FEAR OF JOB LOSS

Racial/Ethnic Differences in Privileged Occupations

George Wilson
Department of Sociology, University of Miami

Krysia Mossakowski
Department of Sociology, University of Miami

Abstract

Sociologists have not attempted to explain the causes of higher levels of perceived job insecurity among racial/ethnic minorities than those of Whites in privileged occupations. This study examines two possible explanations for this finding among White, African American, and Latino professionals and managers. The first emphasizes the discrimination-induced, structural marginality experienced by minorities in the workplace (the marginalized-worker perspective), and the second emphasizes learned dispositions—i.e., fatalism and mistrust—that are brought to the workplace (the dispositional perspective). Using data from the General Social Survey (GSS) and ordered probit regression analyses for both men and women, our findings provide greater support for the marginalized-worker perspective. Results reveal African Americans and Latino men and women have a greater fear of job loss than their White counterparts, regardless of their human capital credentials (e.g., education, work experience) and job/labor market advantages (e.g., job authority, job autonomy, unionized status, favorable market sector). Along these lines, these traditional, stratification-based predictors provide greater insulation from perceived job insecurity for Whites than racial/ethnic minorities. Less support is found for the dispositional perspective: one disposition—fatalism—is associated with greater fear of job loss for African American men and women compared to Whites.

Keywords: Occupations, Perceived Insecurity, Race, Workplace, Inequality

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, sociologists have uncovered a wide range of race-based inequities at privileged levels of the American occupational structure as racial minorities—such as African Americans and Latinos—have moved into these positions at unprecedented rates. In this regard, the overwhelming majority of research by sociologists

Du Bois Review, 6:2 (2009) 357–374.
 1742-058X/09 $15.00
doi:10.1017/S1742058X09990221

on inequality among, for example, managers and professionals, has focused on "structural" outcomes in the workplace. Specifically, in the context of issues such as "returns" by way of income and occupational status for investments in human capital credentials (Farley 2004; Jaynes and Williams, 1989) as well as access to higher-order and reward-relevant job tasks such as job authority and job autonomy (Hite 2007; Hyllegard and Lavin, 1992; Tomaskovic-Devey and Stainback, 2007; Wilson 1997; Smith 2002) , a racialized continuum has emerged with Whites at the high/favorable end, African Americans at the low/unfavorable end, and Latinos occupying a middle ground.

At the same time, sociologists have begun to assess racial differences in reward-relevant "quality of life" experiential domains—such as job satisfaction (Firebaugh and Harley, 1995; Martin and Tuch, 1993; Tuch and Martin, 1991), alienation from job tasks (Dworkin et al., 1983; Hofstetter and Buss, 1988), and perceived job insecurity (Gottschalk and Moffitt, 2000; Manski and Straub, 2000; Wilson et al., 2006)—among incumbents in privileged occupations. Overall, one of these experiential domains—perceived job insecurity—has emerged as particularly worthy of study because of its far-ranging deleterious consequences. For example, fear of impending job loss is related to behavior in the workplace such as employee absenteeism (Loscocco and Spitze, 1990; Pearce 1998), falling worker productivity (Barling et al., 1998), low levels of worker commitment (Ferrie et al., 1998; Lim 1996; Probst 1999), and elevated levels of workplace injuries and accidents (Probst and Brubaker, 2001). Perceived job insecurity, in addition, helps to structure psychosocial "quality of life" indicators that operate in and out of the workplace such as diminished job satisfaction (Heaney et al., 1994; Lim 1996), stress (Jacobson 1991; Siegerist 1996), depression (Heaney et al., 1994; Macneil 1994; Siegerist et al., 1988), and negative sentiments toward outgroups (Thornton and Mizuno, 1999). Finally, perceived insecurity is also associated with a range of antisocial behaviors outside of the workplace including domestic and marital conflict (Ferrie 1997), and even plays a role in structuring career aspirations that are transmitted to one's children (Barling et al., 1998).

Nevertheless, despite the demonstrated importance of perceived fear of impending job loss, the handful of studies that touch on its dynamics vis-à-vis race at the privileged occupational level have gone only as far as documenting that there is a large racial effect (Manski and Straub, 2000; Wilson et al., 2006): approximately twice the proportion of African Americans—the minority group who have been the exclusive focus of study—as Whites express at least a "moderate" (Manski and Straub, 2000) fear of job loss during the decade of the 1990s even after statistical controls are introduced for work experience and age (Manski and Straub, 2000). We do not yet, however, understand crucial issues related to the racial gap. Perhaps our foremost question asks why the gap exists: Is it related, for example, to dynamics that take place in the workplace, or, alternatively, is it related to different race-specific dispositions or temperaments that workers bring with them to the workplace? Furthermore, we do not know how the dynamics of perceived insecurity differ across gender groups at a time when both male and female minority group members have moved into privileged slots in unprecedented numbers. The tendency in existing studies to pool samples of males and females conflates the effects of gender and race across independent variables, precluding an assessment of how race operates within discrete gender categories. Finally, we know little about the dynamics of perceived insecurity among additional minority groups, for example, Latinos, who—in addition to African Americans—have entered privileged occupations at unprecedented rates in recent decades (Farley 2004; Massey and Anderson, 2000).

This study enhances our understanding of the relationship between race/ethnicity and perceived job insecurity at the privileged occupational level by addressing these critical questions. In particular, it uses data from a nationally representative sample, the General Social Survey (GSS), to assess the merits of two theoretical perspectives: the first, focusing on discrimination-induced, structural marginality experienced by racial/ethnic minorities in the workplace (the marginalized-worker perspective) and, the second, emphasizing the learned dispositions of fatalism and mistrust (the dispositional perspective).

PERSPECTIVES ON RACE AND PERCEIVED JOB INSECURITY IN PRIVILEGED OCCUPATIONS

A. The Marginalized-Worker Perspective

Fundamentals

"The marginalized-worker" perspective—a first formulation—is distilled from recent case studies and survey-based analyses that focus on adverse social psychological consequences for African American and Latino managers and professionals, ensuing from a range of employment practices in predominantly White-owned and -managed workplaces (Brown and Erie, 1981; Collins 1997, 1993; Farley 2004, 1996; Fernandez 1981, 1975; Hite 2007; Kluegel 1978; Moore 1981; Mueller et al., 1999; Mundra et al., 1995; Pettigrew 1985; Pettigrew and Martin, 1987; Wilson 1997; Yaffee 1995). This perspective maintains that discriminatory practices inducing fear of job loss do not necessarily lead to actual job loss (see Fernandez 1981; Burstein 1985 for factors—such as affirmative action programs—that can lead to the retention of jobs, though fear of job loss is present). Overall, the employment practices identified are rooted in the institutionally based dynamics associated with "modern racial prejudice" (Pettigrew 1985). Accordingly, they tend not to be discriminatory in intent or have the ill will associated with classic "Jim Crow" racism but rather have a disproportionately negative impact on minorities at upper reaches of the American workplace (Collins 1997; Fernandez 1981). Essentially, African Americans and Latinos in upper-tier occupations may not necessarily be at greater risk of losing their jobs than their White peers, but they may have heightened levels of job insecurity because of concern about the possibility of future unfair evaluation and allocation practices in the workplace.

