

Abstract

In this paper, I argue that racial discrimination is prevalent in employment and that jobseekers from different races and ethnicities experience discrimination in the US labor market. I argue that racial discrimination and stereotyping are the cause of the employment and wage gap between African Americans and White Americans. However, some people doubt the existence of racial discrimination in the US labor market because of protective laws such as the Civil Rights Act. This paper is important because it explores the social, economic, and political problem of racial discrimination in employment in the US. If job opportunities are unequal because of race, the ability to choose housing and access medical care are subsequently affected. I conclude that it is the federal government's responsibility to be more vigilant and involved in enforcing laws to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination in employment and other areas.

Do People from Different Races and Ethnicities Face Racial

Discrimination in Employment in the US?

As Nelson Mandela once said: “No one is born hating another person because of the colour of his skin, or his background, or his religion.” Racial discrimination can be simply defined as “unequal treatment of persons or groups on the basis of their race or ethnicity” (Pager & Shepherd, 2008, p.181). A key feature to consider in any definition of discrimination is behavior that is usually motivated by prejudice, stereotypes, or racism. It is a worldwide phenomenon that can result in depriving minorities from having fewer opportunities in terms of education, employment, housing, credit markets and healthcare. This institutional problem has existed for a long time in the United States. While it is not as overt and widespread as before the Civil Rights revolution, racial discrimination continues to prevail in the US society in forms that are subtle and more difficult to identify. In this paper, I argue that racial discrimination is prevalent in employment and that jobseekers from different races and ethnicities experience discrimination in the US labor market. This paper includes three main arguments, considers the view of people who question the prevalence of racial discrimination, and refutes some of their claims.

A particularly sensitive area of racial discrimination that has received a good deal of interest has focused on employment opportunities. The focus of racial discrimination in labor markets have been studied by researchers from economic, sociological, or psychological fields. They have tried to investigate the eventual relationship between employment opportunities and racial discrimination to explain the existing inequities between minorities and Whites. It has often been noticed that the gap in employment and wage is most of time the result of racial discrimination. As an example, African Americans face unemployment twice as much as Whites

(Pager, 2007). Stereotypes represent another factor susceptible to influence employers' decisions to hire. Misbeliefs about other cultures can lead employers to discriminate against people of a particular race because they attribute to them negative racial characteristics (Moss & Tilly, 2001). Racial discrimination has been denounced through the recruiting practices of employers. A number of studies have found employers engaging in discriminatory behavior when hiring employees. Employers have used some practices like taste-based discrimination or ethnic homophily. This practice consists of favoring one's own race when dealing with applicants (Neckerman & Kirschenman, 1991).

I also consider alternative positions of racial discrimination in the field of employment. These positions doubt the existence of racial discrimination in the US labor market because of protective laws such as the Civil Rights Act (Pager & Shepherd, 2008). Others claim the difficulty to really measure racial discrimination or even believe it is overrated arguing that other factors than race could affect people's employment opportunities. While these positions certainly have support, I show that the laws protecting against discrimination are not always respected and employers have a certain level of freedom and flexibility in the hiring process.

In addition to the previous alternative positions, the numerous methods used to investigate whether there is racial discrimination in employment or not have certainly their limitations. Nonetheless, these methods together have provided great insight into whether, how and when and to what extent racial discrimination impact American people from different races and ethnicities. This paper is an opportunity for the audience, whether they be informed and aware about the issue or not, to realize the seriousness of racial discrimination in employment.

Racial Discrimination Is the Cause of Wage and Employment Gap

One way for researchers to study discrimination is by investigating disparities in outcomes between groups of people. Statistical models used mostly by labor economists have identified systematic disparities between groups. More specifically, differences in wages are evidence of racial discrimination, which occurs, in this case, when companies pay equally qualified members of two races different rates for the same job (Pettigrew & Taylor, 2015). Therefore, the wage gap existing between Whites and minorities has brought researchers to analyze whether racial discrimination is the main cause.

