

Industrial Change and Social Mobility:  
Black Men in New York City & London 1970-1990

by

David Ladipo\*

Working Paper No. 142

May 1995

\* Cambridge Visiting Scholar, The Jerome Levy Economics Institute

\*\*Paper presented to the ESRC London Seminar Series, London School of Economics,  
March 31, 1995

The author acknowledges the invaluable guidance of Suzanne Model, the patience of Brendan Burchell and the good humor of all at Blithewood.

## ABSTRACT

This paper takes up a theme which has been a major area of sociological inquiry since the end of the last century: the impact of industrial change on patterns of social mobility. It looks at the inter-generational mobility of black men in New York City and London, cities which have undergone 'massive and parallel changes in their economic base, spatial organization, and social structure' over the past twenty five years (Sassen 1991, p.4). In terms of occupations, there is seen to be a striking degree of inter-generational mobility; younger black men in the 1990's are clearly not doing the same jobs as were their fathers or older brothers in 1970. But it is not at all obvious that this mobility can be prefixed by the term '*upward*'. If, as I do, one takes earnings rather than occupation as the measure of upward mobility, then the evidence strongly suggests that the position of blacks relative to whites (the dominant ethnic group in both cities) is no better in the 1990's than it was in the 1960's.

As described by John Goldthorpe, postwar research into social mobility in the United States has been dominated by the work of Seymour Lipset, Peter Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan in the 50's and 60's and more recently that of Daniel Bell and Donald Treiman. Although there are important differences between these researchers, he groups them together on the basis of their attachment to the 'logic of industrialism' (Goldthorpe 1987, p.15). This logic dictates that industrial societies will display a high degree of social mobility stemming from a 'fundamental trend' in such societies towards *universalism*: that is, towards the application in all aspects of social life of standards of judgement or decision-making which derive from considerations of rationality and efficiency and which are detached from the particular values or interests of different membership groups. Thus, *even apart from the effects of structural change*, the normative changes wrought by industrialization will tend to produce greater variation between the social positions of parents and their children.

Central to this perspective is the notion that the mobility generated by industrial society is a two-way street, in other words, the upward mobility of some finds its counterpart in the downward mobility of others. In contrast, much of British social mobility work has been devoted to debunking the idea that any such 'exchange' takes place. In 1977, John Goldthorpe and his collaborators on the Nuffield Mobility Project published the results of the first wave of their investigations in "Class Mobility in Britain: Three Theses Examined". Goldthorpe and Llewellyn argued here that structural change - in particular the growth of what they called the 'service class' - meant that the working class now had greater opportunities for upward mobility than it used to. But they warned that *absolute* mobility should not be confused with *relative* mobility because:

increasing 'room at the top' has in fact been shared out more or less pro rata among men of different class origins, including those of Class I and Class II origins, so as to produce no change in their relative chances of access; and on the other hand, the contraction of the working class has been accompanied by a decline not only in the absolute chances of men of Class I and II origins being found in manual work but in their relative chances also. Over all, therefore, the picture obtained, once the perspective of relative mobility is adopted, is no longer one of significant change in the direction of greater opportunity for social ascent but rather, of stability or indeed of increasing *inequality* in class mobility chances (Goldthorpe & Llewellyn 1977, reprinted in Goldthorpe 1987, p.77).

Right-wing sociologists<sup>1</sup> criticized Goldthorpe for his concentration on *relative* mobility, arguing that he was seeking to deflect attention away from the absolute improvement in people's living standards and opportunities for advancement<sup>2</sup>. On the left however, there was - for a time - the opposite charge: that the impressive degree of *absolute* mobility might be simply be a product of the timing of the Nuffield inquiry which stopped in 1972. What would be the effect of the unemployment of the late 1970's and early 1980's on mobility trends? In 1987 came Goldthorpe's answer: the chances of upward mobility from the working class had *not* fallen since the 1972 inquiry and had, by any measure, continued to improve (Goldthorpe 1987, ch.9).

This suggestion was reinforced by the findings of the other major social mobility project of the 1980's - the Essex study conducted by Gordon Marshall et al. - in which the researchers claimed that:

Our basic mobility data suggest that perhaps as many as one-third of those presently in the service class have arrived there from working-class origins. However . . . this *upward* mobility is not the result of changes in relative mobility rates, since these are unaltered between successive cohorts entering formal employment. There have been no changes in social fluidity - that is in the direction of greater equality of opportunity - during the period covered by our mobility tables (Marshall et al. 1988, p.136)

Ray Pawson (1993) notes that although argument about the relative mobility hypothesis has continued to rage, the Goldthorpe and Marshall conclusion on absolute upward mobility has "passed into the conventional wisdom of the discipline without much contention, mainly, because the generative mechanisms accounting for the 'long waves' of mobility concern economic, industrial and post-industrial transformation. Whilst these, of course, are matters of great

---

<sup>1</sup> Yes, they do exist.

<sup>2</sup> The most recent formulation of this charge is to be found in Saunders (1990, p.81). (The preface to this work finds Saunders spluttering on about how sociology in Britain today is underpinned by a 'left-wing socialist-feminist orthodoxy'.)

controversy, there are simply not too many toes to tread on in terms of alternative theories of the relationship between economic change and social mobility rates". If he is right, then by the end of this paper your toes should be, if not trodden, then at least a little bit sore. As indicated earlier, the central thrust of the paper is that - at least with respect to black men - although structural change has generated absolute occupational mobility there is nothing *upward* about it.

The irony is that the one researcher with the best grasp of the theoretical and methodological weaknesses of British social mobility studies recently produced a paper entitled the "Collective Social Mobility of Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain Since 1966" in which he proceeded to commit precisely those sins of which he has elsewhere accused Goldthorpe and Marshall. In earlier publications, Payne had argued in favour of developing a new mobility perspective, one free from what he refers to as the "ideological straightjacket" imposed by Goldthorpe and other writers whose excessive focus on the connection between social mobility and class formation has "narrowed our awareness of mobility and the way it relates to other sociological problems" (Payne 1987a, p.7). He had championed an approach which "grounds mobility firmly in the local, economic and historical conditions of the society in which it occurs" (Payne 1987b, p.15). And he had lambasted British mobility studies for failing to "recognize that mobility is not just about movement across jobs, but also, *inter alia*, movement between levels of income and wealth", concluding that "we shall only achieve the goals set for us by those who have sought to understand class processes, by first expanding our understanding of the full *complexity of the concept of mobility*" (Payne 1989, p.489).

But in his examination of the social mobility of ethnic groups in the UK, this is precisely what Payne fails to do. He does not look at movements between levels of income and wealth and (partly as a result) he does not grasp the 'full complexity of the concept of mobility'! On the contrary he sticks with the following thoroughly Goldthorpean equation:

- occupational transition in post-industrial society means an expansion of non-manual employment and a contraction of manual work . . .
- there is thus more 'room at the top' hence . . .
- regardless of whether there is an increase in relative mobility, absolute upward mobility takes place and thus . . .
- the 'collective' position of those at the bottom of the social hierarchy improves vis - a - vis those at the top.

He then applies this equation to a comparison of the collective socioeconomic position of minority ethnic groups relative to that of whites. Using Labour Force Survey and Census data, Payne examines, amongst others, the occupational locations of West Indian men in Britain between the years 1966 and 1990. Starting with the basic dichotomy between manual and non-manual employment, he observes an impressive increase in the proportions of West Indian men in non-manual work. More importantly, he notes that they have also managed to close the *relative* gap between themselves and the more advantaged white group (in terms of their proportional representation in non-manual work). And he emphasizes that this relative improvement is not restricted merely to the lower ranks of the non-manual class; there has also been an improvement in their proportional representation among employers, managers and professionals.

On the basis of these trends he concludes that “not only have all ethnic groups experienced upward mobility, but the more disadvantaged have improved their conditions vis - a - vis the more advantaged . . . experiencing a substantial improvement in occupational and therefore class position” (Payne 1994, p.14).

But in order to make this claim he has to rely on the crucial assumption that the new jobs created by structural change, and into which ethnic minorities have 'successfully' shifted, are in some way 'better'. He seems to think it self-evident that these non-manual jobs are more 'desirable' than the old manual jobs. It may well be true that data processing is intrinsically a more desirable activity

than metal-working<sup>3</sup>. Nevertheless, Payne entirely ignores the fact that the 'goodness' or 'desirability' of an occupation is heavily determined by the wages that it pays. As will be seen, although the traditional indices of occupational status suggest that West Indians in New York and London have improved their position relative to whites, earnings data suggest that their relative position is no better than it was 20 years ago.

The ideological straightjacket of which Payne complains has proved to be more powerful than he imagined. He is so concerned with attacking the traditional emphasis upon relative mobility and stressing the need to examine 'mobility *per se*' that he is left with no time to consider the actual *content* of the jobs into which people have been mobile.

In his defense however, it must be said that until very recently, there was a perfectly good excuse for not looking at earnings data on ethnic minorities - none of the major socio-demographic data sets contained any earnings information by ethnicity<sup>4</sup>. In 1983, Mark Stewart made an attempt to get round this problem by constructing an occupational 'score' based on the average hourly earnings received by those in that occupation, from which he estimated that the earnings differential of all non-whites was 17.2% less than that of whites (after statistical adjustment for all measurable variables such as age, education, marital status and country of birth). But the methodology employed was extremely laborious and time-consuming and no further attempts were made to replicate this procedure (Stewart 1983).

Early this year, however the Census Micro Data Unit at Manchester (the holder of the Samples of Anonymised Records from the 1991 census) employed a procedure very similar to that used 12 years ago by Stewart: using the New Earnings Survey (NES) they calculated the mean hourly earnings of 70 different occupational groups, with adjustments for age, sex and region, and

---


<sup>3</sup> Although after working on this paper, I am not so sure!

<sup>4</sup> Neither the Labour Force Survey nor the Census ask a question on earnings, whilst the New Earnings Survey does not ask a question on ethnicity.

attached these adjusted values to the individual cases contained in the microdata SAR's files.