The marginalized-worker perspective maintains that the foundation of job insecurity perception among racial minorities—such as African Americans and Latinos—rests in dynamics involving both allocation and performance evaluation practices by employers. Significantly, these practices by employers serve to send signals of relative lack of work to highly skilled, trained, and experienced racial minorities, particularly in predominantly White-owned and -managed firms (Wilson et al., 2006). First, minority professionals and managers tend to be allocated into "racialized" jobs, namely, politically-induced slots that are restricted to servicing the needs of minority customers/clients (Collins 1997, 1993). These jobs are characterized by their non-significant revenue-generating tasks that are acknowledged as marginal to the bottom-line financial status of firms (Brown and Erie, 1981; Collins 1997). Further, minorities tend to work in racially delineated work groups that are most often responsible for accomplishing low-priority organizational goals (Fernandez 1981, 1975). In addition, even when minorities succeed in gaining access to "mainstream" jobs—i.e., those that involve servicing the needs of a racially

diverse customer/client base, and racially mixed work groups—they tend to be relegated as subordinates to Whites in authority hierarchies (Collins 1997; Fernandez 1981).

Second, perceived job insecurity is rooted in unfair and unfavorable performance evaluations, which induce perceptions of "marginality and foreboding that one is not a preferred employee" (Wilson et al., 2006, p. 221) and may also render minority groups disproportionately susceptible to firings, as well as layoffs pursuant to the discretion employers have in identifying who are to be victims of downsizing (see Valletta 2000). In this vein, minorities, relative to Whites, have difficulty demonstrating the range of vaguely defined and difficult to measure "particularistic" (Kluegel 1978) or informal criteria such as perceived loyalty, good character, and leadership potential that are crucial in performance evaluations (Kluegel 1978; Parcel et al., 1989; Wilson 1997). As such, in the absence of opportunities to demonstrate them, the evaluation process for minority group members becomes infused with cognitive distortions such as "statistical discrimination" (Pettigrew and Martin, 1987; Tomaskovic-Devey and Skaggs, 1999) and "attribution bias" (Pettigrew 1985) so that they are assessed on selective bases that reaffirm preexisting negative stereotypes about suitability for—and levels of productivity at—work.

Overall, the two subtle forms of marginalization in the workplace, i.e., allocation and evaluation practices, are responsible for a set of determinants of perceived job insecurity for racial minorities, that, relative to Whites, is broadly based and generalized. Accordingly, a range of traditional, stratification-based causal factors encompassing human capital credentials such as educational attainment and work experience, as well as job/labor market characteristics including economic sector of work, union status of job, job autonomy, and job authority, should provide greater insulation from perceived job insecurity for Whites than African Americans or Latinos/Latinas. In other words, minorities are not as immune from perceived job insecurity as Whites even when they are similarly credentialed and experienced, work in the same economic sector, and have jobs with similar stratification-relevant job features.

A Refinement: Across Gender Groups

The marginalized-worker perspective predicts that African Americans and Latinos are more likely to feel insecure about their jobs than Whites, regardless of their human capital credentials or job/labor market characteristics. We expect that this should be found among both women and men in privileged occupations. Discrimination can be based on different intersecting social statuses, such as race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic standing. Therefore, racial/ethnic minority women in particular can experience "multiple jeopardy" (King 1988). Consequently, they may even have higher levels of job insecurity than their male counterparts. Furthermore, women and racial/ethnic minorities can feel like "tokens" in the workplace because they are visible minorities, and they may believe their skills and work are not valued appropriately (Kanter 1977). In sum, we expect that female and male African American and Latinos in privileged occupations should be more likely to feel marginalized and fear losing their jobs than their White counterparts, despite their achieved socioeconomic status. Along these lines, more specifically, traditional insulating factors—such as human capital and job/labor market characteristics—should provide African Americans and Latinos/Latinas less protection from perceived job insecurity than White gender counterparts.

B. The Dispositional Perspective

Fundamentals

The "dispositional perspective"—a second formulation—emerges from a synthesis of recent research in social psychology, which highlights that fatalism and mistrust are learned dispositions that influence levels of perceived job insecurity (Wilson et al., 2006). A fatalistic disposition involves a low sense of personal control over one's life, such as the belief that life is controlled by luck or fate (Dalbert 1997; Ross and Mirowsky, 2003; Turner and Kiecolt, 1984; Wheaton 1980). Research has revealed that fatalism is associated with psychological distress (Ross and Mirowsky 2003; Wheaton 1980). A mistrusting disposition refers to an absence of confident reliability on the integrity, honesty, or justice of another (Cook 2005). Studies have also suggested that mistrust can interfere with the development of cooperative relationships and social networks, which can lead to loneliness and a sense of alienation (Putnam 1995; Ross et al., 2001; Ross and Mirowsky, 2003; Sztompka 1999). In sum, fatalistic and mistrusting dispositions are brought to the workplace, thereby structuring levels of perceived insecurity about employment status (Wilson et al., 2006). Research is necessary to determine whether these two dispositions exacerbate levels of perceived job insecurity among women and men in prestigious occupations, over and above the traditional predictors of job insecurity, which include human capital (education and work experience) and job/labor market factors (job autonomy, authority, union status, private or economic sector).

A Refinement: Across Minority Groups

Research suggests that Blacks and Latinos generally have higher levels of fatalism and mistrust than Whites, which is not entirely because of socioeconomic status (Bruce and Thornton, 2004; Hughes and Demo, 1989; Ross et al., 2001; Ross and Mirowsky, 2003). It has been argued that experiencing discrimination throughout one's life perpetuates fatalistic and mistrusting attitudes (Ross and Mirowsky, 2003). Accordingly, racial/ethnic minorities in professional occupations likely have histories of discriminatory experiences based on an ascribed characteristic over which they have no control, and thus they could experience the chronic stress of job insecurity despite their achieved credentials because they do not trust that their employers will judge their job performance fairly. Moreover, research needs to establish whether fatalism and mistrust exert a larger impact on perceived job insecurity among African Americans and Latinos than Whites because they exhibit higher levels of these two dispositions.