Black Minority

According to Lang and Lehmann (2012), there has been a gap in earnings between the Black and White populations. This gap represents slightly over 20% for both part-time and full-time workers. Through a cross-temporal analysis of Black and White men from 1972 to 1994, Bobo et al. (1997) explained that this gap in income persists even when other factors of human capital, such as education, work experience, and skills, are adjusted and controlled in equations predicting income. In another study, Smith (2002) concluded that there is a concentration of racial minorities in lower levels of stability and authority jobs and with fewer opportunities for advancement. He further adds that Black men earn a significantly lower income in high authority positions. These findings agree with a previous study by Wilson et al. (1995) stating that discrepancies increase among Black men with higher levels of education.

There is not only a wage gap but also an employment gap between Blacks and Whites. As Lang and Lehmann (2012) report, the employment rate difference of Black and White men aged between 25 to 54 is 7.8% in 2008. The unemployment rate is higher for Blacks with a difference of 4.6%. Not only does the Black minority spend more time looking for a job (Tomaskovic et al., 2005), they also experience longer unemployment than Whites even when

factors like age and education are controlled (Wilson et al., 1995). This large Black-White unemployment gap is confirmed by Ritter and Taylor (2011) who also recognize that the gap can be partially explained by deficiencies in human capital as poorly educated people have higher rates of unemployment than those who are well-educated. However, the authors also argue that these characteristics in human capital account for only 15% to 25% of the gaps for 1960 through 1990. Newer numbers suggest that the employment ratio was 58.3% for Blacks versus 60.7% for Whites in 2018. Jobless rates are lower than previous years for African Americans but still higher than for any other race. Indeed, 6.5% of African Americans were unemployed in 2018 according to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019). This employment gap has been documented in many studies showing that African Americans have a disadvantage at the employment and unemployment levels.

In addition to the wage gap mentioned above, Nunley et al. (2015) wanted to investigate the employment gap between Black and White young college graduates and to what extent racial discrimination can explain this gap. Their experiment focuses on young college graduates to lessen the probability for employers to base their hiring decisions on the quality of experience. Their experiment, consisting of job seekers' resumes in which the race is signaled with Black and White sounding names, revealed that applicants with a Black sounding name received 14% less interview calls than their White counterparts. These employment differentials are true for jobs that require customer interaction.

Hispanic Minority and Other Races

Perceptions of discrimination are also common in the Hispanic minority. Indeed, Schiller (2004) argues that about 20% of Hispanics reported they had personally been ignored for a job or promotion because of their race or ethnicity. Furthermore, in a study by Kenney and Wissoker

(1994), Hispanic job seekers were found to be treated differently than the Anglo counterparts in terms of receiving a positive response when requesting to file an application, obtaining an interview and getting a job. Their unemployment rate was 4.7% in 2018 (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). Hispanics' unemployment rate is lower than the Black minority unemployment rate but still higher than that of the Whites.

For the most part, occupational data can represent an indicator of racial and ethnic labor market differences. It is more common to see Whites and Asians in higher positions. For example, 41% of employed Whites and 54% of employed Asians held managerial, professional, and related occupations compared with 31% of Blacks and 22% of Hispanics (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). Blacks and Hispanics are more likely to hold jobs in production, transportation, and material moving compared to Whites. It is important to note that racial discrimination against Asians is not well documented, probably because this minority group is less discriminated against in the labor market. Some reasons for this lack of research could be attributed to the "difficulty of sampling the small, numerous, and culturally distinct groups that comprise Asians in the United States" (McMurtry et al., 2019, p.1420). What can be noticed with this group is that they experienced consistent increases in participation rates in all the job categories from 1966 through 2013. Asian-Americans showed an increase of 10.13 percentage points in the Professionals category from 1.33% in 1966 to 11.46% in 2013. No research explains the motivation behind such increases.

Racial Stereotypes and Prejudice

Identifying the causes of racial discrimination is difficult as so many factors are involved at different levels. As far as stereotypes are concerned, they operate at the individual level since they are personal opinions and beliefs of a person about race. Stereotypes are essential for

researchers since they hold their own dynamic forces that may initiate discriminatory behaviors (Pager & Shepherd, 2008). The fact that people who form stereotypes are internally motivated makes it difficult to measure the extent to which they lead to discrimination in employment. However, stereotypes have a central place in the understanding of racial discrimination in the labor market (Quillian, 2006). Stereotypes are misbeliefs about other cultures that can lead employers to discriminate against people of a particular race because they attribute them with negative racial characteristics (Moss and Tilly, 2001). It seems, according to Pager (2007) and Pettigrew and Taylor (2005), that racial stereotypes are still common and appear to have changed little over the years despite the shift of racial beliefs toward more egalitarian beliefs. Some other groups might have stereotypes towards other groups but the majority of people in the US are White Anglo-Saxons and they are still more privileged than other minority groups.