Although great care needs to be taken in interpreting these NES 'scores', this paper suggests that they allow us to fulfill Payne's earlier injunction: namely, to 'take account of the full complexity of the concept of mobility'.

But because analyses of these NES scores is restricted to the 1991 census<sup>5</sup>, they cannot be used in longitudinal investigations of social mobility. The alternative - and the approach which I have adopted here - is to divide the population into two age cohorts. Figure 1 shows the age dimensions of native and foreign born West Indians<sup>6</sup> between aged 22-64 in London in 1990. As can be seen, more than 95% of the native born are clustered in the age range 22-34 and more than 60% of the foreign born in the age range 42-64. These are thus the two cohorts ('first' and 'second' generation) used in my analyses.



Source: 1991 UK Census 2% SAR's File

---

<sup>5</sup> Although the US has had microdata census files since 1960, they appeared for the first time in the UK with the 1991 census.

<sup>6</sup> The term 'West Indian' refers to the Census ethgroup category 'Black Caribbean'.



My findings on earnings scores will come later, we need to look first at how the occupational profiles of the two groups compare. Table 1 looks at the proportions of the employed work force in SEG categories 1 to 4 (Payne's upper non-manual group) while Figure 2 expresses the same data in graphical form. On this measure, there does indeed seem to be a considerable narrowing of the 'gap' between West Indians and Whites.<sup>7</sup>


Table 1: Proportions in Non-Manual SEG's: Men in London

	White %	West Indian %
Age 42-64		
Employers and Managers	23.4	6.1
Professionals	6.8	0.6
Total Upper Non-Manual	30.3	6.7
Age 22-34		
Employers and Managers	21.7	12.7
Professionals	10.4	3.2
Total Upper Non-Manual	32.1	15.9

Source: UK 1991 Census (2% SAR's File)


---

<sup>7</sup> N.B. In all of the tables and charts that follow, the data used is restricted to those in the two census categories of 'inner' and 'outer' London. Within this region, 100% of the West Indian cases were pulled from the SAR's and 10% of the white cases. The samples were further restricted to those who were employed and for whom the files contained both a positive NES score and a positive Cambridge Scale Score (see later sections of this paper for a description of this score). The age cohorts 22-34 only contain British born cases and the older cohort only contains foreign born cases.



Source: 1991 UK Census 2% SAR's

In terms of their representation in 'undesirable' manual employment, Figure 3 shows that once again the gap between West Indians and Whites has narrowed.



Source: 1991 UK Census 2% SAR's File

But in the end these figures tell us little more than that second generation West Indian men are not doing the same jobs as their fathers. To jump from these figures to the conclusion that their collective position vis-a-vis Whites has improved would be premature. Table 2 compares the mean age<sup>8</sup> adjusted gross weekly NES earnings<sup>9</sup> scores of West Indians and Whites in the two age brackets 22 - 34 and 42-64. In the older age bracket, the mean West Indian score is only 72% of the mean white score, whilst the 'second generation' register what appears to be a significant relative improvement, with a mean NES score 79% of that of their white counterparts. But this cross-sectional comparison of age cohorts biases conclusions about *intertemporal earnings ratios* because it is likely that the relative earnings position of West Indians in the older cohort has declined significantly from what it was when they were twenty years younger. Whilst a large proportion of their white age counterparts in 1970 appear to have moved up a career trajectory in line with the industrial and occupational transformation of the London labor market, first generation West Indians have largely remained in the job sectors to which they were initially recruited, with 53% of this sample still to be found in the three industrial sectors: manufacturing, construction and transport.

Table 2: Mean NES Scores, London, 1991

	West Indians	Whites	West Indian scores as % of Whites
Age 42-64	£268.02	£371.70	69.3
Age 22-34	£271.18	£341.67	79.4

Source: UK Census 1991, 2% SAR's File

Although there have been no large-scale surveys containing earnings data on ethnic minorities, some useful information can be drawn from the two most comprehensive studies of ethnic

---

<sup>8</sup> Statistical adjustment is made for the fact that within each cohort there are differences in the mean ages of West Indians & Whites.

<sup>9</sup> Weekly scores are calculated by multiplying the hourly NES values of each case in the SAR's by the number of hours worked per week for that case.

minorities in Britain over the past 20 years. The PEP study conducted by David Smith in 1974 estimated median gross national weekly earnings of West Indian men at 91.3% of the median white figure (Smith 1977). The follow-up PSI study by Colin Brown in 1982 estimated median gross national weekly earnings of West Indian men to have fallen to 85% of that of white men (Brown 1984)<sup>10</sup>. Amongst the younger cohort sampled in my analysis of the 1991 census, the median gross weekly NES score of West Indian men was 83.3% of the median white score. There are numerous difficulties in interpreting all three of these results, not least the small sample sizes involved<sup>11</sup>, nevertheless they are the best indicators we have concerning changes in the relative earnings positions of West-Indian men in London over the last 20 years - and unlike the 'occupational' indicators that Payne looks at, they are not at all supportive of the 'optimistic' view of West Indian mobility rates.


Figure 4 shows how one can come to strikingly different conclusions about social mobility according to whether one focuses on earnings or occupation. It presents the mean 'Cambridge Scale' scores of West Indians as a percentage of the mean white score (the 'camratio' in the graph) - the Cambridge Scale being a continuous measure of occupational status often used by mobility researchers<sup>12</sup>. Next to it, is the NES ratio reported in table 2.

---

<sup>10</sup> The use of national figures can be taken as a reflection of the London labour market, given that Brown reports median national white earnings at £129.00 and median London white earnings at £129.90.

<sup>11</sup> The 'second generation' (London) West Indian sample from which my results are drawn contains only 283 cases for which weekly NES scores can be estimated. The results from the PEP and PSI studies are in each case drawn from sample sizes of just over 500 cases.

<sup>12</sup> See Prandy (1990).



Source: 1991 UK Census 2% SAR's File

A better understanding of the mobility experience of West Indian men in London, can also be obtained by examining changes in the earnings and occupational status of their counterparts in New York - the other quintessential 'post-industrial' city.

In my analysis of West Indians in New York, I have looked at men aged 23-39 over three successive census dates, 1970, 1980, and 1990. West Indian immigration to Britain had slowed to a mere trickle by 1970 but there has been heavy and continuous immigration into the United States from the Caribbean throughout the past 25 years (Marshall 1987, Kasinitz 1992 ). But because the focus of my research is on intergenerational mobility, in all three years I have restricted my analysis to men who were either born in the United States or who entered the country prior to 1970<sup>13</sup>. Table 3 and Figures 5 & 6 compare Whites, West Indians and African Americans in terms of their proportional representation in upper non-manual and manual work<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> The analysis is based on all those West Indian cases appearing in the NYC metro area PUMS. Whites were sampled from the PUMS as follows: 5% in 1970 PUMS, 1.5% in 1980, and 2% in 1990. African Americans were sampled from the PUMS as follows: 100% in 1970, 14% in 1980 and 15% in 1990.

<sup>14</sup> Data used is restricted to those who were in employment, with positive earnings.

As in the UK, there appears to be a steady narrowing of the 'gap' between West Indians and Whites.

Table 3: Proportions in Non-Manual ISCO's<sup>15</sup>: Men in New York City


	White	West Indian	African American
1970	%	%	%
Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers	12.3	2.3	3.8
Professionals	20.1	6.2	5.4
Technicians and Associate Professionals	14.8	10.0	6.1
Total Upper Non Manual	47.2	18.5	15.3
1980			
Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers	15.4	9.3	6.6
Professionals	20.0	12.1	8.5
Technicians and Associate Professionals	15.7	13.1	8.3
Total Upper Non Manual	51.1	34.5	23.4
1990			
Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers	18.4	11.1	8.8
Professionals	19.3	16.0	9.9
Technicians and Associate Professionals	14.0	11.3	9.2
Total Upper Non Manual	51.7	38.4	27.9

Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970-1990

---


<sup>15</sup> Based on the 1 digit International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) See Ganzeboom et al. (1992) and Ganzeboom & Treiman (1994).

Fig 5: Percentage of men in "upper" non-manual occupations in New York



Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970-1990


Fig 6: Percentage of men in skilled & unskilled manual work in New York



Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970-1990

But, as in the UK, with the use of Cambridge Scale Scores, I have attempted to get beyond these rather crude categorical distinctions, by employing a continuous measure of socioeconomic status, in this case the International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI) developed by Donald

Treiman<sup>16</sup>. The mean ISEI scores of West Indians and African Americans were then compared with those of Whites. Statistical adjustments were made first for differences in age, and then also for differences in years of schooling<sup>17</sup>. Figures 7 & 8 express these scores as a percentage of the mean white score. Controlling for age differences, between 1970 and 1990 the mean West Indian ISEI score narrowed from 77% to 93% of the white score and the African American score from 75% to 93%. This apparent increase in their relative socioeconomic status appears even more dramatic if one controls for years of schooling as well as age, with the West Indian score reaching 99% of the white score by 1990.



Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970-1990


---

<sup>16</sup> In order to generate ISEI scores, the 3 digit occupation codes from the censuses were first recoded into ISCO (International Standard Classification of Occupations) values and then into ISEI values using an algorithm supplied by Donald Treiman of UCLA's Dept of Sociology. The procedure is described in Ganzeboom et al. (1992) and Ganzeboom & Treiman (1994).

<sup>17</sup> Following a method used by Model (1991) and many others, the adjusted scores are calculated by substituting the mean age and years of schooling values of whites into the equations that contain the returns (slopes) associated with the West Indian and African American groups. In other words, expected ISEI scores are the scores that the West Indian and African Americans would receive if they had the age and schooling attributes of whites but converted these attributes into ISEI scores at their own (West Indian & African American) rates of return.




