (.138)
HR x Total Work Experience	.049 (.035)	-.026 (.053)	.042 (.038)	-.054 (.055)
HR x Prior Job-Specific Experience (0:1)	.393 (.671)	.403 (1.054)	-.128 (.673)	-1.468 (.986)
HR x Years with Employer	-.112 (.063)	.117 (.077)	-.165 (.098)	.047 (.139)
Constant	-3.938 (2.278)	-4.972 (3.666)	-4.283 (2.391)	-9.726* (4.169)
Model χ^2 (df)	72.0 (34)		86.9 (34)	
N	387		446	
	White Women ^a		Black Women ^a	
	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor	Supervisor vs. Worker	Manager vs. Supervisor
HR Ascriptively Similar Superior (0:1)	1.136 (1.882)	-5.250 (3.052)	-4.057* (2.052)	5.314 (3.655)
HR x Network Assistance (0:1)	-.306 (.605)	.502 (.808)	-.109 (.582)	-1.851 (1.182)
HR x Years of Education	-.030 (.129)	.279 (.198)	.252 (.146)	-.242 (.251)
HR x Total Work Experience	-.096* (.037)	.154* (.048)	.006 (.029)	.008 (.052)
HR x Prior Job-Specific Experience (0:1)	.669 (.622)	-.853 (.839)	.212 (.531)	.186 (.993)
HR x Years with Employer	.120 (.063)	-.234* (.076)	.034 (0.42)	-.123 (.112)
Constant	-3.467 (1.977)	-9.667* (3.391)	5.869* (1.841)	-10.600* (4.035)
Model χ^2 (df)	97.9		113.2 (34)	
N	474		744	

Note: Data shown are multinomial logistic regression coefficients from interaction equations; standard errors are in parentheses. HR = homosocial reproduction

Controls for employment context include number of workers in the respondent's establishment (logged), public sector (0:1), hours worked per week (logged), and occupational location (professional/technical, craft/repair, service, clerical/sales). Latinas are not included in this analysis because too few Latina supervisors (n=7) and managers (n=0) report having ascriptively similar superiors with which to compare. Samples include only workers entering new jobs within five years of the survey.

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed test)

^a $\log[\text{Pr}(\text{Level}_n)/\text{Pr}(\text{Level}_{n-1})] = a + b_1[\text{Similar Superior}] + b_2[\text{Network}] + b_3[\text{Education}] + b_4[\text{Total}] + b_5[\text{Prior}] + b_6[\text{Tenure}] + b_7([\text{Similar Superior}] \times \text{Network}) + b_8([\text{Similar Superior}] \times \text{Education}) + b_9([\text{Similar Superior}] \times \text{Total}) + b_{10}([\text{Similar Superior}] \times \text{Prior}) + b_{11}([\text{Similar Superior}] \times \text{Tenure}) + \sum_i b_i[\text{Employment Context}_i]$; coefficients for a, b₁, and b₇ through b₁₁ are reported.