One method that researchers have used to identify racial discrimination in employment has been through in-person interviews. For example, Kirschenman and Neckerman (1991) describe how employers admitted their avoidance of young, inner-city Black men when they search for low-wage workers. The interviewed employers were reported to be rather frank in the characteristics they gave to this group. "Lazy" and "unreliable" were among the words they used to describe the inner-city Black jobseekers (p. 213). Wilson et al. (1995) also report the disadvantage that African Americans have during interviews because of their body language and communication skills. Many Chicago employers view inner-city Black males as uneducated, unreliable, irresponsible, and dishonest. Moss and Tilly (2001) report similar perceptions of Black workers. Using a telephone survey of 8,000 managers in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles between 1992 and 1995, the authors found that 15 to 33% of the employers said that Blacks lack essential skills and motivation.

Although in-person interviews still help provide invaluable psychological insight into the causes of discrimination, Quillian (2006) pointed out that this method and in-depth studies of employers has serious limitations. These limitations exist because the employers engaging in discriminatory actions are not fully accurate in their responses and employers may fear legal action if they admit racial discriminatory behaviors.

A good amount of work has been conducted on the notion of prejudice. This term is defined by Lang and Lehmann (2012) as “a dislike” for other races and ethnicities based on a “preconceived” belief that is not founded on “reason or actual experience” (p.223). As Taylor and Pettigrew (2000) remark, there is a dual nature to this definition. Not only is there a negative feeling or dislike toward a specific group, but there is also a poorly established opinion or a stereotype about members of the specific group. As a result, prejudice is an attitude in people’s head that can be reflected in their behavior and ultimately motivate or lead to unequal treatments of minority racial groups.

These concepts of stereotypes and prejudicial behavior are psychological in nature. They brought researchers to distinguish between direct and indirect discrimination. Researchers also refer to this distinction as conscious and unconscious discrimination. Pettigrew and Taylor (2015) argue that people “who are conscious of their abetting racial discrimination are typically racially prejudiced” (p. 542). Their intentions of harming are explicit and regarded as justified. That said, many people who take part in racial discrimination are unaware of their behavior and just following the “group norms participating in the subtle forms of indirect discrimination” (p. 542). The authors mention that social psychologists view this attitude as a preference of the in-group without intention of harming the out-group.

This relationship between racial prejudice and racial discrimination may not be firm in this case, but racial discrimination still exists indirectly. As an example, many employers rely on word-of-mouth to hire new employees, especially for jobs that do not require skills. Therefore, current workers, often mostly Whites, create implicitly a disproportionate workforce by bringing in White friends and relatives to fill these jobs, contributing in turn to racial inequalities in employment. It is also worth noting that racial groups other than Whites, for example an Asian manager, have also their preferences when it comes to hiring and are most likely to refer people from their own race.

Recruiting Practices

Methods of job recruitment have a significant impact on minority job seekers. A great deal of research has tried to identify whether employers base their hiring decisions on race or not. The results of many experimental audit studies have consistently concluded the existence of racial discrimination in recruiting as well as a White preference (Pager, 2007). Recruitment by names, word-of-mouth, taste-based, and religious affiliation are some of the practices used by employers that lead to discriminatory behaviors.

Recruitment by Names

Employers can discriminate against certain job seekers. Discrimination can occur when employers decide to hire or not by examining job seekers' names. For example, in a study by Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004), identical resumes were mailed to employers in Boston and Chicago for help-wanted ads using racially identifiable names on purpose. Names like Lakisha and Jamal were used to signal African American names while names like Brad and Emily signaled White names. To decide which names are exclusively African American and which

names are typically White, the authors use name frequency and race-based data calculated from birth certificates of all newborns between 1974 and 1979 in Massachusetts.