DATA AND METHODS

Data from the 1998 file of the GSS are pooled to assess the determinants of perceived job insecurity among White, African American, and Latino males and females in the context of the marginalized-work and dispositional perspectives (for a description of the GSS data set, see Davis and Smith, 1996). In particular, the sample consists of all non-self-employed White, African American, and Latino/Latina full-time workers between the ages of eighteen and sixty who worked in the 1980 "Managerial and Professional" census-based occupational category and were posed questions regarding perceived job insecurity and at the time of their interview. This selection criteria resulted in a sample of 830 individuals, 456 Whites (196 women,

260 men), 205 African Americans (85 women, 120 men), and 172 Latinos (80 women, 92 men). The model used in this study is operationalized as follows.[1]

Dependent Variable

Perceived Job Insecurity

Consistent with the approach taken in the majority of previous research, perceived job insecurity is operationalized as a one-item, global indicator that taps the fear of losing a present job (Ferrie et al., 1998; Heaney et al., 1994; Jacobson 1991; Manski and Straub, 2000; Schmidt 2000). Specifically, the indicator of perceived job insecurity is phrased as follows: "Thinking about the next 12 months, how likely do you think it is that you will lose your job or be laid off—not at all likely, not too likely, fairly likely, or very likely?" The variable is coded 0–3 (higher scores on the item reflect greater levels of perceived job insecurity).[2]

Independent Variables

Human Capital Characteristics

The level of educational attainment is the principal human capital predictor variable in the model and is coded in years completed.[3] Higher scores reflect greater levels of educational attainment. A measure of experience in the workforce is also included. The GSS provides no direct measure of experience in the workforce; however, in line with other studies (Kluegel 1978; Smith 1997), a variable that constitutes a proxy for experience is constructed. Specifically, experience equals age minus years of education minus six, with age being respondents' age in years and education being the number of years of school completed.[4]

Job/Labor Market Characteristics

The influence of several job characteristics are assessed. First, position in the authority structure is measured by constructing a three-category hierarchical variable that derives from the following questions: 1) "In your job, do you supervise anyone who is directly responsible to you?," and, 2) "If yes, do any of those persons supervise anyone else?" Those with two levels of subordinates are coded as 2; those with one level of subordinates are coded as 1; and those who do not supervise anyone are coded as 0. Second, job autonomy is measured by the following question: "Do you have a supervisor on your job to whom you are directly responsible (coded 1 = no, 0 = yes). Third, union status is based on whether respondent belongs to a labor union (1 = yes, 0 = no).

In addition, several labor market characteristics are assessed. First, the public/private sector distinction is represented by a dummy variable (1 = public, 0 = private). Second, the effect of industry on perceived job insecurity is gauged. Specifically, the broad three-digit 1990 industries [A) Public Administration; B) Finance, Insurance and Real Estate; C) Retail and Wholesale Trade; D) Transportation, Communications, and Public Utilities; and E) Entertainment, Professional, Recreational, and Business Services] that have expanded in terms of the number of available jobs during the 1990s are designated "growth industries" (Neumark 2000) and are coded 1; industries [A) Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries/Mining; B) Nondurable Goods, Manufacturing; C) Durable Goods, Manufacturing; and, D) Construc-

tion] that have contracted during the decade of the 1990s are designated "declining industries" (Neumark 2000) and are coded 0.

Dispositions

The influence of two dispositions are assessed. First, fatalistic views about future life-events are measured as a summative scale of two questions that assess the extent to which respondents agree or disagree with the following statements: "The really good things that happen to me are mostly luck," and "I have little control over the bad things that happen to me." Higher scores on the scale indicate heightened levels of fatalism.[5] Choices on each of the two items range from "strongly disagree" (coded 0) to "strongly agree" (coded 4). Mistrust is also measured with a like-style item that is worded as follows: "Generally speaking, would you say that people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?" Higher scores on answers signify greater mistrust. Specifically, answers ranged from "people can always be trusted" (coded 0) to "almost always can't be too careful in dealing with people" (coded 3).

Finally, ordered probit regression models run separately for males and females and are used to assess the adequacy of the marginalized-worker and dispositional perspectives in explaining racial/ethnic differences among males and females in levels of perceived job insecurity. Probit is estimated by maximum likelihood techniques and is the appropriate form of multivariate analysis to employ when the dependent variable is measured in terms of ordered categories that do not take the form of a precise interval scale. Assuming that the ordered categories are of equal length can produce biased results when standard ordinary least squares regression is employed. Probit includes one set of additional parameters (cut points) that represent the unobserved thresholds between the categories and permit the likelihood function to be maximized with respect to the effect and threshold parameters simultaneously (Long 1997). Probit assesses the substantive importance of shifts in particular independent variables on the likelihood that a particular event will occur in the dependent variable.

RESULTS

Mean levels of perceived job insecurity among men and women across three racial/ethnic groups—African Americans, Latinos, and Whites—are presented in Table 1 (descriptive results for all variables utilized in the analyses are found in the Appendix).

Table 1. Levels of Perceived Job Insecurity in Privileged Occupations: GSS Sample

Men						Women					
White		Afr. Amer.		Latino		White		Afr. Amer.		Latina	
X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.
1.1[a,c]	.5	1.7[a,b]	.4	1.3[b,c]	.3	1.4[a,c]	.4	1.9[a,b]	.4	1.5[b,c]	.3

T-Tests for Group Differences (at $P > .05$ level)
[a]Significantly Different from Latinos
[b]Significantly Different from Whites
[c]Significantly Different from African Americans

The t-test results indicate that among both men and women there are significant differences across racial groups in levels of perceived job insecurity,[6] Specifically, across both gender groups a racialized hierarchy emerges in levels of perceived job insecurity: Whites are most advantaged, African Americans are least advantaged, and Latinos occupy a middle ground. Among males, Whites (1.1) have the lowest mean levels of perceived job insecurity, African Americans (1.7) have the highest mean levels, and Latinos (1.3) are in-between the other two groups. Among women, Whites (1.4) have the lowest mean levels of perceived insecurity, African Americans (1.9) have the highest mean levels, and Latinos (1.5) are between the other two groups. Supplementary t-test analyses indicate that women fear job loss to a greater extent than men.