Fig 8: ISEI ratios controlling for age and years of schooling (New York)



Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970-1990

But when we compare the earnings performance of West Indians and African Americans relative to whites, the picture is strikingly different. As shown in figure 9, between 1970 and 1980, mean age adjusted earnings of West Indian men rise from 61% to 69% of mean white earnings, only to fall back down to 66% in 1990. Young African American men fared even worse, with earnings as a percentage of whites falling from 65 to 63 to 57 in each successive census year.

Fig 9: Relative earnings controlling for age (New York)



Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970 -1990

Before considering the reasons for this dismal earnings performance, it is worth noting the relevance of these comparisons to an area of substantial theoretical dispute in sociological research: the extent to which 'cultural values' are seen as motivating differences in socioeconomic attainment. There is a long tradition in American sociology whereby the poor achievements of African American men are held to be a product of their peculiar cultural attributes<sup>18</sup>, the most prolific contemporary exponent of which is Thomas Sowell who argues that while many groups suffered virulent discrimination upon arrival in the United States, those who were able to overcome this handicap, particularly the Jews, Japanese *and West Indians*, exhibited:

such traits as work, thrift and education - more generally achievements involving planning and working for self-denial in the present and emphasizing the logical and mundane over the emotional, the imaginative, the heroic (Sowell 1975, p.130 quoted in Model 1991, p.249).

And precisely because - as he argues - African Americans do not share these attributes, "West Indians in the United States are a test case of the explanatory importance of color, as such, in analyzing socioeconomic progress in the American economy and society, as compared to the cultural traditions of the American Negro".

Whilst an emphasis on the occupational indicators presented in figures 5 & 6 might serve to support the Sowellian claim that West Indians have experienced markedly higher rates of socioeconomic progress than their black American counterparts, when one turns to their earnings performance it is not the differences between the two black groups that is striking. On the contrary, it is the extent to which the two groups resemble each other in terms of the sheer extent

---

<sup>18</sup> e.g Glazer & Moynihan (1970)

by which their earnings lag behind those of whites<sup>19</sup>

If the relative socioeconomic status of black men in New York and London has registered little if any improvement over the last 25 years, where should the blame be laid? Mainstream labor economists in the United States point the finger at 'mismatches': With the shift away from low-skill manufacturing, wholesaling and transportation towards the new 'knowledge-intensive' industries centered around the cities' financial services complex, there is seen to be a growing mismatch between the skills demanded by employers and those possessed by black men. This skills mismatch being in turn a function of a 'spatial' mismatch, as employers have moved manufacturing and back-office jobs out of the urban centers and into the suburban regions, or out of the country altogether. As the jobs have moved, so too have white men, whilst black men have remained trapped in the 'inner city'.

There is a good deal of evidence to support the mismatch story. The US Census PUMS indicates that for white men aged 23-39 in the New York Metro Area in 1990, the highest wages were earned by those employed in the paradigmatic 'knowledge-intensive' industry: FIRE (Finance, Insurance and Retail Estate) where they registered average earnings in excess of \$60,000 dollars per annum. By contrast, West Indians in the same industry averaged only \$33,000 per annum and African Americans just over \$30,000 p.a. Much of this earnings differential would seem to be linked to differences in the educational qualifications of the three groups, with Whites possessing, on average, an extra year and a half of full time educational experience.

In London, the 1991 SAR's indicate that as much as 25% of white men between the ages of 22 and 34 are to be found in the census category of 'Banking, Finance, Insurance, & Business Services', where they average by far the highest NES weekly earnings score, at £413. By

---

<sup>19</sup> The same argument has been made by Farley & Allen (1987); Model (1991, 1994); Darity (1992); and Woodbury (1993). But in any event, many sociologists in the United States no longer hide behind the old euphemistic 'cultural values' terminology. Taking their cue from Charles Murray (1994) and other such darlings of the 'new wave' Republican Party, they have once again found the confidence to talk about the genetic bases for racial differences in attainment levels.

comparison, less than 17% of West Indian men in the same age category are to be found in this sector, with a mean NES score of £324 per week. Once again, this earnings difference would seem to be linked to differences in educational qualifications: 48% of whites in this sector possess qualifications at 'first degree' level or above, compared to only 9% of West Indians<sup>20</sup>.

Nevertheless one of the problems with the mismatch hypothesis is that although *qualification* requirements have risen, it is not at all clear what this implies about actual '*skill*' requirements. If the skill mismatch explanation is correct, increases in wage inequality mean that the market is still paying workers what they are really 'worth'; and are signaling workers to upgrade their skills. But research in the United States by David Howell and Edward Wolff, and also by Lawrence Mishel and Ruy Teixeira show a *deceleration* in the rate of skill growth between the 1960's and 1980's which makes it hard to explain why the 1970's and 1980's experienced a dramatic expansion of wage inequality in comparison to the previous three decades (Howell 1994, p.86).

Nor can the skills mismatch hypothesis readily account for the widening wage distribution *within* both education and experience groupings. Arnold Packer and John Wirt (US Department of Labor officials) note that for men in the United States, inequality within education groups grew from less than twice as much as inequality between groups in 1967 to more than twice as much by 1992 (Packer & Wirt 1992, p.38).


A further difficulty with the mismatch hypothesis is that the educational gap between blacks and whites in New York City has been considerably reduced over the past 20 years. Mean differences in years of schooling between the West Indian and White groups which I looked at, narrowed from 2.1 years in 1970 to 1.3 in 1980 and 0.8 in 1990. In the African American/White comparison the gap in years of schooling falls from 2.1 to 1.9 to 1.6 in each successive census year. But as Barry Bluestone has argued, even as the educational backgrounds of whites and blacks have converged, the importance of small differences in education has increased, in other

---

<sup>20</sup> It is also true of both cities that rates of outmigration by whites have far exceeded that of blacks (Waldinger 1986, p.377; Cross & Waldinger 1992, p.160).

words the 'return' of education, or how much one earns with a given level of education, has diverged sharply from its 'rate of return', or how much an additional year of education is worth. Bluestone argues that America has witnessed a reduction in the return of education - a decline in earnings for high school graduates for instance - while "the increment in earnings due to a little more schooling pays off a whole lot, most notably at the upper end" (Bluestone 1994, p.84).

But one can control for changes in the rate of return on education by calculating the earnings that blacks would receive if they had the same measurable educational attributes as whites<sup>21</sup>. Figure 10 below shows what happens when you employ this procedure. There is a marginal but insignificant improvement in the relative earnings of West Indians whilst the relative position of African Americans actually *falls*.



Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970-1990

But neoclassical labor economists have a ready answer to all this quibbling: if wage dispersion has increased despite a fall in the rate of skill increase; if wage inequalities for all Americans have

---

<sup>21</sup> As described in the earlier discussion of ISEI scores, the statistical procedure used involves substituting the mean age and years of schooling values of whites into the equations that contain the returns (slopes) associated with the West Indian and African American groups.

increased *within* educational groups; and if blacks with the same educational qualifications as whites are at the same disadvantage as they were 20 years ago, then we must be looking at the wrong skill indicators!

Hence the resort to ‘unobservables’ or ‘soft skills’. The argument being that workers are still hired and paid according to ‘their’ objective skills, it is just that these skills cannot be measured according to length of education or experience. The sophistry involved is really rather *unsophisticated* and can be described as follows: ‘In regressions relating black and white wages to the standard human capital variables, we cannot get rid of the enormous negative coefficient attached to the racial dummy. But, since we have already decided that the only thing that determines wage differences are ‘productivity’ differences rooted in ‘skill’ differences, we’ll just announce that these differences exist, really they do, it’s just that well . . . we can’t see them’. This is the approach taken in the work of June O’Neill for instance, (nominated by the Republican Party to be the next head of the Congressional Budget Office<sup>22</sup>) who argues that 99% of black, white wage differentials can be explained by reference to such unobservable or ‘background’ variables (O’Neill 1990; 1992).

Of course these variables are unobservable. Simply naming something doesn’t make it any more understandable. That employers might judge black men on the basis of something other than their educational qualifications is hardly a novel concept.

But there is an alternative approach to the labor market, one which abandons the attempt to treat it ‘as if it were no different from the market for fish’<sup>23</sup>, and which recognizes the ‘socially embedded’ character of decisions about hiring, firing, pay and promotion. What is significant from this perspective is the extent of the ‘de-institutionalisation’ of the labor market that has taken

---

<sup>22</sup> Yet another disturbing indicator of the right-ward shift in American politics.

<sup>23</sup> See Will Hutton’s *Guardian* article for a good description of the fishy nature of neoclassical economics (Hutton 1994).

place in both Britain and the United States over the past 15 years.

While the conventional view is that technological change has increased the demand for skill, leading to an increased premium for “unobserved” skills, it may be that the de-institutionalization of the labor market has had a greater effect. Wage norms appear to have broken down *within firms* (as internal labor markets are opened up to external competition), *within industries* (as increasing competition causes differences among firms to become a more critical factor in wage outcomes) and *among communities* (as transportation and telecommunications facilitate the relocation of some, but not all, firms to lower wage areas). In short the “law of one price” that supposedly characterizes the free markets may have been undermined, not promoted, by the heightened competition in labor markets (Howell 1994).

In both Britain and the United States this ‘deinstitutionalisation’ of the labor market has been actively encouraged by governments, which, in their pursuit of ‘the flexible labor market’, have privatized and deregulated whole industries and legislated swingeing reductions in the power of trade unions<sup>24</sup>.

That these processes may have had a *differential* impact upon black and white men is not a particularly radical suggestion. As James Johnson & Melvin Oliver have recently demonstrated, the legal framework for the labor market now permits employers to exert almost total control over the racial, ethnic, and gender composition of their labor forces, and employers are actively using this freedom to discriminate against black men in their hiring decisions (Johnson & Oliver 1992).