This experiment showed significant racial differences in callback rates. While the study does not mention the race of the employers making the callbacks, applicants with African Americans names got far fewer callbacks for each resume they sent out to the firms. Applicants with White names need to send ten resumes to get a callback while applicants with African American names need to send 15 resumes. This situation shows a 50% gap in callback. In addition, a White name brings in the equivalent of an additional eight years of experience on a resume in callbacks. More importantly, in this experiment, race seems to affect the advantage of having a better resume. On the one hand, results indicated that White names with better resumes got 30 % more callbacks than White names with lower-quality resumes. On the other hand, high quality resumes with African American names had a small effect on callbacks. Therefore, the quality of the resume does not increase the chances for African Americans to be called for an interview.

In this study, the gap in callbacks between Blacks and Whites is attributed to the name manipulation since the resumes sent to employers were identical in qualifications. It is worth mentioning that the authors speculate that these results may be attributed to the non-examination of resumes with Black names by employers as they stopped from doing so after reading the name. Baert et al. (2013) bring further evidence to the bias against racially sounding names but this time in relation to labor market tightness. The authors explained that employers are willing to hire a minority applicant if they have difficulties filling vacancies. The results of their correspondence study show that applicants with a foreign name are equally called back for an interview compared to applicants with White names if the vacancies are difficult to fill.

However, if the job vacancies can be easily filled up, the applicants with a foreign name have to send twice as many applications.

Phenotype and Religious Affiliation

In an interesting study, Yemane (2020) attends to ethnic heterogeneity within racial groups. She also questions whether there is more to be considered than just race when investigating discrimination in the labor market. Furthermore, she adds religious affiliation as a factor capable of influencing hiring decisions. By using a correspondence method in which false jobseekers send job applications across 49 states in the US, the author aims to record employer's callbacks. The job applicants belong to 35 different ethnicities and have different religious backgrounds. Language and geographic migration were mentioned in their cover letters, except for African Americans and Whites and. The study shows a discrimination by ethnicity within the racial group. In other words, employers not only tend to discriminate because they perceive the applicants as African American, Hispanic, or Asian but also discriminate against different ethnic groups. This study also reveals how being Muslim and phenotypically non-White constitute "strong markers of otherness" (p. 9) that lead to bias. In addition, while Muslim affiliation or non-Whiteness is enough for some employers to engage in discriminatory behavior, discrimination against Muslims is greater than that of non-Whites.

In addition to the previous study, the possibility that religion can impact job opportunities in the US was also investigated by Wright et al. (2013). In their study, religious affiliation was signaled through student activities in the CVs. On the opposite side, students in the control group had no indication of any religious affiliation in their CVs. The results showed that applications indicating a Muslim affiliation were 24% less likely to be contacted at least once by either email or phone compared to the control group. In general, they also received 33% fewer total contacts

than did those from the control group. As a result, different ethnic and religious background are additional factors leading to racial discrimination.

Word-of-mouth Recruiting

Less explicit recruitment practices such as word-of-mouth are somehow accepted in the workplace. Such practices can contribute to unequal access to employment and advancement opportunities for minority job applicants (Quillian et al., 2017). Indeed, as mentioned above, as an implicit form of racial prejudice, word-of-mouth recruiting is the practice where employers fill job openings by asking for recommendations from other workers, other employers, or their own social networks. This practice tends to limit workers' racial, ethnic, and even gender diversification in the workplace.

Word-of-mouth recruiting happens inside the organization or networks. Therefore, the role of network in hiring practices are important as they are viewed as an efficient strategy for matching workers to employers with advantages for employers (McPherson et al. 2001). More specifically, networks matter not only for obtaining information and referrals for jobs, but also for being exposed to mentoring and relevant information that are essential for professional advancement opportunities (Grodsky & Pager, 2001). This kind of practice creates segregated social networks within an organization and contributes to the preservation of the existing organization's hierarchy.

The Civil Rights Act

Many specialists have argued that discrimination in the United States has decreased over time. Indeed, American society has changed in fundamental ways since the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. During this time, many social and legal reforms took shape eliminating the segregation era against African Americans (Heckman, 1998) and forbidding overt forms of

discrimination. Therefore, American society has been working towards reaching a color-blind society where racial minorities have henceforth acquired equal rights and opportunities with the White majority.

