1-1-2013

Human Capital In The Context Of Race, Gender And Geography: How Does It Really Help To Get A Good Job?

Ian Palmer
Wayne State University,

HUMAN CAPITAL IN THE CONTEXT OF RACE, GENDER AND GEOGRAPHY: HOW DOES IT REALLY HELP TO GET A GOOD JOB?

by

IAN PALMER

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

2013

MAJOR: SOCIOLOGY (Labor)

Approved By:

_____

Advisor Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank David Fasenfest for his tireless effort in helping me improve my academic skills. I would also like to thank Heidi Gottfried for encouraging me in my graduate work as well as introducing me to gender studies. I would also like to thank Sarah Swider for listening to me and helping me to maintain my interest in the literature by discussing it with me. None of this would have been possible without these three exceptional academics. THANK YOU!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Literature Review	3
Data	9
Analysis	15
Appendices	20
Reference	34
Abstract	36
Autobiographical Statement	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics, for All Respondents 23

Table 2 Workforce Characteristics in the Region 24

Table 3 Demographic Characteristics, by Geography 25

Table 4 Demographic Characteristics, by Geography 26

Table 5 Demographic Characteristics, by Geography and Race 28

Table 6 Workforce Characteristics, by Geography and Race 29

Table 7 Demographic Characteristics, by Geography and Gender 31

Table 8 Workforce Characteristics, by Geography and Gender 32

Human Capital in the Context of Race, Gender and Geography:

How much does it Really Help to Get a Good Job?

Introduction

After the 1950's it was common place for children and adults to be told that if you went to college or were trained at a vocational school then you could secure a job that would provide you with a good wage/salary, benefits and stable employment. This remained true for a while but times have changed. Human capital appears to be no longer adequate to explain why some people get good jobs and others get bad jobs. Increasingly, a person's race, gender, class and geographical location seem to be better predictors for the type of jobs people secure.

Attending college is an investment made by a person into their own human capital. There is also an unwritten social agreement between the individual and society regarding higher education and skill training. That agreement states that a person who attends at least some post-secondary schooling will obtain employment that will provide an adequate wage/salary, provide benefits and stable employment. The responsibility the individual takes on is one that entails an investment of time and money, an investment that is directed-expended towards paying for school is supposed to be paid back in the future through wages and salaries. (Machin 2006)

The supply side argument above describes only one half of the equation of labor market outcomes. The other half, the demand side, determines what skills and what education are considered

valuable in a job search. Another important factor is the location of work, and the relationship of individuals to those locations—do they work near jobs, are those jobs accessible to a worker. For instance, during the 1950's the economic activity in Metropolitan Detroit was centered within the city's limits, primarily focused on the manufacturing of automobiles. As time passed the manufacturing and physical production of automobiles began to change. The big three began to expand and build plants further away from the city because land costs and taxes were lower. This contributed to the relocation of the middle and working class whites to the suburbs. The consequence of this transition created a major city with a dwindling population. Conversely, the suburbs increasingly became the primary place to live and work. The expansion of the regional highway system enabled more and more people to live and work outside of the City of Detroit, creating an inner core of few jobs and an increasingly poor, minority population. Capital moved from one place (Detroit) to another (the suburbs) (Harvey, 2000), those with the skills and resources followed. A major city that was built for millions upon a vibrant industry now has less than a million inhabitants who now have minimal access to jobs in the suburbs.

The next stage of the transition that Southeastern Michigan experienced was the transformation of the economy from the production off goods to a more intellectual property and services based economy. A general decline of US manufacturing followed as capital and jobs were moved to lower wage states, and then out of the country to Asia in part due to lower wages. To replace the loss of manufacturing in the US, and more specifically southeastern Michigan, more investments were made in research and development. This development in southeastern Michigan expanded beyond the car industry to include both high tech and defense industries, and is best illustrated by the creation of

Automation Alley in 1997 (see, http://automationalley.com). Automation Alley's purpose is to bring together government, academia and business in the pursuit of economic development.

Taken together, the decline of the City of Detroit, the increasing number of less skilled minorities living in a community with higher unemployment, the shift in both the nature of work and the labor force requirements, and the movement of jobs and people into the outlying suburban regions, all give rise to ask what accounts for the ability of the local residents to secure good paying jobs. Specifically, this research explores how the race, gender and location of a worker in relation to their human capital offers an understanding of the pattern of employment in a region in transition.