Multivariate Analyses

Table 2 uses ordered probit regression analyses to test whether the marginalized-worker and/or dispositional perspectives explain racial/ethnic differences in perceived job insecurity among men in privileged occupations. According to model 1 in Table 2, African Americans ($b = 0.30$; $P < 0.001$) and Latinos ($b = 0.22$; $P < 0.01$) are significantly more likely to feel insecure about their jobs than Whites. Model 2 shows that these racial/ethnic differences are maintained while controlling for human capital, measured by education and work experience.[7] These human capital credentials are not powerful mediating mechanisms that explain why there are racial/ethnic differences in fear of impending job loss in privileged occupations. Model 3 additionally adjusts for job/labor market factors, which include union status, public sector, growth industry, job authority, and job autonomy. The coefficients for African American ($b = 0.21$; $P < 0.01$) and Latino ($b = 0.19$; $P < 0.05$) are somewhat diminished in size, but continue to be statistically significant in model 3, which suggests that job/labor market factors only partially explain racial/ethnic differences in perceptions of job insecurity. As predicted by the marginalized-worker perspective, results in model 3 show that African Americans and Latinos in professional occupations are more likely to feel insecure about their jobs than Whites over and above their privileged human capital credentials and job/labor market characteristics. Other noteworthy findings are that education exerts only a weak inverse effect on perceived job insecurity that is no longer statistically significant when job/labor market factors are controlled: Work experience, public sector, growth industry, and job authority are associated with significantly lower levels of perceived job insecurity among males in privileged occupations.

The dispositional perspective is tested in models 4 to 6 in Table 2. Results indicate that the dispositions of fatalism and mistrust do not significantly influence perceived job insecurity among males in privileged occupations, controlling for the other traditional predictors of job insecurity. Supplementary analyses (available on request) of the zero-order associations, however, reveal that fatalism is significantly ($P < 0.05$) associated with higher levels of perceived job insecurity among males. Results in model 6 suggest that racial/ethnic differences in fear of job loss are not explained by fatalistic and mistrusting attitudes.

Model 7 examines interaction effects to determine whether the predictors of perceived job insecurity vary by race/ethnicity. In essence, results indicate that work experience, job authority, and growth industry serve to insulate Whites from feeling insecure about their jobs to a greater extent than for African Americans and Latinos. The relationship between union status and lower levels of job insecurity is also stronger for Whites than African Americans, but the interaction effect is not signif-

Table 2. Probit Regressions for Determinants of Perceived Job Insecurity in Privileged Occupations: Men

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
African American	.30*** (.13)	.27*** (.12)	.21** (.09)	.21** (.09)	.21** (.09)	.21** (.09)	.20** (.09)
Latino	.22** (.09)	.21** (.09)	.19* (.09)	.16* (.07)	.16* (.07)	.16* (.07)	.14* (.06)
Education		−.14* (.06)	−.10 (.06)	−.08 (.06)	−.06 (.05)	−.06 (.05)	−.04 (.04)
Work experience		−.04*** (.01)	−.04*** (.01)	−.03** (.01)	−.03** (.01)	−.03** (.01)	−.03** (.01)
Union			−.12 (.08)	−.07 (.06)	−.06 (.05)	−.06 (.05)	−.06 (.04)
Public sector			−.16* (.08)	−.15* (.07)	−.15* (.07)	−.15* (.07)	−.14* (.06)
Job authority			−.15* (.07)	−.14* (.06)	−.14* (.06)	−.14* (.06)	−.14* (.06)
Job autonomy			.02 (.02)	.02 (.02)	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)
Growth industry			−.14* (.06)	−.13* (.06)	−.13* (.06)	−.13* (.06)	−.13* (.06)
Fatalism				−.01 (.01)		−.01 (.01)	−.02 (.01)
Mistrust					−.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)
Interaction effects							
Education × African American							.03 (.02)
Education × Latino							.02 (.02)
Work experience × African American							.02* (.01)
Work experience × Latino							.02* (.01)
Union × African American							.17** (.07)
Union × Latino							.05 (.04)
Public sector × African American							.09 (.06)
Public sector × Latino							.05 (.03)
Job authority × African American							.17** (.07)
Job authority × Latino							.13* (.06)
Job autonomy × African American							.04 (.03)
Job autonomy × Latino							.06 (.04)
Growth industry × African American							.15* (.07)
Growth industry × Latino							.13* (.06)
Fatalism × African American							.07** (.02)
Fatalism × Latino							.03 (.02)
Mistrust × African American							.02 (.02)
Mistrust × Latino							.02 (.02)

Note: Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors in parentheses are shown.
*$P < .05$; **$P < .01$; ***$P < .001$

icant for Latinos. Union status is associated with significantly lower levels of perceived job insecurity among Whites, but not among African Americans. Together, these interaction effects provide evidence for the marginalized-worker perspective. A significant interaction is also observed between African American and fatalism ($b = 0.07$; $P < 0.01$). This finding supports the dispositional perspective by showing that the relationship between fatalism and higher levels of job insecurity is stronger for African American men than White men.

Table 3 uses ordered probit regression analyses to test whether the marginalized worker and/or dispositional perspectives explain racial/ethnic differences in perceived job insecurity among women in privileged occupations. Reflecting the findings for men, African American ($b = 0.21$; $P < 0.01$) and Latino ($b = 0.16$; $P < 0.05$) women are more likely to feel insecure about their jobs than Whites. Model 2 controls for human capital (education and work experience), and the effects of African American ($b = 0.19$; $P < 0.01$) and Latino ($b = .15$; $P < .05$) are relatively unchanged and maintain their levels of statistical significance. Model 3 additionally adjusts for job/labor market factors, which include union status, public sector, growth industry, job authority, and job autonomy. Racial/ethnic differences in perceived job insecurity (African American, $b = .18$; Latino, $b = .14$) are slightly decreased in size, but continue to be statistically significant ($P < .05$). Therefore, racial/ethnic disparities in levels of perceived job insecurity among women in privileged occupations are not explained by their human capital credentials or job/labor market factors. Consistent with the literature, model 3 shows that more education, work experience, and job authority are associated with being less likely to feel job insecurity. Models 4 to 6 test the dispositional perspective. Like the findings for men, the dispositions of fatalism and mistrust do not have significant associations with perceptions of job insecurity among women, net of control variables.