This perspective on changes in the urban labor market suggests rather different policy strategies from those favored by the mismatch theorists. If the earnings problems of black men are the product of a technologically driven acceleration in skill requirements, then public policy must aim at upgrading their qualification levels. But if earnings differentials are institutionally determined, then an *exclusively* human capital approach will do little to improve the enormous income

---

<sup>24</sup> See Deakin & Wilkinson (1991); Dickens (1993); Harper (1994); and Bluestone (1994).

differentials which exist not only between but also within racial groups.

### References

Bluestone, B. 1994: "The Inequality Express." *The American Prospect* (Winter), pp. 81-93.

Brown, C. 1984: *Black and White Britain: the 3rd PSI Survey*. London: Heinemann.

Cross, M. and Waldinger, R. 1992: "Migrants, Minorities, and the Ethnic Division of Labour," in Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. (ed), *Divided Cities: New York & London in the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 151-174

Darity, W. 1992: "Dressing for Success?: Economic History and the Economic Performance of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the USA." Draft paper prepared for the 'Cambridge Economic History of the United States', edited by Stanley Engerman and Robert Gallman, Dept of Economics, University of North Carolina.

Deakin, S. and Wilkinson, F. 1991: "Labour Law, Social Security and Economic Inequality." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 15, pp. 125-148.

Dickens 1993: "Wage Councils: Was There a Case for Abolition?" *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, (December).

Farley, R. and Allen, W. R. 1987: *The Color Line and the Quality of Life in America*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Ganzeboom, H. B. G., De Graaf, P. M. and Treiman, D. J. 1992: "A Standard International Socio-economic Index of Occupational Status." *Social Science Research*, 21 (March), pp. 1-56

Ganzeboom, H. B. G. and Treiman, D. J. 1994: "Internationally Comparable Measures of Occupational Status For 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations." Mimeo, University of California at Los Angeles.

Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D. P. 1970: *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.

Goldthorpe, J. 1987: *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harper, K. 1994: "Thatcher Legacy Changed Industrial Landscape." *The Guardian*, London, May 24, p. 20.



- Howell, D. 1994: "The Skills Myth." *The American Prospect* (Summer), pp. 81-90.
- Hutton, W. 1994: "An end to the rule of fish market economics." *The Guardian*, London, July 25, p. 12.
- Johnson, J. H. and Oliver, M. L. 1992: "Structural Changes in the U.S. Economy and Black Male Joblessness: A Reassessment," in Peterson, G. E. and Vroman, W. (ed), *Urban Labor Markets and Job Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, pp. 113-147.
- Kasinitz, P. 1992: *Caribbean New York: Black Immigrants and the Politics of Race*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
- Marshall, D. 1987: "A History of West Indian Migrations: Overseas Opportunities and "Safety Valve" Policies," in Levine, B. (ed), *The Caribbean Exodus*. New York: Praeger Press.
- Marshall, G., et al. 1988: *Social Class in Modern Britain*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Model, S. 1991: "Caribbean Immigrants: A Black Success Story?" *International Migration Review*, 25 (2), pp. 248-276.
- Model, S. 1995: "West Indian Prosperity: Fact or Fiction?" Mimeo, Social and Demographic Research Institute, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Murray, C. 1994: "Race, Genes and I.Q. - An Apologia." *The New Republic*, 211 (4163), pp. 27-37.
- O'Neill, J. 1990: "The Role of Human Capital in Earnings Differences Between Black and White Males." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 4 (4), pp. 25-45.
- O'Neill, J. 1992: "Affirmative Action in the Labor Market." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 523 (September), pp. 88-103.
- Packer, A. H. and Wirt, J. G. 1992: "Changing Skills in the U.S. Workforce: Trends of Supply and Demand," in Peterson, G. E. and Vroman, W. (ed), *Urban Labor Markets and Job Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, pp. 31-65.
- Pawson, R. 1993: "Social Mobility," in Morgan, D. and Stanley, L. (ed), *Debates in Sociology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 26-51.
- Payne, G. 1987a: *Employment and Opportunity*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Payne, G. 1987b: *Mobility and Change in Modern Society*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Payne, G. 1989: "Social Mobility." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 40 (3), pp. 471-492.

Payne, G. 1994: "The Collective Social Mobility of Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain Since 1966." Paper presented at the Cambridge Social Stratification Seminar, Cambridge University, September 23.

Prandy, K. 1990: "The Revised Cambridge Scale of Occupations", *Sociology*, 24 (4), pp. 629-655.

Sassen, S. 1991: *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* . Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Saunders, P. 1990: *Social Class and Stratification* . London: Routledge.

Smith, D. J. 1977: *Racial Disadvantage in Britain: The PEP Report* . Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Sowell, T. 1975: *Race and Economics* . New York: David McKay.

Stewart, M. B. 1983: "Racial Discrimination and Occupational Attainment in Britain." *Economic Journal*, 93, (September), pp. 521-541.

Waldinger, R. 1986-87: "Changing Ladders and Musical Chairs." *Politics and Society*, 15, pp. 369-402.

Woodbury, S. A. 1993: "Culture, Human Capital, and the Earnings of West Indian Blacks", Paper presented at the Eastern Economic Association Annual Conference, Washington D.C., March 19-21.

## APPENDIX

### The London Region

As noted in footnote 9, the London region refers to the two census categories of 'inner' and 'outer' London which in 1991 had a total population of 6.7 million. This region until 1986 (when it was abolished) was the area of jurisdiction of the Greater London Council, divided into 32 boroughs plus the City of London. Of its residents in 1991, 535,000 were black, of whom 55% were defined as 'Black Caribbean', 30% as 'Black African' and 15% as 'Black Other'<sup>1</sup>.

### West Indians as a Percentage of all Black Men Aged 22-34 & 42-64 in London

For the London region the 2% SAR's file records that: 75.1% of all foreign born black men aged 42-64 are in the Census category 'Black Caribbean', 19.4% are 'Black African', and 5.5% 'Black Other'. 65.6% of all British born black are men aged 22-34 are 'Black Caribbean', 15.6% are 'Black African', and 18.8% are 'Black Other'.

### The London Definition of 'Upper' Non-Manual and of 'Skilled & Unskilled' Manual.

The 'upper' non-manual group is composed of SEG categories 1-4. The 'skilled & unskilled manual group is composed of SEG categories 8-11. Table A1 at the back of this appendix provides the full frequency listings from which Table 1 and Figures 2 & 3 are derived.

### NES Scores on the SAR's

The NES is a large survey (sample size about 160,000) conducted annually by the British government which collects information on employers about the earnings of their employees. The data are collected under statute and only aggregate (tabular) data is released. Any cell size which contains fewer than three individuals is suppressed.

What the Census Microdata Unit have done is to construct a very large table from the NES which gives mean hourly earnings, broken down by a range of characteristics. This is then matched against individuals with the same characteristics in the SARs. This breakdown is given below and provides, in effect, a table with 2,336 cells.

---

<sup>1</sup> Owen, D. 1992: *Ethnic Minorities in Great Britain Settlement Patterns*. 1991 Census Statistical Paper No.1. University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.

- Hourly earnings excluding overtime for 1991
- Variables extracted: mean, number of cases and percentage standard error.
- Geographical grouping:
  - (1) London and the south-east
  - (2) Rest of GB
- Sex: male/female
- Full-time/ part-time
- Age: 16-19, 20-29, 30-49, 50+
- Occupation: level of minor SOC - 73 categories

Where there are fewer than 3 values in a category there is a missing value.

The NES variables have been attached to anyone reporting an occupation, irrespective of their current economic activity.

Some NES values have very high sampling errors.

### Age-adjusted NES and CAM Scores

The West Indian scores are adjusted to reflect the scores the West Indian group would achieve if it had the same mean age as the white group, but converted age into NES and CAM at their own (West Indian) rate of return.

The ordinary least squares regression equations relating age to NES scores for West Indians are as follows:

$$\text{Age 22 - 34: predicted NES} = 117.470102 + 5.569271(\text{AGE})$$

$$\text{Age 44 - 64: predicted NES} = 542.435045 - 5.328392(\text{AGE})$$

The mean age of West Indians in the younger cohort is 27.1 and in the older cohort 53.5. The mean age of Whites in the younger cohort is 27.6 and in the older cohort 51.5.

The NES scores of West Indians in Table 2 are thus the values arrived at when one substitutes the mean ages of the two white cohorts into the *West Indian* regression equations given above. The same procedure is used to adjust the West Indian Cambridge scale (CAM) scores presented in the graph in Figure 4. The regression equations relating age to CAM scores for West Indians are as follows:

Age 22-34: predicted CAM = 32.060891 + 0.004873(AGE)

Age 42-64: predicted CAM = 49.702089 - 0.538332(AGE)

N.B I have adjusted for the effect of age differences between West Indians and Whites for the sake of methodological rigour. As it happens, this effect is minute, as can be seen if one calculates black/white NES and CAM ratios using the unadjusted values reported in table A2 at the back of this appendix.

### CAM Score: Score on the Revised Cambridge Scale of Occupations

As defined by the Census:

“CAM Score is a continuous measure, based on occupation and employment status, that provides an alternative to social class. It is designed to measure social advantage and is based on the assumption that there is social interaction between those with similar lifestyles. The scale was derived using multi-dimensional scaling methods using data on friendships and marriages between members of different occupational groups. It therefore provides a finely graded hierarchy, rather than a structure of discrete and homogenous classes. Tests using the scale show that it is as least as good in terms of explanatory power as any existing class scheme in a variety of areas including social interaction, voting and social mobility. Scale values fall within the range 0 to 100, with a separate scale for men and women in recognition of the fact that the same occupation may have a different social standing when held by a woman rather than a man.

A manual explaining the derivation of the scale in further detail, and providing the score value for each SOC unit is available from the University of Cambridge: K Prandy (1992) Cambridge Scale Scores for CASOC Groupings, Working paper, No 11, Social and Political Sciences, Cambridge.”