Geography

The location of a worker's residence is an important component in whether or not work can be found, and what kind one can secure. Spatial mismatch, long cited as a reason for persistent poverty among inner city residents who cannot find good paying jobs (Kain, 1968), argues that low-skilled and primarily non-white workers living in racially segregated communities in the inner city experience higher rates of unemployment. Several mechanisms for this result have been discussed (as summarized by Gobillon, Selod and Zenou, 2007). One explanation centers on the difficulty inner city workers have commuting to areas with higher paid work, and even if they get to the job the costs of the commute bring down the effective wage (see Wilson, 1997).

Another argument for this outcome is that poor inner-city residents do not have access to information or informal networks that would assist them in locating better paying jobs outside their community. The end result is that inner-city and primarily minority workers live in communities offering primarily low-skill low-paid work, in an environment of higher unemployment, cut off from

information flows that would facilitate finding better jobs. Rather, these workers must rely on local neighborhood networks and have little hope of these networks providing information about jobs elsewhere (see Granovetter 1995 for a discussion of the role of networks in job searches). These limited social ties and networks further impact of whether or not acquisition of the necessary skills and human capital will be of help in securing well-paid employment.

To assess the important of location and geography, this analysis compares the experience of workers living in the City of Detroit, a predominantly African-American city experience persistent poverty with those living outside of the city in the rest of the Southeast Michigan region.

Human Capital

Human capital is important to economic development, representing the skills, education and work experience that an individual possesses and determining in large part the kinds of jobs they find and their level of pay. (Becker1993) The base line for the amount of human capital that most people have in American society traditionally has been a high school diploma. Free public education through high school had been made available to anyone who wants it, and was mandatory through primary education. After high school an individual has the choice of adding to their human capital. This can be achieved by two distinctly different paths. One may decide to go to college/university and choosing a major that will net them a good job or simply to attend college/university for intellectual enlightenment. Both choices allow a person to gain human capital. The significant difference is the labor market value of the skills obtained. For instance, the less desirable skills deemed by the labor market are those that come from studying the humanities, while the more desirable education tends to come from math and science. As an alternative, others may decide to join the job market right out of

high school. This allows a person to gain job experience that can initially put them ahead of people who chose to go to college first. This can be viewed from a different perspective where as the college student obtains skills that the direct to work individual does not have the opportunity to learn.

An understanding of the value of human capital is key to understanding one's position, and is determined by a labor market (Sakamoto 1988, Hunter and Leiper 1993 and Gottfried 2006) that determines which education level, skill sets or work experience is valuable and which ones are not. This means that when an individual is planning for his or her future they are betting on types of education, skill and work experience. The fact that they have abided by the social contract and have attended school does not mean they will be granted a job right out of college. Instead, the individual is judged on how well they foresaw the skills they would obtain from a degree. In other words people who got to college are rewarded with a good job for choosing the degree that the labor market would fine most valuable.

The obtainment of skills is less restrictive than the obtainment of education. Skills are learned by either attending a vocational school (affordable) or working on the job. The obvious barrier here would be getting the job. This can sometimes be a question of whom you know or who your family knows. Historically this has been the way whites excluded Blacks and Hispanics. A class barrier does not exist here as it does in education. In fact, most skilled workers tend to come from lower class backgrounds. The reason for this is skilled workers tend to earn a middle class income. With that income they send their children to college so that they will not have to be employed as skilled workers. This means the only group that can replenish the ranks of the skilled workers is the lower class. (Sennett and Cobb 1972)

Skills in the labor market fair well as long as the job that utilizes them has not been automated or relocated overseas. They can be measured by a "certificate," but most times it is understood that a worker possesses them by the types of jobs she or he has worked at in the past. Skills and work experience are closely related. Since most skills are learned on the job, job experience is the most accurate way to evaluate a person's skills.

The main goal of obtaining valuable human capital is to get a "good" job. A good job is employment that is stable, pays a wage/salary (that allows a person to live off of) and benefits. (Sakamoto 1988, Hunter and Leiper 1993, Becker 1993, Gottfried 2006 and Tilly 1996) The labor market should be able to provide this for those individuals who are qualified because it is in a firm's best interest to provide such benefits to attract and retain quality employees. The various types of human capital that the labor market has shown that give this type of return on its investment are a bachelor's degree, those highly skilled and at least five years experience.