Finally, analyses of interaction effects explore racial/ethnic differences in the determinants of perceived job insecurity in model 7 of Table 3. Results indicate that human capital credentials (education and work experience) serve to insulate Whites from perceptions of job insecurity to a greater extent than for African Americans and Latinos. Job authority and Union status significantly interact with African Americans, such that these job/labor market factors protect Whites from perceived insecurity more than African Americans. These findings support the marginalized-worker perspective. There is also some support for the dispositional perspective because fatalism interacts significantly with African American ($b = .05$; $P < .01$). The relationship between having a fatalistic disposition and fear of job loss is stronger for African American women than White women.

In sum, African American and Latino women and men in prestigious occupations can still feel like "marginalized workers" because they are more likely to be insecure about their jobs than Whites, despite their educational achievements, work experience, job autonomy or authority, and other advantaged labor market factors. Furthermore, the link between having a fatalistic disposition and fear of job loss is stronger among African American women and men than Whites.[8]

CONCLUSION

Fear of job loss represents a potentially important source of racial inequality at the privileged occupational level (Elman and O'Rand, 2002; Manski and Straub, 2000; Wilson et al., 2006). Research at the privileged level has indicated that African Americans are the most concerned about losing their jobs, followed by Latinos, and

Table 3. Probit Regressions for Determinants of Perceived Job Insecurity in Privileged Occupations: Women

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
African American	.21** (.09)	.19** (.08)	.18* (.08)	.18* (.08)	.17* (.08)	.16* (.07)	.15* (.07)
Latino	.16* (.08)	.15* (.07)	.14* (.06)	.14* (.06)	.14* (.06)	.14* (.06)	.13* (.06)
Education		−.18* (.08)	−.17* (.08)	−.17* (.08)	−.16* (.08)	−.16* (.08)	−.14* (.07)
Work experience		−.03** (.01)	−.02* (.01)	−.02* (.01)	−.02* (.01)	−.02* (.01)	−.02* (.01)
Union			−.10 (.07)	−.08 (.06)	−.07 (.04)	−.05 (.03)	−.05 (.03)
Public sector			−.12 (.08)	−.10 (.06)	−.09 (.06)	−.07 (.04)	−.06 (.04)
Job authority			−.17* (.08)	−.16* (.07)	−.14* (.06)	−.13* (.06)	−.13* (.06)
Job autonomy			.02 (.02)	.02 (.02)	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)
Growth industry			−.04 (.03)	−.03 (.02)	−.03 (.02)	−.03 (.02)	.02 (.02)
Fatalism				.01 (.01)		−.01 (.01)	−.01 (.01)
Mistrust					−.02 (.02)	.01 (.01)	.01 (.01)
Interaction effects							
Education × African American							.16* (.07)
Education × Latino							.13* (.06)
Work experience × African American							.04*** (.01)
Work experience × Latino							.02* (.01)
Union × African American							.17* (.08)
Union × Latino							.07 (.05)
Public sector × African American							.05 (.03)
Public sector × Latino							.03 (.02)
Job authority × African American							.13* (.06)
Job authority × Latino							.09 (.05)
Job autonomy × African American							.02 (.02)
Job autonomy × Latino							.03 (.02)
Growth industry × African American							.05 (.04)
Growth industry × Latino							.04 (.03)
Fatalism × African American							.05** (.02)
Fatalism × Latino							.01 (.01)
Mistrust × African American							.02 (.02)
Mistrust × Latino							.01 (.02)

Note: Unstandardized coefficients and standard errors in parentheses are shown.
*$P < .05$; **$P < .01$; ***$P < .001$

then Whites (Elman and O'Rand, 2002; Wilson et al., 2006). Sociologists have not attempted, however, to explain the causes related to higher levels of perceived job insecurity among racial minorities than Whites. This study has examined two possible explanations for this finding among a sample of professionals and managers. The first emphasizes the discrimination-induced, structural marginality experienced by minorities in the workplace (the marginalized-worker perspective) and the second emphasizes the learned dispositions of fatalism and mistrust (the dispositional perspective).

Results from a nationally representative sample indicate that male and female African Americans and Latinos are significantly more likely to fear impending job loss than Whites along lines enunciated by the marginalized-worker perspective. Therefore, African Americans and Latinos in prestigious occupations can feel like "marginalized workers" regardless of their achieved status, likely because histories of discrimination have perpetuated their fear of being evaluated or allocated unfairly in the workplace, which could increase their perceived risk of job loss. Specifically, consistent with the notion that discriminatory allocation and evaluation practices induce heightened perceived insecurity, interaction effects indicate that human capital credentials and job/labor market characteristics serve to insulate Whites from perceived job insecurity to a greater extent than for African Americans and Latinos. These interaction effects also provided evidence to support one of the two components of the dispositional perspective—fatalism—on a limited race-specific basis. Male and female African Americans with higher levels of fatalism—i.e., a generalized expectation that life is not responsive to one's own choices, actions, and efforts because it is determined by luck, fate, or powerful others (Ross and Mirowsky, 2003)—were significantly more likely to feel insecure about their jobs than Whites.

Overall, generalized susceptibility to perceived job insecurity among African American and Latino men and women constitutes a tangible form of inequality at the privileged occupational level. It is rooted in discriminatory dynamics, so that for Latinos/Latinas and African Americans, experiencing perceived job insecurity emerges as an almost inevitable consequence of occupying a privileged job. These minorities, unlike Whites, cannot overcome perceived insecurity through conventional, stratification-based means, for example, increased motivation or work ethic on the "supply side" nor working in a more favorable economic sector or in a unionized slot on the "demand side." In short, the force of prejudice and discrimination negates advantages accruing from a traditional favorable stratification-based profile. Moreover, racial/ethnic discrimination in the workplace can be gendered (Bell and Nkomo, 2001; Feagin and Sikes, 1994; Harvey Wingfield 2007), and more research should examine its implications for perceptions of job insecurity.

African Americans and Latinos disproportionately suffer from the far-reaching damaging consequences of this generalized susceptibility to perceived job insecurity. They are, for example, more likely to suffer from psychosocial deficits and struggle with commitment and productivity issues in the workplace, which hamper economic trajectories and negatively impinge on family dynamics outside of the workplace. Job insecurity is a chronic stressor, and research has indicated that chronic stressors have more harmful psychological consequences than acute stressors (Turner et al., 1995). Fear of unemployment may be psychologically distressing for African Americans and Latino families because they have more financial debt than White families on average in the United States (Collins 1997, 1993; Oliver and Shapiro, 1997). Thus, they are less likely to have the economic security of positive net worth if they experience unemployment for long periods of time. African Americans and Latinos in privileged occupations who persistently feel like their jobs are at risk are thus more likely to

suffer from psychosocial deficits, such as symptoms of depression, and struggle with commitment and productivity issues in the workplace which hamper economic trajectories and negatively impinge on family dynamics outside of the workplace. Finally, it is suspected—though not yet firmly established in empirical research—that perceived insecurity may also be a precursor to job displacement (see Fullerton and Wallace, 2007; Manski and Straub, 2000).