The datasets used in the Revised Cambridge Scale consist of 4 surveys all conducted prior to 1975: a sample of 1918 male non-manual respondents in a study of white collar unionism, a study of 951 male unqualified manual workers, a ‘general’ survey designed to secure representation of a wide range of occupations totalling 5060 male cases, and a survey on perceptions of income of 200 male and female respondents (Prandy 1990, p.630).

In their discussion of the original Cambridge Scale, the authors note (p.53) that “the manual/non-

manual distinction is . . . still very clear”<sup>2</sup>. That this distinction comes out just as strongly in the revised scale, is perhaps not surprising given that datasets used date from 20 years ago. The Cambridge Scale claims to be a measure of ‘relative generalised advantage’ (Prandy 1990, p.651). On this definition, a strong manual/non-manual distinction might appear more plausible in 1975 than in 1995 when the earnings of non-manual sales and clerical workers fall considerably below that of skilled and even semi-skilled manufacturing and construction workers.

### The Definition of ‘West Indian’ in the US Data

The term is used to refer only to those individuals with origins in the British West Indies, defined as Belize, Guyana, Bermuda, all past and present British colonies in the Caribbean Sea, and Caribbean locations “not elsewhere classified”.

With regard to the native born, it should be noted that the 1970 census inquired about parents’ nativities, and if both parents were born abroad, only the father’s birthplace was recorded in the public use sample. Hence, native born West Indians for this year are those whose fathers were born in the British West Indies as defined above but who were themselves born in the USA. In 1980 and 1990, instead of parents’ birthplaces, individuals were asked to supply up to two national ancestries. In these years, the native born West Indians are those who gave at least one national ancestry from the British West Indies as defined above.

### The New York Region

Although the text refers to ‘New York City’, the data is actually drawn from the area defined by the US Census Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA), which contains 24 counties including parts of Connecticut and New Jersey and which in 1987 had a total population of 17.9 million.<sup>3</sup> Within this region, the samples from the US Census indicate that there are 104,000 men of British West Indian ancestry between the ages of 18 and 64, of whom 12,000 are US born. US born white men within this age group number 2,944,000.

N.B. I apologise for the confusing use of the terms ‘New York City’ and ‘New York Metro Area’ in both the main body of the text and in the tables in the appendix. ALL the statistics refer to the New York CMSA as defined above!

---

<sup>2</sup> Stewart, A., Prandy, K. and Blackburn, R.M. 1980: *Social Stratification and Occupations*. Macmillan Press.

<sup>3</sup> Fainstein, S., Gordon, I. and Harloe, M. 1992 *Divided Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

## Public Use Microdata Samples

Footnote 15 details how cases were sampled from the pums files. But the sample size of these files themselves should also be noted. In 1970, the pums was a 15% sample of all NY Metro residents; in years 1980 and 1990 the pums was drawn from a 5% sample of all NY Metro residents.

## ISCO's

The ISCO categories referred to here are those of the International Standard Classification of Occupations, published by the International Labour Office in 1988 (revising the earlier 1968 ISCO classification - see Ganzeboom et al. 1992 and Ganzeboom & Treiman 1994). At the 1 digit level there are 6 other categories besides the top three reported in table 3. All 9 categories are listed below.

- 1 Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers
- 2 Professionals
- 3 Technicians and Associate Professionals
- 4 Clerks
- 5 Service Workers, Shop & Market Sales
- 6 Skilled Agricultural & Fishery Workers
- 7 Craft and Related Trades Workers
- 8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers
- 9 Elementary Occupations

## The New York Definition of 'Upper' Non-manual and of 'Skilled & Unskilled' Manual

The 'upper' non-manual category consists of ISCO's 1-3 and the 'Skilled & Unskilled' category consists of ISCO's 7-9. Tables A3-A5 at the back of this appendix provide the full frequency listings from which Table 3 and Figures 5 and 6 are derived.

## ISEI's

ISEI scores were generated using the full four digit ISCO classification which identifies 390 occupational groups. Using the coding scheme devised by Treiman (1994) the census occupation codes were mapped into this 4 digit ISCO to which ISEI values were then assigned (once again, using the coding scheme devised by Treiman 1994).

Treiman's coding scheme only recodes 1980 US census occupation codes into ISCO. In order to get ISCO values for 1970 and 1990, these had to be recoded into 1980 census values. With the 1990 file, this is unproblematic, as there were only occupational 21 coding changes between the two censuses. Deriving 1980 values from the 1970 file is more difficult, as there were numerous coding changes between these 2 years. The coding scheme I have developed was made using reference to the U.S.

Bureau of the Census, Technical Paper 59, *The Relationship Between the 1970 and 1980 Industry and Occupation Classification Systems* . Copies of my coding scheme are available on request.

ISEI scores range from 16 to 90, with 'judges' gaining the highest score. The lowest score is jointly held by two ISCO unit groups: 9211 'Farm-hands and Labourers' and 9132 'Helpers and Cleaners in Offices, Hotels and Other Establishments'.

The basis for the construction of the ISEI (International Socio-Economic Index) consisted of a stacked file of 31 surveys covering 16 nations for various years from 1968 to 1982 with comparably coded data on education, occupation, and income for 73,901 full-time employed men - representing what the authors claim were 'the most important and highest quality data sets on intergenerational occupational mobility that were available to us when we constructed the scale' (Ganzeboom et al. 1992, p.13).

Unlike Treiman's earlier International Occupational Prestige Scale, the ISEI Scale does not "involve subjective judgements by the members of a society but are constructed as a weighted sum of the average education and average income of occupational groups, sometimes corrected for the influence of age" (Ganzeboom et al. 1992, p.7).

#### Age-adjusted US Earnings and ISEI Scores

As noted in footnote 19, the West Indian and African American scores are adjusted to reflect the scores the two groups would achieve if they had the same age and schooling attributes as the white group, but converted these attributes into earnings and ISEI at their own (West Indian & African American) rates of return.

The ordinary least squares regression equations relating age to earnings are as follows (WI denoting West Indian, AA denoting African American, p.e denoting predicted earnings and p.i. denoting predicted isei):

$$1970 \text{ WI p.e.} = 2652.631487 + 116.276221 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1970 \text{ AA p.e.} = 3405.108441 + 104.209313 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1980 \text{ WI p.e.} = -2296.100934 + 489.304089 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1980 \text{ AA p.e.} = -358.838843 + 423.943577 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1990 \text{ WI p.e.} = -10664.47681 + 1175.813308 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1990 \text{ AA p.e.} = -9000.968041 + 1006.109174 (\text{AGE})$$

The regression equations relating age to ISEI are as follows:



$$1970 \text{ WI p.i.} = 28.135351 + 0.317897 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1970 \text{ AA p.i.} = 40.334942 - 0.113396 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1980 \text{ WI p.i.} = 41.450123 + 0.059473 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1980 \text{ AA p.i.} = 38.210473 + 0.020076 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1990 \text{ WI p.i.} = 45.983506 - 0.000986489 (\text{AGE})$$

$$1990 \text{ AA p.i.} = 35.387793 + 0.166878 (\text{AGE})$$

The regression equations relating age *and* schooling to earnings are as follows:

$$1970 \text{ WI p.e.} = -4633.158619 + 155.969365 (\text{AGE}) + 543.370502 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1970 \text{ AA p.e.} = -773.080880 + 127.430868 (\text{AGE}) + 313.094443 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1980 \text{ WI p.e.} = -9896.135509 + 502.746143 (\text{AGE}) + 555.849984 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1980 \text{ AA p.e.} = -11727.34877 + 454.413942 (\text{AGE}) + 764.438146 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1990 \text{ WI p.e.} = -47080.22514 + 1111.823702 (\text{AGE}) + 3371.757889 (\text{SCHOOL})^*$$

$$1990 \text{ AA p.e.} = -34253.18451 + 897.493992 (\text{AGE}) + 2682.693163 (\text{SCHOOL})^*$$

The regression equations relating age *and* schooling to ISEI are as follows:

$$1970 \text{ WI p.i.} = 5.700879 + 0.440120 (\text{AGE}) + 1.673151 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1970 \text{ AA p.i.} = 12.928351 + 0.038925 (\text{AGE}) + 2.053725 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1980 \text{ WI p.i.} = 11.622393 + 0.112228 (\text{AGE}) + 2.181535 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1980 \text{ AA p.i.} = 3.219837 + 0.122904 (\text{AGE}) + 2.579751 (\text{SCHOOL})$$

$$1990 \text{ WI p.i.} = 8.611189 - 0.066657 (\text{AGE}) + 3.460327 (\text{SCHOOL})^*$$

$$1990 \text{ AA p.i.} = 3.945636 + 0.031639 (\text{AGE}) + 3.340287 (\text{SCHOOL})^*$$

As described earlier, adjusted West Indian and African American scores are calculated by substituting the mean white attributes into the above equations, which contain the returns (slopes) i.e regression coefficients, associated with the respective black groups.

These mean white attributes can be found in table A6 at the back of this appendix. \*N.B. The school values used in the regressions for 1990 are not those found in table A6. This is because, in 1990 the education variable changed from being a straightforward years of schooling variable to a diverse set of year and/or credential aggregates. In order to transform it into a simple years of schooling variable - so as to be comparable with the 1970 and 1980 values - I used the recoding scheme of Cordelia

Reimers<sup>4</sup>: recode yearsch (1/3=0) (4=2) (5=6) (6=9) (7=10) (8/9=11) (10=12) (11/13=14) (14=16) (15=17) (16=19) (17=20). The school values thus derived are the ones reported in table A6. But in my regressions, I used the untransformed years of schooling values which are as follows: mean white school value = 12.3; mean West Indian school value = 11.4; mean African American school value = 10.7.