Most people would consider a "good" job to be a standard job and a "bad" job (or nonstandard) to consist of contract, temporary or part time work. Polivka, Cohany and Hipple (2000) found that part time workers, temps, and on-call workers were less educated then standard workers. This demonstrates that human capital has been the gate which people pass through in order to work in the standard labor market. In other words the more human capital a person has the greater their chances are of obtaining employment in the standard labor market. What happens if this is not true?

In preliminary analysis of the 2002 State wide Survey, I have found that nonstandard workers tend to have just as much education as standard workers. How can this be? All the literature supports that the more human capital a person has the more likely they are to have a job that pays a wage/salary

(that supports a person), is stable and provides benefits. There may be mediating factors at play that need to be looked at before we are sure that human capital is no longer a good predictor of a person's position in the labor market.

As mediating factors, race, gender and space are known to affect most social phenomena. It is known that they have an effect on human capital, especially regarding who gets to earn it and how they earn it. All three factors will effect a person's participation in the labor market and will have to be considered when we try to understand why human capital is no longer a reliable predictor of an individual's position in the labor market.

Manning Marable (1983) tells us that race will be an important determinant of a person's class position, and that starting in a lower class position will likely mean it will be reproduced inter-generationally. Restated, if a person is born white they are more likely to find themselves in a middle class or upper middle class family. African Americans are more likely to be born into a lower class family. This positioning determines the quality of human capital that someone can have access to. The white person growing up in a middle class family will be exposed to education that is suitable for maintenance of a middle class lifestyle, while the individual who is born into a lower class will receive the quality of education that maintains his or her position in society. Although some may disagree with the previous statement, I would challenge them to prove that lower class children are receiving the same education as middle class children. If lower class children were receiving such quality education, they would not remain within that class. Instead they would be more likely to go to college and take jobs that would provide an income that would move them up in the social strata.

The next mediating factor that needs to be addressed is gender. Gender interacts with human capital slightly different then race. Even though it still does have an antagonist in the white male, the relationship with class is not as explicit. Human capital is gendered. To elaborate, the types of human capital that the two genders are socially encouraged to earn are clearly different. For instance, the modern age old belief that women are better suited to perform tasks that involve caring, cooking, cleaning and creative pursuits. While men are suppose to engage in physical world performing tasks that require "brawn and smarts". Men are typically tasked by society to be skilled workers, laborers, managers and academics in the traditional sciences (i.e. math and science). This social distribution of the genders through the filter of human capital has caused an equal balance in the types of jobs that women and men have, however, it has also caused a significant wage gap between the two.

The wage gap is not only caused by the socialization of the genders it is also caused by plain and simple discrimination. Heidi Gottfried (2006) and Rose and Hartmann (2004) have found that women who have an equal amount of human capital to men are still paid less than men. There is no eloquent rationalization or justification for such blatant discrimination. In addition, women tend to perform labor that is not accounted for in their wages or is recognized as work by society. An example of this disparity is a mother of two who works full time outside the house not only does she perform her job, she is required to care for her children and maintain a household. This requires time and attention well beyond forty hours per week. Unfortunately she is paid actual wages for only the forty hours a week she works. Yes she may have a husband who helps around the house, but it is well known that this is not the norm. In her job, because she is a woman, she is looked to as someone who exhibits with female qualities. A woman in the work place is expected to be nice, polite, empathetic and caring. She can rarely if ever expect to be paid more because she brings these qualities to work.

Male counterparts are not expected to bring those qualities to the work place. In fact, if they do display what society considers being female behaviors he will probably not be on the path for future promotion.

Populations tend to locate around economic activity and the more economic activity going on in an area the greater the size of the population (Harvey 2000). When manufacturing moved outward to the suburbs and then waned in its significance, capital was able to invest in research and development. This meant that the population that had relocated out of the city could remain in the suburbs. It also meant that the change in focus to higher tech would attract people with more education and higher skill sets. This leaves the city of Detroit with a lower skilled and less educated population in a city that grew to accommodate twice the size of the population that it currently has.

Data

The data for this thesis comes from a random telephone survey of Southeastern Michigan residents conducted by the Center for Urban Studies over a number of years; for consistency of information this research is based on the results from 2002. I have limited my study to respondents from Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Claire, Washtenaw, Wayne (separated into those not living in Detroit and those in the City of Detroit proper). The data were further reduced to respondents who were in the labor force (either currently employed—including those indicating they were momentarily absent from work--or self-employed) at the time of the survey. This research is only focused on the regional differences in the workforce experience of workers partitioned by race and sex.