It follows logically from this discussion that perceived job insecurity is an aspect of racial inequality that will be difficult to redress in the privileged workplace. In fact, for minority group members the situation could get worse before it improves. At the very time that racial minorities continue to gain entry into privileged slots in unprecedented numbers, there is evidence that in the "new restructured workplace" (Cappelli 2000) the enhanced flexibility of employers in determining the job conditions of workers—pursuant to the erosion of traditional internal labor market protections (DiPrete 1989; Hipple 1999) and union concessions to avoid downsizing (Cappelli 2000)—is increasing their discretion/opportunity to implement the discriminatory practices that disproportionately induce perceived job insecurity in minority group workers. To "stem the tide" and bring about greater equity in the dynamics of perceived insecurity, it is recommended that, first, efforts be made to formalize conditions of work; for example, establishing clear-cut guidelines that govern employment evaluations and facilitate integrated work-tasks, which match minority employees and majority group clients/customers and serve to reduce the preponderance of segregated job networks as well as the allocation of African Americans into racialized job functions (Bielby 2000; Reskin 2000). Second, broadening the scope of equal opportunity law and reversing its increasingly lax enforcement in recent years, as well as establishing internal review boards that monitor employment practices with sanctioning capability, would also provide a check on institutionally based discriminatory employment practices that induce perceived job insecurity on a disproportionate basis among racial minorities.

In sum, this study represents only a preliminary attempt to assess the racial/ethnic differences in the determinants of perceived insecurity at the privileged occupational level. Future research needs, for example, to employ longitudinal and trend-based designs that are necessary to assess the durability of the findings reached here and to examine the long-term social and psychological consequences of the stress of job insecurity among racial/ethnic minorities in privileged occupations. Longitudinal research is also necessary to examine, for example, whether fatalism, which develops temporally prior to entry into the workplace, increases the likelihood of fear of job loss at all levels of the occupational structure. Moreover, in the context of the marginalized-worker perspective, research needs to establish more directly the link between the discriminatory behavior of employers and perceived job insecurity. A recognized limitation of this study is that employers' discriminatory employment practices are not directly measured: their influence is inferred from patterns of significance along a vector of predictor variables in which they should play a role. It is possible the effects of human capital credentials and job/labor market characteristics on perceived insecurity are driven by unmeasured variables—such as cognitive differences and performance differences in the workplace—not included in the statistical model; these unmeasured variables could, conceivably, render differences in the statistical effects of human capital credentials, and job/labor market characteristics as unrelated to institutionalized discriminatory dynamics. Accordingly, it is necessary to cast the causal role of institutionally based dynamics in qualified terms. This limitation, we believe, can be overcome by collecting data in specific organizations, where the potential exists to observe first-hand how different levels of vulner-

ability to dismissal across racial groups are created, and in turn, how specified employment practices impact perceived job insecurity. When these suggestions for future research are implemented it will move us forward in better understanding the underlying causes of an experiential domain in the privileged workplace which constitutes a significant aspect of inequality along racial lines.

Corresponding author: Professor George Wilson, Department of Sociology, University of Miami, Merrick Building, Coral Gables, FL 33124. E-mail Gwilson1@miami.edu

NOTES

1. Checks on model specification were performed to ensure that results were not confounded by heteroscedasticity or multicollinearity. The Cook-Weisberg test of the assumption of common error variance was performed for all regression analyses. In all instances $x2$ statistics of 0.01 were obtained and had corresponding p values that ranged from 0.658 to 0.673, indicating low levels of heteroscedasticity. In addition, collinearity diagnostics were performed, and conditional indices produced no evidence of multicollinearity.
2. Items in the perceived job insecurity literature are of two types: the GSS qualitative types (likelihood of job loss) and the probabilistic type (chance of job loss). Significantly, Dominitz and Manski (1997) compared the GSS item in this study with a probabilistic item from the Survey of Economic Expectations. The authors found that they exhibit similar variations in risk perception across groups by race, gender, and educational attainment.
3. Missing values for African Americans, Whites, and Latinos on all independent variables were coded to racial group means. Overall, missing values did not exceed 14% for any independent variables among African American males and females, White males and females, or Latino males and females.
4. This proxy is based on the notion that workplace-based experience is one's age minus the total number of years spent in school and age six, the age in which formal education begins.
5. Cronbach's alpha of internal reliability for scales constructed in the statistical model were 0.63 for mistrust and 0.72 for fatalism.
6. We also ran the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in order to bolster our confidence in the descriptive findings. Results were similar using this method to those reported in this study.
7. Supplementary analyses of interaction effects examined whether the effects of the predictors of job insecurity varied by age. The main effect of age and the interactions were not statistically significant. Work experience was excluded from these analyses to avoid multicollinearity because it is measured using age (see footnote 4). Findings from this analysis are available upon request.
8. Data from the U.S. Department of Labor indicates that across 1998, racial differences in the unemployment rate in the "Professional and Management" occupational category were relatively small, specifically, 3.8 to 4.2 for Whites, 4.3 to 5.0 for African Americans, and 4.1 to 4.7 for Latinos/Latinas. Nevertheless, to assess the influence of actual insecurity on the findings we ran a separate set of regressions analyses that included a measure of objective insecurity on a race-specific basis. The GSS contains two kinds of geographic identifiers: region of residence, (New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, Pacific) and size of place of residence (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) vs. outside of SMSA). On the basis of these identifiers and unemployment data in the "Professional and Management" occupational designation for the U.S. Department of Labor from July (closest to midpoint) 1998, we constructed a measure as follows: for each region, the race-specific unemployment rate for all SMSA's was averaged as was the unemployment rate for the ten most populous counties not containing an SMSA. GSS members whose geographic referents, e.g., Northeast, outside of an SMSA, had a race-specific unemployment rate that was below the national average in the professional and management category (4.3%), were coded 0 (not objectively insecure) or had a race-specific unemployment rate that was above the national average in the professional and management category were coded 1 (objectively

insecure). This variable was not statistically significant—as a main effect or in interaction with other predictors—in the regression analyses run references.

REFERENCES

Barling, Julien, Kathyrne Dupe, and Gail Hepburn (1998). Effects of Parent's Job Insecurity on Children's Work Beliefs and Attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 112–118.