For some, racial discrimination is no longer the cause of unequal life opportunities for African Americans and Hispanics. According to Pager (2007), most White Americans believe that a Black person has equal opportunities at obtaining a job as an equally qualified White person. In addition, only about 30% believe that racial discrimination explains the disparities in jobs and housing between Whites and minorities. It is also evident that diversity has been endorsed by large companies that have modified their hiring practices accordingly. Some people further argue that the election of a Black president was a sign that the American society matured and left its dark history of slavery and segregation history behind it.

While some undeniable racial progress was achieved, these claims of a declining racial discrimination can be challenged. Some studies give evidence to the persistence of racial discrimination in key economic and social sectors. As an example, a recent meta-analysis by Quillian et al. (2017), provide strong evidence that racial discrimination in American society has hardly changed over the past 25 years, which seems to indicate that the ideal society free of discrimination is still to be achieved. In fact, while explicit forms of prejudice have sharply decreased, discrimination has become subtle and implicit. The meta-analysis study shows that rates of hiring discrimination have not changed over time for African Americans and that they remain clearly at a disadvantage at the point of hire compared with equally qualified Whites. The authors confidently conclude that these results, coming from 21 field experiment and audit studies, were statistically significant. As far as Latinos are concerned, conclusions about a

possible regression in hiring discrimination of Latinos were difficult to draw because of a small number of studies.

Since the adoption of reforms in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, most large organizations have tried to integrate programs to comply with antidiscrimination laws and promote diversity. As Kalev et al. (2006) have argued, some initiatives to reduce bias such as the diversity training have had little impact. Therefore, some of these programs may be more successful if they are in line with concrete goals and under the supervision and accountability of the organization's leadership.

Another relevant example of the persistence of racial discrimination even after major effort to contain it lies on the role of networks. Many researchers concluded that the effect of hiring workers through networks is detrimental to minorities or to groups that are not well represented in some organizations (Fernandez et al. 2000). Like McPherson et al. (2001) show it in their study, networks are more likely to keep the current racial composition of the organization because of referrals, a practice that is convenient for employers. For example, in a study of non-college jobs, Mouw (2002) observes that the use of employee referrals in firms where the racial composition is mainly White reduces the probability to hire a Black worker by nearly 75% compared to the use of newspaper ads. This referral situation is another factor that causes unemployment gap between Blacks and Whites.

Racial Discrimination Is Difficult to Measure

The people believing that racial discrimination is a thing of the past are not aware of the numerous methods used to measure it. It is evident that any method has its limitations but together they contribute to a better understanding of modern racial discrimination and most

importantly bring insights to whether, how, and to what extent there is discrimination in the labor market.

Formal discrimination claims from the courts, Fair Employment/Fair Housing Bureaus, and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) represent official records of discrimination. These records offer essential insights into the ways discrimination is performed and the kinds of legal actions taken accordingly in different contexts overtime (Pager & Shepherd, 2007). Of course, not all complaints are purely honest, but according to some specialists, the fake ones are insignificant compared with the cases of discrimination that are unreported or unnoticed (Tomaskovic-Devey et al., 2005). The analysis by Roscigno (2007) of thousands of employment and housing discrimination claims filed in the state of Ohio describe discriminatory behaviors and other more discrete or subtle forms of racial bias. All in all, these claims and reports constitute essential guides for action.

Experimental Approaches

It is difficult to measure whether race is the motivation behind discrimination in employment. As a result, experimental research has been a successful way to do measure discrimination. While some experimental studies have been conducted in the lab, most of them have been conducted in the field. This approach provides even better results than statistical models as they provide strong evidence of causal relationship (Quillian et al., 2017). Field experiments, also called audits, provide a concrete measure of discrimination in authentic settings. In this type of studies, testers are selected, trained, and sent to firms to play the role of a job seeker. The particularity of these audits resides in sending equally qualified people who

differ only by race. This way, it is possible for researchers to examine the extent to which race is a problem in employment opportunities.

Field experiments have their share of criticism as they are costly, difficult to implement, and limited to hiring decisions. Nevertheless, the results of the studies derived from this type of method have given a great deal of evidence and valuable insights to racial discrimination and employers' hiring practices (Pager, 2007). This method has a highly causal validity (Quillian et al., 2017) because the experimenter can manipulate the process and have control over many possible confusing variables. To sum up, field experimental research provides helpful insights on the issue of racial discrimination.