The total weighted sample population of employed workers for the Metropolitan Detroit area is 2,040,691. Of which the suburbs account for 1,606,912 and Detroit accounts for 433,779. The

number of women in Metro Detroit is 975,957 or about 48% of the population. The number of women in the suburbs is 745,180 or 46%. Detroit has 230,778 women or 53% of the population. Women are clearly over represented in the city and underrepresented in the suburbs compared to the population as a whole. The number of nonwhites in Metropolitan Detroit is 601,411 or 29.5%. The majority (65%) of nonwhites in Metro Detroit reside in the city of Detroit (392,271). The majority (97%) of whites in Metro Detroit reside in the suburbs. As you can see from the numbers the racial demographics is not evenly spaced amongst the Metropolitan Detroit Region.

Research Question

1) Are non-whites will more likely find temporary work than their white counterparts?

2) Are women more likely to be represented in the temporary workforce than men?

3) Does geographic area (Detroit versus the rest of the region) determine the overall distributed of the labor force with respect to race and gender?

4) Does human capital explain the pattern of temporary employment by race, gender and geography?

Variables

Temporary work- Temporary work can be defined in two ways. The first one is that the worker is employed by a temporary agency and is then sent out to work for companies but is truly employed by the temp agency (Negrey 1993, Hatton 2011, Estevao and Lach 2000, Rogers 2000). The second type of temporary worker is a worker who is hired directly by company but is not considered a full

employee. Temporary work is considered to be a part of the contingent labor market because it is non-standard work. That means that it is not regular/permanent employment.

Temporary employment has grown significantly in the United States since 1982, when 0.5 percent of the workforce was employed in temporary work. This has increased six times since then (Hatton 2011). In 2000 the temporary labor force made up 3% of total jobs in the national work force (Uchitelle 2001: 11). Erin Hatton (2011) writes that the share of workers in the temporary work force is going to continue to grow. The temp agency has been able to insert its self into the employee employer relationship by marketing itself as a cost effective tool that can hire qualified workers and keep these workers off the payrolls of the client company. This cuts down on human resource department budgets as well as on the cost of benefits to the employees.

The data have been organized around key concepts that help explore the question of who gets good jobs and where do they live. They include:

Gender- defined by the interviewer who thinks the voice on the phone sounds male or female. The use of gender in thesis analysis will allow me to see if previous literature is correct in terms of Metro Detroit. I am also expecting there to be a greater proportion of women from the city making up the temporary workforce than women from the suburbs. The following variables interaction with gender will explain this and I will discuss it further in my analysis section.

Race- is self-reported by asking the respondent's primary race. I then reduced to racial groups down to two (Non-white and White) so that the descriptive analysis would be more robust. I anticipate finding that women make up a greater proportion of the temporary workforce then is there proportion in the population as a whole. As has been written previously there is a

dramatic racial difference in geographic areas in Metro Detroit. Most expectations when looking at temporary labor verses regular labor will be affected by geography here, however I do expect that nonwhites in the suburbs will be over represented in the temporary workforce per their proportion of the suburban population. The reverse is not true. Whites will not make up a larger percentage of the temporary workforce in the city. The previous and later statements do not happen in vacuum; rather it takes the interaction with other variables in order to fully understand what is happening in Metro Detroit.

Age- is measured by the response to the question "How old were you at your last birthday?" Ages in categorized into four groups: 18-24 year olds (most people in this age group are enrolled in school/vocational training or are just beginning to work); 25-34 year olds (those persons are starting their careers or just completing their education); 35-54 year olds (the period of peak earnings); and finally, 55 and older (reflecting those at the end of their careers or preparing for retirement). I anticipate that a majority of the temporary workforce will fall within the two youngest age categories. Adults just out of high school tend to work in temporary jobs. One reason is that they lack the skills required to work in more advanced job and two they tend only need a job when they are out of school. I include the second age category here because some adults may stay in school longer perhaps attending grad school.