Bell, Ella and Stella Nkomo (2001). *Our Separate Ways: Black and White Women and the Struggle for Professional Identity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Bielby, William (2000). Minimizing Workplace Gender and Racial Bias. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29: 120–129.

Brown, Michael, and Paul Erie (1981). Blacks and the Legacy of the Great Society: The Economic and Political Impact of Federal Social Policy. *Public Policy*, 29: 299–330.

Bruce, Marino A., and Michael C. Thornton (2004). It's My World? Exploring Black and White Perceptions of Personal Control. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45: 597–612.

Burstein, Paul (1985). *Race, Jobs, and Discrimination*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cappelli, Philip (2000). Examining the Incidence of Downsizing and its Effects on Establishment Performance. In D. Neumark (Ed.), *On the Job: Is Long-Term Employment a Thing of the Past?*, pp. 463–516. New York: Russell Sage.

Collins, Patricia Hill (1997). African-American Women and Economic Justice: A Preliminary Analysis of Wealth, Family, and Black Social Class. *University of Cincinnati Law Review*, 65(2): 825–52.

Collins, Patricia Hill (1998). Intersections of Race, Class, Gender and Nation: Some Implications for Black Family Studies. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 29(1): 27–36.

Collins, Sharon (1997). *Black Corporate Executives: The Making and Breaking of a Black Middle Class*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Collins, Sharon (1993). Blacks on the Bubble: The Vulnerability of Black Executives in White Corporations. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34: 429–447.

Cook, Karen (2005). Networks, Norms, and Trust: The Social Psychology of Social Capital. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68: 4–14.

Dalbert, Claudia (1997). Coping with an Unjust Fate: The Case of Structural Unemployment. *Social Justice Research*, 10: 175–189.

Davis, James, and Tom Smith (1996). *General Social Surveys: 1972–1996: Cumulative Codebook*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

DiPrete, Thomas (1989). Industrial Restructuring and the Mobility Response of American Workers in the 1980's. *American Sociological Review*, 58: 74–96.

Dominitz, Jeff, and Charles Manski (1997). Perceptions of Economic Insecurity: Evidence from the Survey of Economic Experiences. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61: 261–287.

Dworkin, Anthony, Janet Saltzman, and Rosalind Dworkin (1983). The Effect of Tokenism on Job Commitment Among Urban Public School Teachers: A Test of Kantor's Approach. Paper read at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association.

Elman, Cheryl, and Angela O'Rand (2002). Perceived Job Insecurity and Entry into Work-Related Education and Training among Adult Workers. *Social Science Research*, 31: 49–76.

Farley, Reynolds (1996). *The New American Reality*. New York: Russell Sage.

Farley, Reynolds (2004). *The American People*. New York: Russell Sage.

Feagin, Joe R., and Melvin P. Sikes (1994). *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Fernandez, John (1975). *Racism and Sexism in White Corporations*. New York: Wiley Press.

Fernandez, John (1981). *Black Managers in White Corporations*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Ferrie, Jane (1997). Labor Market Status, Insecurity, and Health. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 3: 373–397.

Ferrie, Jane, Martin Shipley, Michael Marmot, Steven Stansfeld, and George Davey-Smith (1998). The Health Effects of Major Organizational Change and Job Insecurity. *Social Science and Medicine*, 46: 243–254.

Firebaugh, Glenn, and Brian Harley (1995). Trends in Job Satisfaction in the U.S. by Race, Gender, and Type of Occupation. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, 11: 87–104.

Fullerton, Andrew, and Michael Wallace (2007). Traversing the Flexible Turn: U.S. Workers' Perceptions of Job Insecurity, 1977–2002. *Social Science Research*, 36: 201–221.

Gottschalk, Peter, and Robert Moffitt (2000). Job Instability and Insecurity for Males in the 1980's and 1990's. In David Neumark (Ed.), *On the Job: Is Long-Term Employment a Thing of the Past?*, pp. 196–226: New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Harvey Wingfield, Adia M. (2007). The Modern Mammy and the Angry Black Man: African American Professionals' Experiences with Gendered Racism in the Workplace. *Race, Gender, & Class*, 14(2): 196–212.
Heaney, Catherine, Barbara Israel, and James House (1994). Chronic Job Insecurity Among Automobile Workers: Effects on Job Satisfaction and Health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 38: 1431–1437.
Hipple, Steven (1999). Worker Displacement in the 1990's. *Monthly Labor Review*, 22: 15–32.
Hite, Larry (2007). Hispanic Managers and Professionals: Reflections On Life and Work. *Gender Work and Organization*, 14: 20–36.
Hofstetter, Richard, and Terry Buss (1988). Race and Alienation: Observations on the Impact of Joblessness. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 11: 305–318.
Hughes, Michael, and David H. Demo (1989). Perceptions of Black Americans: Self-Esteem and Personal Efficacy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95: 132–159.
Hyllegard, David, and David Lavin (1992). Higher Education and Challenging Work: Open Admissions and Ethnic and Gender Differences in Job Complexity. *Sociological Forum*, 7: 239–260.
Jackson, Pamela Braboy, and Quincy Thomas Stewart (2003). A Research Agenda for the Black Middle Class: Work Stress, Survival Strategies, and Mental Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 44: 442–455.
Jacobson, Dan (1991). Toward a Theoretical Distinction Between the Stress Components of the Job Insecurity and Job Loss Experiences. *Research in Sociology of Organizations*, 9: 1–19.
Jaynes, David, and Robin Williams (1989). *A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
Kanter, Rosabeth (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
King, Deborah (1988). Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14(1): 42–72.
Kluegel, James (1978). The Causes and Cost of Racial Exclusion from Job Authority. *American Sociological Review*, 43: 285–301.
Kluegel, James, and Larry Bobo (2001). Perceived Group Discrimination and Policy Attitudes: The Sources and Consequences for Race and Gender Gaps. In A. O'Connor, C. Tilly, and L Bobo (Eds.), *Urban Inequality: Evidence From Four Cities*. New York: Russell Sage.
Lim, Vivien (1996). Job Insecurity and it Outcomes: Moderating Effects of Work-Based and Non-Network Based Social Support. *Human Relations*, 49: 171–194.
Long, Scott (1997). *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Loscocco, Karyn, and Glenna Spitze (1990). Working Conditions, Social Support, and Well-Being of Female and Male Factory Workers. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 4: 429–432.
Macneil, Maurya (1994). Reactions to Job Insecurity in a Declining Organization: A Longitudinal Study. Doctoral Dissertation. Ohio State University.
Manski, Charles, and John Straub (2000). Perceptions of Job Insecurity in the Mid 1990's: Evidence from the Survey of Economic Experiences. *Journal of Human Resources*, 35: 447–479.
Martin, Jack, and Steven Tuch (1993). Black-White Differences in the Values of Job Rewards Revisited. *Social Science Quarterly*, 74: 884–901.
Massey, Douglas, and Elijah Anderson (Eds.) (2000). *Problem of the Century: Racial Stratification in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
Moore, Joan (1981). Minorities in the American Class System. *Daedalus*, 110: 275–299.
Mueller, Charles, Ashley Finley, Roderick Iverson, and James Price (1999). Effects of Group Racial Composition on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Career Commitment. *Work and Occupations*, 26: 187–219.
Mundra, Kenneth, Anthony Moellner, and William Lopze-Aqueres (1995). Investigating Hispanic Under-representation in Managerial and Professional Occupations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 25: 513–529.
Neumark, David (2000). *Is Long-Term Employment a Thing of the Past?* New York: Russell Sage.
Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro (1997). *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.
Parcel, Toby, Charles Mueller, and Komiko Tanaka (1989). Particularism in Authority Outcomes: The Case of Supervisors. *Social Science Research*, 32: 1–20.