Factors Other Than Race Explain Employment Disparities

The literature on racial discrimination in employment has questioned the relevance of the race factor as the main cause of unequal outcomes. In fact, factors other than race can explain the unequal distribution of employment and wage. These factors can include education, work experience, skills and other structural changes in the economy (Heckman, 1998). While many researchers have acknowledged the importance of these factors, they do not explain why workers with equivalent skills do not necessarily have the same opportunities when it comes to being hired, trained, or promoted (Ritter & Taylor, 2008).

In an effort to examine racial discrimination in the workplace, economists and sociologists have assessed the relationship between racial and gross racial differential. While economists and sociologists attribute a portion of gross racial differential to qualification, they also found that the residual portion, not dependent on qualifications, education, or skills, is then presented as the result of discrimination (Kenney & Wissoker, 1998). Similarly, Quillian et al. (2017) analyzed a number of studies using pairs of testers from different races in an attempt to

explain this persisting gap. These pairs of testers are equal on all the determinants necessary for a job except race. Any difference existing in the outcomes between the testers provide a measure of discrimination. It can be concluded that audit studies are usually an effective way to measure the incidence of racial discrimination.

In addition to the use of audit studies, statistical studies have revealed inequalities between races even after accounting for human capital factors (Tomaskovic-Devey et al., 2005). Evidence from these studies suggest that African Americans spend more time looking for a job and experience less stable employment. As far as wages are concerned, statistical evidence explained the disparities between races by direct discrimination. For example, Cancio et al. (1996) stated that White men earn roughly 15% more than Blacks with similar qualifications. The same is true for White women who earned 6% more than comparable Black women. While factors such as education, motivation, or interpersonal skills may be taken into consideration to justify some of the employment and wage gap between Blacks and Whites, they do not explain why Blacks and Whites with obviously similar human capital characteristics face significantly different employment opportunities.

Conclusion

Racial discrimination is a worldwide phenomenon that can result in depriving minorities from opportunities in terms of education, employment, housing, and healthcare. More specifically, the labor market is a place where disparities among racial groups have always existed. The numerous studies of racial discrimination have brought evidence to the fact that racial discrimination is not over but has instead taken new forms that affect the equal chances to apply for a job, get an interview, or a gain promotion.

Racial discrimination has been the subject of interest of many researchers whether they be economists, sociologists, or psychologists. They have tried to investigate the eventual relationship between employment opportunities and racial discrimination to explain the existing inequities between minorities and Whites. Three main arguments support the claim of the existence of racial discrimination in employment. First, it has often been noticed that the gap in employment and wage is most of time the result of racial discrimination. As an example, African Americans face unemployment twice as much as Whites. Second, stereotypes represent another factor susceptible to influence employers' decisions to hire. Personal biases about a particular race affect employment outcome and contribute to racial disparities. Some studies suggest that employers base their judgements of candidates' soft skills on racial stereotypes. Third, racial discrimination has been denounced through the recruiting practices of certain employers. Indeed, a number of studies have found employers engaging in discriminatory behavior when hiring employees. Detecting African American or foreign sounding names and avoiding certain phenotype and religious affiliation along with informal hiring networks are discriminatory practices creating a social and economic disadvantage for minorities.

Other views of racial discrimination question the assertion that racial discrimination still exists in the US labor market. The United States, a country that was historically segregated, has tried to forget this era and work to achieve a color-blind society that treats all people equally. This initiative has brought to life the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s with many important reforms to neutralize racial discrimination in many aspects of racial minorities' lives. While it is not as overt and widespread as before the Civil Rights era, racial discrimination continues to prevail in the US society in forms that are subtle and more difficult to identify. Others claim the difficulty to really measure racial discrimination or even believe that factors other than race

could affect people's employment opportunities. Certainly, the numerous methods used to investigate whether there is racial discrimination in employment or not have their limitations. Nonetheless, these methods together have provided great insight into whether, how and when and to what extent racial discrimination impact American people from different races and ethnicities. Furthermore, research has found that even qualified minorities do not get equal job and career advancement opportunities.