Education- is measured by asking a respondent what degree have they earned. I have made the following categories: Less than High school, High school/equivalent, some college, Associates, Bachelor's and Graduate. I expect the first three categories to have respondents that are temporary workers than the last three. I also expect that there will be more bachelors and graduate degrees in the suburbs than in the city. I posit that most temporary workers are going

to have a high school diploma or less. The majority of temporary jobs do not require significant amounts of schooling. If they did have this requirement workers would probably be paid better than they are. The higher the education of a person the more likely they will want to work in a regular full time position with steady pay and benefits. Temporary jobs do not offer this kind of compensation.

Computer Skills- is measured by asking respondents seven questions varying from "do you use a computer" to being able to use particular types of computer software related to business. I added these questions together and reported the mean, median, standard deviation and the range. Most respondents that work in temporary jobs are going to have the same amount of computer skills as the mean. Most jobs are located in the office environment these days. These jobs require computer knowledge. This may be one of the few variables I expect there to be little difference between temporary workers and regular employment.

Personal Income- is measured categorically. Respondents were asked if they made more or less than $30,000. The interviewer then asked them a series of categories to pinpoint where each respondent fit in a more nuanced ordinal scale. The categories are as follows: Below $20,000; $20,000-$29,999; $30,000-$39,999; $40,000-$49,999; $50,000-$74,999 and $75,000 and above. The expectation here is that most temporary workers are probably going to be in the first two categories. I anticipate that most temporary workers will earn in the bottom two income categories (below $20,000 and $20,000-$29,999). The lack of education that is required to work a temporary job means that they will be paid less. This is simple supply and demand. There a large number of people who have educations at the high school level or below. This type of education is less valued than some college or a bachelor's degree.

Occupation-is measured by asking a respondent to situate their occupation relative to the following employment categories: Manager, Business Professional, Medical/Education, Supervisor, Skilled/Manual Labor, Clerical Administrative, Operative and Sales/Service. I expect there will be temporary workers in all categories but will be heavily represented among those in the sales and service. These two categories require the least amount of education and skill.

Work Tenure for Temps-is measured by asking respondents who are temporary workers how long they have had their current job. I broke the distribution in five employment tenure groups as follows: less than one year, 1-2 years, 3-4 years 5-6 years and 7 or more years. I expect that work tenure for temps will be low. Temporary means that they are used when there is a sudden need or a lack of funds to hire regular employees. I suspect that there may be some temp workers who work at a job for more than year, but the majority will probably work for less than a year.

Mean Hours Worked at Main Job- is measured by asking how many hours respondents worked at their main job. I anticipate regular workers to work more hours than temp workers on average, who tend to work part time.

Mean Hours Worked at an Additional Job- is measured by asking how many hours workers worked at job outside their main job. Temporary workers are expected to have greater mean hours worked at an additional job, for two reasons. The first is most temp jobs do not pay a high enough salary or wage if that is their only job. Second, most temporary jobs are not going to be full time. Workers in more secure workforce positions will earn a wage or salary that will

reduce the need to work at another job, and they will probably work more than full time hours if possible, rather than look to work a second job.

Job Type- is measured by whether a respondent reports they work full-time or part-time. There will be more jobs as a whole that are full-time, though I anticipate that temporary workers will more likely be working at part time jobs. Most employers, if they are going to hire temporary workers, will do so on a part time basis because that reduces wage and benefit costs. Employing temporary workers full time may be a form of intimidation by threatening the jobs of permanent workers—but that is beyond the scope of this analysis.

Work Related Stress- is measured by whether a respondent said yes or no to a question asking them if they experienced work related stress. Temporary workers, I am positing, will experience greater amounts of work related stress for three reasons: because their work is precarious and they never know when they will be let go or placed in another job; because temporary workers tend to have to work more than one job in order to survive economically; and because the type of jobs that temps are likely to find are not very fulfilling, requiring workers to battle boredom and feelings of inadequacy.

Analysis

The majority of temp workers in Southeastern Michigan during 2002 were men (55%) (Table 1). When the region is split up between the city of Detroit and the suburbs I find that women make up 63% of the temporary workers in Detroit while in the suburbs they only account for 40.1% of temp workers (Table 2). An unexpected finding is that in 2002 women are not the primary temp workers. Most of the research presented in this paper shows that women tend to be temp workers.