### Industrial Classifications Used in Tables A7-A19

The US classification is based on the 13 major groups of the US Census which I disaggregated using the following recoding schemes:

#### **1970:**

recode

indus

(727=11) (728=12) (17 thru 29=0) (47 thru 58=1) (67 thru 78=2) (107 thru 267=3) (268 thru 398=4) (407 thru 429=5) (447 thru 449=6) (467 thru 499=7) (507 thru 599=8) (607 thru 699=9) (707 thru 719=10) (729 thru 748=11) (749 thru 767=12) (769 thru 799=13) (807 thru 817=14) (828 thru 899=15) (907 thru 947=16) (997 thru 999=17) into indusdiv .

variable labels indusdiv 'industry division'.

value labels indusdiv

0 "Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing"

1 "Mining"

2 "Construction"

3 "Manufacturing Durable Goods"

4 "Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods"

5 "Transportation"

6 "Communications"

7 "Utilities and Sanitary Services"

8 "Wholesale Trade"

9 "Retail Trade"

10 "Finance, Insurance & Real Estate"

11 "Business Services"

12 "Repair Services"

13 "Personal Services"

14 "Entertainment & Recreation"

15 "Professional & Related Services"

---

<sup>4</sup> Cordelia Reimers 1994, "Caught in the Widening Skill Differential: Native-Born Mexican American Wages in California in the 1980's" Hunter College, Dept of Economics, mimeo (courtesy of Suzanne Model, Umass Amherst).

16 "Public Administration"

17 "Not Classified" .

**1980:**

recode

industry

(60=2) (721=11) (722=12) (10 thru 31=0) (40 thru 50=1) (100 thru  
222=4) (230 thru 392=3) (400 thru 432=5) (440 thru 442=6) (460 thru  
472=7) (500 thru 571=8) (580 thru 691=9) (700 thru 712=10) (730 thru  
742=11) (750 thru 760=12) (761 thru 791=13) (800 thru 802=14) (812 thru  
892=15) (900 thru 932=16) (991 thru 992=17) INTO indusdiv .

variable labels indusdiv 'industry division'.

value labels indusdiv

0 "Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing"

1 "Mining"

2 "Construction"

3 "Manufacturing Durable Goods"

4 "Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods"

5 "Transportation"

6 "Communications"

7 "Utilities and Sanitary Services"

8 "Wholesale Trade"

9 "Retail Trade"

10 "Finance, Insurance & Real Estate"

11 "Business Services"

12 "Repair Services"

13 "Personal Services"

14 "Entertainment & Recreation"

15 "Professional & Related Services"

16 "Public Administration"

17 "Not Classified" .

**1990:**

recode

industry

(60=2) (721=11) (722=12) (10 thru 32=0) (40 thru 50=1) (100 thru  
222=4) (230 thru 392=3) (400 thru 432=5) (440 thru 442=6) (450 thru  
472=7) (500 thru 571=8) (580 thru 691=9) (700 thru 712=10) (731 thru  
741=11) (742 thru 760=12) (761 thru 791=13) (800 thru 810=14) (812 thru  
899=15) (900 thru 932=16) (940 thru 992=17) INTO indusdiv .

variabel labels indusdiv 'industry division'.

```
value labels indusdiv
0 "Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing"
1 "Mining"
2 "Construction"
3 "Manufacturing Durable Goods"
4 "Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods"
5 "Transportation"
6 "Communications"
7 "Utilities and Sanitary Services"
8 "Wholesale Trade"
9 "Retail Trade"
10 "Finance, Insurance & Real Estate"
11 "Business Services"
12 "Repair Services"
13 "Personal Services"
14 "Entertainment & Recreation"
15 "Professional & Related Services"
16 "Public Administration"
17 "Not Classified" .
```

The UK classification is based on the 10 Standard Industrial Classification 'Divisions' of the UK Census, which I disaggregated using the following recoding scheme:

```
recode
industry
(1 thru 2=0) (3 thru 7=1) (8 thru 11=2) (12 thru 18=3) (19 thru 25=4)
(26=5) (27 thru 29=6) (30 thru 31=7) (32 thru 34=8) (35=9) (36 thru 37=10)
(38 thru 43=11) (44 thru 45=12) (46 thru 50=13) (51=14) (52=15)
(53=16) (54=17) (55=18) (56=19) (57=20)
(58 thru 59=21) (60=22) (else=sysmis) into indusdiv .
variable labels indusdiv 'industrial classification'.
execute.
```

formats indusdiv (F8).

```
value labels indusdiv
0 "Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing"
1 "Energy & Water Supply Industries"
2 "Mining & Metal & Chemical Processing"
3 "Metal Goods, Engineering & Vehicle Industries"
4 "Other Manufacturing Industries"
5 "Construction"
6 "Distribution"
7 "Retail"
```

- 8 "Catering"
- 9 "Hoter & Other Accomodation"
- 10 "Repairs"
- 11 "Transportation"
- 12 "Post & Telecommunications"
- 13 "Banking, Finance, Insurance, & Business Services"
- 14 "Miscellaneous Public Admin"
- 15 "Sanitary & Cleaning Services"
- 16 "Education"
- 17 "Research & Development"
- 18 "Health"
- 19 "Other Services for Gen Public"
- 20 "Entertainment"
- 21 "Personal & Domestic Services"
- 22 "Diplomacy & Work Abroad" .

Table A2: Means, Std Deviations (\*), & Std Error of Means (\*\*) of Major Variables  
Men in London, 1991

Variable	British Born West Indians Aged 22-34	British Born Whites Aged 22-34	Foreign Born West Indians Aged 42-64	British Born Whites Aged 42-64
Age	27.08	27.64	53.47	51.53
*	3.35	3.49	5.55	6.42
**	0.20	0.13	0.29	0.25
CAM Score	32.19	37.76	20.92	34.46
*	15.47	17.62	13.21	18.73
**	0.92	0.65	0.69	0.74
NES Score	268.29	341.67	257.53	371.70
*	106.39	148.87	99.34	176.65
**	6.32	5.47	5.21	6.96
N of Cases	283	741	363	644

Source: UK Census, 2% SAR's File. All figures limited to persons with positive NES scores and positive Cambridge Scale (CAM) scores.

Table A3: ISCO occupation category by ethnicity, men aged 23-39 in NY Metro Area, 1970

ISCO	White		West Indian		African American	
	N of Cases	Percent	N of Cases	Percent	N of Cases	Percent
1970						
1 Legislators, Senior Officials	237	12.3	3	2.3	68	3.8
2 Professionals	388	20.1	8	6.2	97	5.4
3 Technicians & Assoc Profs	286	14.8	13	10.0	109	6.1
4 Clerks	155	8.0	25	19.2	247	13.8
5 Service Workers	196	10.2	10	7.7	231	12.9
6 Skilled Agricultural	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7 Craft & Related Workers	343	17.8	30	23.1	300	16.7
8 Plant & Machine Operators	202	10.5	30	23.1	425	23.7
9 Elementary Occupations	121	6.3	11	8.5	315	17.6
Total	1928	100.0	130	100.0	1792	100.0

Source: US Census PUMS File 1970

Table A4: ISCO occupation category by ethnicity, men aged 23-39 in NY Metro Area, 1980

ISCO	White		West Indian		African American	
	N of Cases	Percent	N of Cases	Percent	N of Cases	Percent
1980						
1 Legislators, Senior Officials	128	15.4	68	9.3	81	6.6
2 Professionals	167	20.0	89	12.1	104	8.5
3 Technicians & Assoc Profs	131	15.7	96	13.1	102	8.3
4 Clerks	72	8.6	101	13.8	162	13.2
5 Service Workers	80	9.6	73	10.0	121	9.9
6 Skilled Agricultural	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
7 Craft & Related Workers	124	14.9	145	19.8	178	14.5
8 Plant & Machine Operators	83	10.0	94	12.8	261	21.3
9 Elementary Occupations	47	5.6	66	9.0	218	17.8
Total	833	100.0	733	100.0	1228	100.0

Source: US Census PUMS File 1980

Table A5: ISCO occupation category by ethnicity, men aged 23-39 in NY Metro Area, 1990

ISCO 1990	White		West Indian		African American	
	N of Cases	Percent	N of Cases	Percent	N of Cases	Percent
1 Legislators, Senior Officials	229	18.4	47	11.1	143	8.8
2 Professionals	241	19.3	68	16.0	161	9.9
3 Technicians & Assoc Profs	174	14.0	48	11.3	150	9.2
4 Clerks	89	7.1	65	15.3	216	13.3
5 Service Workers	127	10.2	55	12.9	212	13.0
6 Skilled Agricultural	3	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.1
7 Craft & Related Workers	213	17.1	51	12.0	202	12.4
8 Plant & Machine Operators	85	6.8	44	10.4	244	15.0
9 Elementary Occupations	85	6.8	47	11.1	298	18.3
Total	1246	100.0	425	100.0	1627	100.0

Source: US Census PUMS File 1990



Table A6: Means , Std Deviations (\*), & Std Errors of Means (\*\*) of Major Variables  
Men Aged 23 - 39 in New York City, 1990

Year	Group	Age	School (years)	ISEI	Earnings (\$ p.a)	N of Cases	
1970	Whites	30.56	13.17	49.39	10,159.23	1,928	
	*	4.99	2.91	16.91	6,715.68		
	**	0.11	0.07	0.39	152.95		
	West Indians		32.02	11.07	38.32	6,376.15	130
		*	4.89	3.40	13.42	4,035.34	
		**	0.43	0.30	1.18	353.92	
	African Americans		30.80	11.06	36.84	6,615.01	1,792
		*	4.85	2.69	12.75	3,227.97	
		**	0.11	0.06	0.30	76.25	
1980	Whites	30.65	14.22	49.66	18,495.68	833	
	*	4.79	2.93	16.46	11,693.16		
	**	0.17	0.10	0.57	405.14		
	West Indians		32.39	12.89	43.38	13,553.21	733
		*	4.60	3.06	15.39	9,306.98	
		**	0.17	0.11	0.57	343.76	
	African Americans		30.77	12.34	38.83	11,685.37	1,228
		*	4.77	2.49	14.80	7,617.04	
		**	0.14	0.07	0.42	217.36	
1990	Whites	31.30	14.52	49.47	39,805.40	1,246	
	*	4.81	2.26	17.05	34,687.06		
	**	0.14	0.06	0.48	982.67		
	West Indians		30.98	13.71	45.95	25,766.37	425
		*	4.97	2.52	17.16	22,681.02	
		**	0.24	0.12	0.83	1,100.19	
	African Americans		31.17	12.97	40.59	23,356.00	1,627
		*	4.96	2.38	15.36	18,866.01	
		**	0.12	0.06	0.38	467.72	

Source: US Census PUMS Files 1970 - 1990. All figures limited to persons with positive earnings. All Whites and African Americans born in USA. West Indians either born in USA or entered USA prior to 1970.