Pearce, Jone (1998). Job Insecurity is Important, but not for the Reasons You Might Think: The Example of Contingent Workers. *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, 5: 31–46.
Pettigrew, Thomas (1985). New Black-White Patterns: How Best to Conceptualize Them. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11: 329–346.
Pettigrew, Thomas, and Joanne Martin (1987). Shaping the Organizational Context for African American Inclusion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 43: 41–78.
Probst, Tahire (1999). Antecedents and Consequences of Job Security: An Integrated Model. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois.
Probst, Tahire, and Ty Brubaker (2001). The Effects of Job Insecurity on Employee Safety Outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6: 139–159.
Putnam, Robert (1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6: 65–78.
Reskin, Barbara (2000). The Proximate Causes of Discrimination. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29: 319–328.
Ross, Catherine E., and John Mirowsky (2003). Social Structure and Psychological Functioning: Distress, Perceived Control and Trust. In John Delamater's (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, pp. 411–447. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
Ross, Catherine, John Mirowsky, and Shana Pribesh (2001). Powerlessness and the Amplification of Threat: Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Mistrust. *American Sociological Review*, 66: 568–591.
Schmidt, Stefanie (2000). Job Security Beliefs in the General Social Survey: Evidence on Long-Run Trends and Comparability with Other Surveys. In David Neumark (Ed.), *On the Job: Is Long-Term Employment a Thing of the Past?*, pp. 300–334. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Siegerist, John (1996). Adverse Health Effects of High Effort/Low-Reward Jobs. *International Journal of Health Services*, 26: 569–589.
Siegerist, John, Alan Matchinger, Paul Cremer, and David Seidel (1988). Atherogenic Risk in Men Suffering from Occupational Stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1: 27–41.
Smith, Ryan (1997). Race, Income, and Authority at Work: A Cross-Temporal Analysis of Black and White Men (1972–1994). *Social Problems*, 38: 19–37.
Smith, Ryan (2002). Race, Gender, and Authority in the Workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28: 509–542.
Stewart, Jay (2000). Did Job Security Decline in the 1990's. In David Neumark (Ed.), *On the Job: Is Long-Term Employment a Thing of the Past?*, pp. 257–299. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Sztompka, Piotr (1999). *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Thornton, Michael, and Yuko Mizuno (1999). Economic Well-Being and Black Adult Feelings toward Immigrants and Whites. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30: 15–44.
Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, and Sheryl Skaggs (1999). An Establishment-Level Test of the Statistical Discrimination Hypothesis. *Work and Occupations*, 26: 422–445.
Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, and Kevin Stainback (2007). Discrimination and Desegregation: Equal Opportunity Progress in U.S. Private Sector Workplaces Since the Civil Rights Act. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 609: 49–84.
Tuch, Steven, and Jack Martin (1991). Race in the Workplace: Black/White Differences in the Sources of Job Satisfaction. *Sociological Quarterly*, 32: 103–116.
Turner, Ralph, and Jill Kiecolt (1984). Responses to Uncertainty and Risk: Mexican American, Black, and Anglo Beliefs about the Manageability of the Future. *Social Science Quarterly*, 65: 665–679.
Turner, R. Jay, Blair Wheaton, and Donald A. Lloyd (1995). The Epidemiology of Social Stress. *American Sociological Review*, 60: 104–24.
Valletta, Robert (2000). Declining Job Security. In David Neumark (Ed.), *On the Job: Is Long-Term Employment a Thing of the Past?*, pp. 227–256. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Wheaton, Blair (1980). The Sociogenesis of Psychological Disorder: An Attributional Theory. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21: 100–124.
Wilson, George (1997). Pathways to Power: Racial Differences in the Determinants of Job Authority. *Social Problems*, 44: 38–54.
Wilson, George, Tamela Eitle, and Benjamin Bishin (2006). The Determinants of Racial Disparities in Perceived Job Insecurity: A Test of Three Perspectives. *Sociological Inquiry*, 76: 210–230.
Wilson, William Julius (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Yaffee, James (1995). Latina Managers in Employment—Perceptions of Organizational Discrimination. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 17: 334–346.

APPENDIX

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR GSS SAMPLE

	White				Afr. Amer.				Latino			
	M		W		M		W		M		W	
	X[a]	SD[b]	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Human Capital												
Education	13.8	2.4	13.7	2.6	13.7	2.5	13.7	2.4	13.5	2.7	13.6	2.6
Workforce Exp.	12.3	1.6	10.8	1.4	12.1	1.5	10.7	1.3	11.7	1.4	10.5	1.5
Job/Labor Market												
Job Authority	1.5	.5	1.2	.4	1.3	.5	1.1	.6	1.3	.4	1.0	.5
Job Autonomy	38% = No		23% = No		34% = No		22% = No		36% = No		21% = No	
Public Sector	33%		33%		43%		41%		35%		36%	
Unionized	31%		28%		29%		26%		28%		26%	
Growth Ind.	65%		57%		60%		55%		58%		54%	
Disposition												
Fatalism	2.8	.4	3.2	.5	2.9	.5	3.4	.6	2.9	.6	3.4	.5
Mistrust	1.3	.3	1.4	.4	1.6	.6	1.4	.3	1.5	.4	1.3	.3

[a]X = Mean
[b]SD = Standard Deviation