Since the characteristic of the modern racial discrimination lies in its subtle nature creating an indirect form of discrimination, policy makers and company managers must strictly enforce and follow laws to combat discrimination. Such laws may bring equality between the different racial groups and improve the situation of ethnicities that face an economic disadvantage.

References

- Baert, S., Cockx, B., Gheyle, N., & Vandamme, C. (2013). *Do employers discriminate less if vacancies are difficult to fill? evidence from a field experiment*. St. Louis: Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis.
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991-1013.
- Bobo, L., Kluegel, G., & Smith, R. (1997). Laissez-faire racism: The crystallization of a kinder, gentler, anti-Black. In *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, ed Touch, S.A. & Martin, G.K. pp. 15-42. West port, CT.
- Fernandez, R.M., Castilla, E.J., & Moore, P. (2000). Social capital at work: Networks and employment at a phone center. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 105(5), 1288-1356.
- Grodsky, E. & Pager, D. (2001). The structure of disadvantage: individual and occupational determinants of black-white wage gap. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 542-567.
- Heckman, J.J. (1998). Detecting discrimination. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2), 101-116.
- Kalev A., Dobbin F., Kelly E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Diversity management and the remediation of inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589-917.
- Kenney, G.M., & Wissoker, D.A. (1994). An analysis of the correlates of discrimination facing young hispanic job-seekers. *American Economic Review*, 84(3), 674-683.
- Kirschenman, J. & Neckerman, K. (1991). We'd love to hire them, but ...: The meaning of race for employers. In Jencks, C. & Peterson, P.E. (Eds.), *The Urban Underclass* (pp. 203-234). Washington, DC: Brookings Inst.

- Lang, K., & Lehmann, J.K. (2012). Racial discrimination in the labor market: Theory and empirics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(4), 959-1006.
- McMurtry, C.L., Findling, M.G., Casey, L., Blendon, R., Sayde, J., Miller, C. (2019) Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of Asian Americans. *Health Services Research*, 54(2), 1420-1430.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415-444.
- Moss, P. & Tilly, C. (2001). *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill and Hiring in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mouw, T. (2002). Are black workers missing the connection? The effect of spatial distance and employee referrals on interfirm racial segregation. *Demography*, 39(3), 507-528.
- Nunley, J.M., Pugh, A., Romero, N., & Seals, Richard Alan, Jr. (2014). *An examination of racial discrimination in the labor market for recent college graduates: Estimates from the field*. Department of Economics, Auburn University, Auburn Economics Working Paper Series: AUWP 2014-06.
- Pager, D. (2007). The use of field experiments for studies of employment discrimination: Contributions, critiques, and directions for the future. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 609, 104-133.
- Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34(1), 181-209.
- Pettigrew, T.F. & Taylor, M. C. (2015). Discrimination: Racial. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 542-545.

- Quillian, L. (2006). New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32, 299-328.
- Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midtboen, A., H. (2017). Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(41), 1-6.
- Ritter, J.A., & Taylor, L.J. (2011). Racial disparity in unemployment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(1), 30-42.
- Roscigno, V.J. (Ed.). (2007). *The Face of Discrimination: How Race and Gender Impact Work and Home Lives*. Plymouth: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Smith, R.A. (2002). Race, gender, and authority in the workplace: Theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 509-542.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Thomas, M., & Johnson, K. (2005). Race and the accumulation of human capital across the career: A theoretical model and fixed-effects application. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 111(1), 58-89.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019, May 12). *Unemployment rate unchanged at 3.6 percent in May 2019*. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2019/unemployment-rate-unchanged-at-3-point-6-percent-in-may-2019>
- Wilson, F., Tienda, M. & Wu, L. (1995). Race and unemployment: labor market experiences of black and white men, 1968–1988. *Work and Occupations*, 22(3), 245–270.
- Wright, B., Wallace, M., Bailey, J., & Hyde, A. (2013). Religious affiliation and hiring discrimination in New England: A field experiment. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 34, 111-126.

Yemane, R. (2020). Cumulative disadvantage? The role of race compared to ethnicity, religion, and non-White phenotype in explaining hiring discrimination in the U.S. labour market. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 69, 3-11.