Table A1: West Indian Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1970

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
industry division						
Construction	\$4,344	32.7	9.7	32.8	9	6.9%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$6,706	34.3	11.6	33.0	16	12.3%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$6,562	36.5	11.5	31.2	13	10.0%
Transportation	\$6,727	36.1	9.8	33.1	11	8.5%
Communications	\$7,400	43.0	9.0	32.3	3	2.3%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$6,043	37.4	11.1	31.3	7	5.4%
Wholesale Trade	\$5,500	38.5	11.7	31.2	6	4.6%
Retail Trade	\$5,510	31.9	10.0	32.7	10	7.7%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$6,268	44.5	11.8	31.7	22	16.9%
Business Services	\$5,700	47.5	10.5	31.5	4	3.1%
Repair Services	\$4,067	32.7	10.0	30.7	3	2.3%
Personal Services	\$5,440	26.8	11.0	30.0	5	3.8%
Professional & Related Services	\$8,081	45.4	11.9	32.5	16	12.3%
Public Administration	\$8,240	39.6	11.8	31.2	5	3.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,376</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: 1970 US Census PUMS File All figures limited to persons with positive earnings. Both foreign and native born included.

Table A8: White Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area 1970

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$7,358	35.8	12.2	32.1	12	.6%
Construction	\$9,319	36.2	11.3	30.9	153	7.9%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$10,136	46.4	12.8	30.7	232	12.0%
<b>Manufacturing</b> Non-Durable Goods	\$10,320	47.6	12.8	30.9	196	10.2%
Transportation	\$9,427	42.0	12.1	31.1	132	6.8%
Communications	\$9,811	49.2	12.5	30.1	44	2.3%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$9,117	37.8	11.8	30.7	52	2.7%
Wholesale Trade	\$10,426	47.9	12.7	30.8	91	4.7%
Retail Trade	\$9,185	47.3	12.2	30.5	212	11.0%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$12,364	56.8	14.0	30.3	169	8.8%
Business Services	\$12,717	56.3	14.6	30.8	72	3.7%
Repair Services	\$8,249	40.1	11.6	31.7	39	2.0%
Personal Services	\$6,668	34.5	11.4	31.2	31	1.6%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$9,390	51.9	13.5	30.2	20	1.0%
Professional & Related Services	\$11,076	65.1	16.0	30.0	308	16.0%
Public Administration	\$9,210	47.0	12.6	30.2	165	8.6%
Total	\$10,159	49.4	13.2	30.6	1,928	100.0%

Source: 1970 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to persons with positive earnings born in USA.

Table A9: African American Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1970

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE	number	percent
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$4,850	17.8	9.5	EL.5	10	.6%
Mining	\$8,000	22.0	11.5	EO.0	7	.1%
Construction	\$6,765	20.0	9.9	31.1	111	6.2%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$6,554	32.6	10.8	30.4	234	12.9%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$6,520	34.5	10.6	31.2	185	10.3%
Transportation	\$7,105	32.7	11.0	31.0	201	11.2%
Communications	\$8,193	46.1	12.5	30.7	27	1.5%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$6,269	30.4	10.2	31.9	65	3.6%
Wholesale Trade	\$6,538	35.0	10.5	31.6	95	5.3%
Retail Trade	\$5,862	38.0	10.6	30.0	226	12.6%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$6,129	43.6	11.6	30.0	106	5.9%
Business Services	\$6,563	45.7	11.6	29.9	35	2.0%
Repair Services	\$5,290	33.7	10.5	30.2	79	4.4%
Personal Services	\$6,421	34.1	10.3	31.3	57	3.2%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$7,856	45.5	12.4	EL.0	16	.9%
Professional & Related Services	\$7,053	45.5	12.7	31.4	202	11.3%
Public Administration	\$7,657	42.1	12.1	30.8	144	8.0%
Total	\$6,615	36.8	11.1	30.8	1792	100.0%

Source: 1970 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings born in USA.

Table A10: West Indian Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1980

	ARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$18,755	42.5	12.0	35.0	2	.3%
Mining	\$7,808	45.0	12.0	39.0	1	.1%
Construction	\$14,095	46.1	11.3	32.8	90	5.5%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$14,231	39.1	12.1	31.9	74	10.1%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$11,742	41.3	11.9	32.0	70	9.5%
Transportation	\$13,720	35.0	12.1	33.0	68	9.3%
Communications	\$20,970	50.9	14.1	33.4	22	3.0%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$17,191	45.1	12.5	33.1	11	1.5%
Wholesale Trade	\$16,612	42.8	12.2	33.8	35	4.8%
Retail Trade	\$11,068	40.8	12.3	31.8	64	8.7%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$14,078	53.8	14.1	32.6	76	10.4%
Business Services	\$9,980	47.5	14.5	32.7	22	3.0%
Repair Services	\$12,712	34.6	12.0	32.9	28	3.8%
Personal Services	\$9,071	36.1	10.9	33.9	14	1.9%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$19,655	43.0	11.6	29.9	14	1.9%
Professional & Related Services	\$12,674	47.6	12.5	32.1	142	19.4%
Public Administration	\$14,603	42.1	14.5	31.3	50	6.8%
Total	\$13,553	43.4	12.9	32.4	733	100.0%

Source: 1980 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to persons with positive earnings. Includes all native born. Foreign born included if entered USA prior to 1970.

Table A11: White Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1980

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE	number	percent
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$10,356	31.5	8.8	30.5	4	.5%
Mining	\$1,005	74.0	14.0	24.0	1	.1%
Construction	\$15,729	36.3	12.4	30.6	60	7.2%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$17,575	46.6	13.2	29.5	83	10.0%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$20,828	49.3	14.9	31.1	71	8.5%
Transportation	\$18,241	40.1	12.9	30.1	60	7.2%
Communications	\$21,690	96.7	13.6	30.5	24	2.9%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$20,263	39.7	13.2	30.3	25	3.0%
Wholesale Trade	\$18,817	49.4	14.1	30.8	62	7.4%
Retail Trade	\$14,183	46.0	13.5	29.3	96	11.5%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$21,878	55.2	15.1	31.9	76	9.1%
Business Services	\$24,055	57.5	14.9	31.8	49	5.9%
Repair Services	\$15,282	41.7	12.9	31.1	19	2.3%
Personal Services	\$13,147	33.3	13.2	32.6	11	1.3%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$18,894	51.8	14.1	30.7	18	2.2%
Professional & Related Services	\$17,875	63.8	16.5	30.5	118	14.2%
Public Administration	\$19,781	53.5	14.8	31.7	56	6.7%
Total	\$18,496	49.7	14.2	30.6	833	100.0%

Source: 1980 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to persons with positive earnings born in USA.

Table A12: African American Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1980

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$9,072	42.7	12.7	31.0	3	.2%
Construction	\$9,856	30.7	11.1	31.1	64	5.2%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$11,611	33.5	11.8	30.6	155	12.6%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$12,007	34.6	11.7	31.1	118	9.6%
Transportation	\$13,553	34.4	12.2	31.0	159	12.9%
Communications	\$16,487	47.1	14.2	30.9	28	2.3%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$14,008	33.7	12.1	29.5	37	3.0%
Wholesale Trade	\$11,615	36.2	12.0	31.3	42	3.4%
Retail Trade	\$9,758	41.3	12.4	30.2	111	9.0%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$13,205	45.5	12.6	29.6	92	7.5%
Business Services	\$9,787	44.4	12.9	30.4	57	4.6%
Repair Services	\$8,792	31.1	10.9	32.1	46	3.7%
Personal Services	\$9,869	34.5	11.4	30.8	28	2.3%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$16,595	50.0	13.2	29.9	14	1.1%
Professional & Related Services	\$10,794	44.0	13.1	30.5	208	16.9%
Public Administration	\$12,748	48.5	13.5	30.5	66	5.4%
Total	\$11,685	38.8	12.3	30.8	1228	100.0%

Source: 1980 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings born in USA.

Table A13: West Indian Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1990

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
industry division						
Construction	\$21,119	35.2	12.8	33.2	33	7.8%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$27,000	44.8	13.5	30.9	22	5.2%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$26,975	43.4	12.6	29.8	16	3.8%
Transportation	\$24,316	39.5	13.5	31.6	86	13.2%
Communications	\$29,877	52.9	14.0	29.9	14	3.3%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$24,368	37.5	13.5	28.8	10	2.4%
Wholesale Trade	\$27,722	41.6	12.7	29.5	14	3.3%
Retail Trade	\$14,685	40.6	12.7	29.5	48	11.3%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$33,015	53.7	14.2	30.7	55	12.9%
Business Services	\$18,435	43.5	12.8	31.8	17	4.0%
Repair Services	\$20,611	31.8	12.8	31.8	16	3.8%
Personal Services	\$14,124	39.0	12.2	32.7	6	1.4%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$25,000	21.0	13.0	29.5	2	.5%
Professional & Related Services	\$27,000	54.5	14.6	30.8	83	19.5%
Public Administration	\$38,317	55.4	13.0	32.4	33	7.8%
Total	\$25,766	46.0	13.1	31.0	425	100.0%

Source: 1990 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to persons with positive earnings. Includes all native born. Foreign born included if entered USA prior to 1970.



Table A14: White Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1990

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE	number	percent
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$20,476	29.3	13.0	28.8	24	1.9%
Construction	\$33,723	36.3	13.2	31.1	123	9.9%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$32,801	47.3	13.8	31.0	86	6.9%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$47,319	48.3	14.5	31.5	96	7.7%
Transportation	\$30,114	42.7	13.8	31.3	93	7.5%
Communications	\$43,530	56.1	14.9	31.8	28	2.2%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$33,263	38.2	12.9	31.8	19	1.5%
Wholesale Trade	\$45,887	46.8	14.1	31.5	69	5.5%
Retail Trade	\$29,003	45.2	14.0	30.3	163	13.1%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$60,524	56.9	15.6	31.4	153	12.3%
Business Services	\$43,899	56.1	14.5	31.4	46	3.7%
Repair Services	\$22,862	39.9	12.9	31.4	24	1.9%
Personal Services	\$19,723	40.0	12.9	30.9	15	1.2%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$24,747	46.6	14.8	30.9	22	1.8%
Professional & Related Services	\$45,284	63.9	16.4	32.0	201	16.1%
Public Administration	\$39,034	49.9	14.3	31.9	84	6.7%
Total	\$39,805	49.5	14.5	31.3	1246	100.0%

Source: 1990 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings born in USA.

Table A15: African American Men Aged 23-39 in New York Metro Area, 1990

	EARNINGS	ISEI	SCHOOL	AGE	number	percent
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
industry division						
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	\$10,032	20.8	11.8	30.8	11	.7%
Mining	\$16,113	34.3	15.3	35.0	3	.2%
Construction	\$19,019	29.1	12.1	31.5	138	8.5%
Manufacturing Durable Goods	\$20,685	36.4	12.0	31.9	127	7.8%
Manufacturing Non-Durable Goods	\$16,746	36.7	12.3	30.3	86	5.3%
Transportation	\$24,338	36.1	13.0	31.5	192	11.8%
Communications	\$30,395	50.7	14.0	31.4	49	3.0%
Utilities and Sanitary Services	\$28,309	31.4	11.4	32.5	20	1.2%
Wholesale Trade	\$24,939	38.7	12.8	31.9	93	5.7%
Retail Trade	\$17,008	39.3	12.9	29.8	174	10.7%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	\$30,586	51.0	14.1	31.8	119	7.3%
Business Services	\$16,869	42.3	12.0	30.5	93	5.7%
Repair Services	\$20,918	31.6	12.0	30.9	57	3.5%
Personal Services	\$13,077	33.7	12.3	30.7	34	2.1%
Entertainment & Recreation	\$22,527	42.0	14.4	30.9	23	1.4%
Professional & Related Services	\$23,148	48.0	13.4	31.3	287	17.6%
Public Administration	\$29,017	47.4	13.8	31.0	171	7.4%
Total	\$22,356	40.6	13.0	31.2	1627	100.0%

Source: 1990 US Census PUMS File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings born in USA.

Table 16: British Born West Indian Men Aged 22-34 in London, 1991

	NES SCORE	CAM SCORE	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean		
				number	percent
industrial classification					
Energy & Water Supply Industries	326.40	19.0	33.0	7	.7%
Mining & Metal & Chemical Processing	305.48	20.2	29.0	7	.7%
Metal Goods, Engineering & Vehicle Industries	256.17	24.1	26.5	20	7.1%
Other Manufacturing Industries	235.97	20.4	27.0	14	4.9%
Construction	295.90	26.7	26.6	16	5.7%
Distribution	236.70	22.8	28.5	11	3.9%
Retail	233.21	30.6	26.0	41	14.5%
Catering	232.57	29.9	28.3	10	3.5%
Hoter & Other Accomodation	200.80	16.3	24.0	1	.4%
Repairs	252.72	27.0	28.3	9	3.2%
Transportation	276.27	25.8	27.0	20	7.1%
Post & Telecommunications	273.81	26.4	27.6	29	10.2%
Banking, Finance, Insurance, & Business Services	323.76	41.8	26.9	47	16.6%
Miscellaneous Public Admin	293.84	42.8	26.9	29	10.2%
Sanitary & Cleaning Services	157.56	22.5	28.0	3	1.1%
Education	307.30	63.1	29.5	7	.7%
Research & Development	316.08	54.3	22.0	1	.4%
Health	194.83	28.7	28.0	3	1.1%
Other Services for Gen Public	280.85	29.5	29.3	8	2.8%
Entertainment	216.60	29.5	26.2	17	4.6%
Personal & Domestic Services	140.68	35.4	28.5	7	.7%
Total	268.29	37.7	27.1	283	100.0%

Source: 1991 UK Census, 2% SAR's File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings and positive Cambridge Scale (CAM) score.

Table 17: Foreign Born West Indian Men Aged 42-64 in London, 1991

	NES SCORE	CAM SCORE	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean		
				number	percent
industrial classification					
Energy & Water Supply Industries	265.96	27.1	55.8	6	1.7%
Mining & Metal & Chemical Processing	252.93	14.8	53.7	6	1.7%
Metal Goods, Engineering & Vehicle Industries	246.69	17.0	52.4	37	10.2%
Other Manufacturing Industries	240.01	15.9	54.4	39	10.7%
Construction	253.43	19.4	54.0	42	11.6%
Distribution	247.89	13.1	51.6	8	2.2%
Retail	236.00	19.8	51.0	5	1.4%
Catering	255.18	22.4	53.2	5	1.4%
Hoter & Other Accomodation	183.79	14.3	55.6	5	1.4%
Repairs	235.03	18.8	51.2	6	1.7%
Transportation	245.81	19.1	53.9	76	20.9%
Post & Telecommunications	277.89	24.9	52.0	29	8.0%
Banking, Finance, Insurance, & Business Services	334.98	27.4	51.7	19	5.2%
Miscellaneous Public Admin	305.14	29.1	54.3	27	7.4%
Sanitary & Cleaning Services	196.59	14.4	55.1	11	3.0%
Education	313.30	37.3	53.0	8	2.2%
Health	242.62	21.0	53.2	19	5.2%
Other Services for Gen Public	323.88	34.3	53.3	4	1.1%
Entertainment	247.27	28.7	55.3	9	2.5%
Personal & Domestic Services	164.01	21.5	52.5	2	.6%
Total	257.53	20.9	53.5	363	100.0%

Source: 1991 UK Census, 2% SAR's File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings and positive Cambridge Scale (CAM) score.

Table 18: British Born White Men Aged 22-34 in London, 1991

	NES SCORE	CAM SCORE	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
Industrial classification					
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	245.42	28.4	26.7	3	.4%
Energy & Water Supply Industries	310.77	34.6	28.4	11	1.5%
Mining & Metal & Chemical Processing	324.98	33.4	27.9	11	1.5%
Metal Goods, Engineering & Vehicle Industries	336.41	35.2	27.3	12	4.3%
Other Manufacturing Industries	318.18	28.5	27.9	40	5.4%
Construction	307.07	25.9	27.9	59	8.0%
Distribution	331.92	33.1	27.7	55	7.4%
Retail	313.35	33.9	27.3	64	8.6%
Catering	215.37	27.4	25.5	13	1.8%
Hotels & Other Accommodation	232.21	26.8	25.3	4	.5%
Repairs	233.80	22.5	26.7	9	1.2%
Transportation	309.92	30.8	27.6	49	6.6%
Post & Telecommunications	315.05	32.3	27.3	38	5.1%
Banking, Finance, Insurance, & Business Service	412.97	47.0	27.3	181	24.4%
Miscellaneous Public Admin	327.81	36.9	28.7	66	8.9%
Sanitary & Cleaning Services	229.56	21.9	27.9	8	1.1%
Education	397.54	64.0	28.8	21	2.8%
Research & Development	354.42	51.8	27.8	5	.7%
Health	319.93	47.6	28.3	19	2.6%
Other Services for Gen Public	334.75	44.0	28.7	16	2.2%
Entertainment	353.15	40.5	27.9	12	4.3%
Personal & Domestic Services	220.64	36.9	25.6	5	.7%
Total	341.67	37.8	27.6	741	100.0%

Source: 1991 UK Census, 2% SAR's File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings and positive Cambridge Scale (CAM) score.

Table 19: British Born White Men Aged 42-64 in London, 1991

	NES SCORE	CAM SCORE	AGE		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	number	percent
industrial classification					
Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing	208.62	17.4	57.0	1	.2%
Energy & Water Supply Industries	317.10	29.2	50.5	11	1.7%
Mining & Metal & Chemical Processing	315.29	27.9	51.1	20	3.1%
Metal Goods, Engineering & Vehicle Industries	350.76	30.8	52.5	65	10.1%
Other Manufacturing Industries	391.26	37.7	52.5	51	7.9%
Construction	346.87	25.3	50.1	36	8.7%
Distribution	363.12	30.1	52.0	40	4.7%
Retail	316.01	30.1	53.6	31	4.8%
Catering	396.63	32.9	57.6	8	1.2%
Hoter & Other Accomodation	332.02	37.1	53.3	5	.5%
Repairs	329.84	27.7	52.9	8	1.2%
Transportation	287.25	22.6	49.9	62	9.6%
Post & Telecommunications	310.26	29.3	52.0	47	6.5%
Banking, Finance, Insurance, & Business Services	486.56	45.8	50.6	88	13.7%
Miscellaneous Public Admin	408.39	41.1	51.1	68	10.6%
Sanitary & Cleaning Services	272.64	27.0	51.1	19	3.0%
Education	431.22	56.0	52.4	30	4.7%
Health	285.43	37.5	53.6	14	2.2%
Other Services for Gen Public	457.18	53.7	53.1	14	2.2%
Entertainment	421.63	37.9	52.0	20	3.1%
Personal & Domestic Services	441.38	62.4	50.7	3	.5%
Total	2711.70	34.5	51.5	644	100.0%

Source: 1991 UK Census, 2% SAR's File. All figures limited to those with positive earnings and positive Cambridge Scale (CAM) score.