Since the basic layers of analysis are not following the prescribed outcomes let's look further into the data to see what types of jobs women are working as temps, how much are they earning and what their tenure is at temporary jobs. Female temporary workers from the city of Detroit tend to work in sales and service (41.8%) occupations and at clerical/administrative (26.1%) (Table 4). Their counterparts in the suburbs share a different patter of change between years. In 2002 women who lived in the suburbs and worked at temporary jobs tended to have occupations in the clerical/administrative (45.1%) and business professional (28.5) sectors of the economy (Table 4). They did differ depending on where they lived as to which jobs they held.

To get a clearer picture of women working in the temp industry it would be best to look at how race played a role. A hundred percent of whites who lived in the city of Detroit and worked as temporary workers were female (Table 5). Nonwhite women make up 59% of the female temporary workforce in the city of Detroit during 2002 (Table 5). There is another significant change in race based on gender when the suburban temporary labor force is looked at. In 2002 white female temp workers living in the suburbs accounted for 49.1% of the white temporary work force living in the suburbs (Table 7). Nonwhite females living in the suburbs, working temporary jobs did not change their proportion of the nonwhite population who work temp jobs during 2002 (23.6%) very much (Table 7). The gist of all this is that if you are a white temporary worker who lives the city of Detroit it is more than likely you are a female.

As gender was an important intersectional variable to use to look at how the temporary work force is arranged in Southeastern Michigan so too will race be important to look at. Regionally nonwhites make up 47% of the temporary work force while they are only 26.3% of the entire labor force (Table 1). When another layer is peeled away and the region is divided into city and suburbs,

race takes on a new meaning. Whites represent 10.6% of all workers who live in the city of Detroit, while nonwhites represent 89.6% (Table 5). Nonwhites take an even greater majority when temporary workers are severed from the entire work force. They represent 92.5 percent of temp workers who live in the city (Table 5). The suburbs on the other hand have a different story to tell. Nonwhites residing in the suburbs make up 12% of the entire labor force (Table 5), and in 2002 nonwhites account for 35.2% of temporary workers (Table 5). There were no significant fluctuations in any other part of the labor force so this is a question that needs to be answered.

One pursuit of an answer of the question above is to look at how gender and race interact in place and in the temporary work force. Nonwhite males living in the city of Detroit make up a 100% of the male temporary laborers (Table 7). Nonwhite female residents of the city make up 88% of the female temporary work force (Table 7). Nonwhite women occupy significantly less of the proportion of temporary workers residing in the suburbs. Nonwhite men represent 45% of suburban males who reside in the suburbs and work in the temporary industry in 2002 (Table 7). To put these numbers into context, nonwhite males make up 14.1% of all male laborers in 2002.

A further look into how race is organized in the temporary labor force leads us to look at occupation, tenure at temp jobs and income. A 100% of white residents of the city of Detroit work in the sales/service sector of the temporary economy (Table 6). Nonwhite residents of the city who are temporary workers tend to work in sales/service occupations in 2002 (37.6%) (Table 6). Nonwhite residents of the suburbs tend to hold managerial (52.7%) types of temporary jobs (Table 6). In 2002 white residents of the suburbs are almost evenly dispersed among business professional (26.8%), clerical/admin (22.1) and sales/service (29.7%) temporary occupations (Table 6).

Most nonwhite residents of Detroit tend to have been at their current temporary job for less than a year while white residents of the city that work temp jobs are more likely to have been at their current job for 1-4 years (Table 6). In 2002 nonwhite suburbanites were more than likely to have held their current temporary job for less than one year (74%) just like their city counterparts (Table 6). Suburban white temporary workers tended to hold their job for less than a year (37.1%) while suburban nonwhites typically held their current temporary job for one to two years (Table 6).

Discussion

The data shows that nonwhites are more likely than whites to work in the temporary economy. In fact nonwhite temporary workers accounted for almost twenty one percent above their proportion of employed workers in metro Detroit in 2002. The answer to the first research question is yes nonwhites to account for greater percentage of temporary workers than whites do.

The second research question was focused on gender and if women were more likely be temporary workers than men. This was found to be false. Men had a 1.3% increase from their proportion of the population while women had a 1.3% decrease in the proportion of temporary workers.

Geography does not have a clear effect on the distribution of temporary workers by gender. In 2002 women living in the city of Detroit accounted for a 12.3% increase in their proportion of the temporary work force compared to the overall proportion of employed workers, female residents of the suburbs were under represented in the temporary work force (Table 3). 2002 so far looks like there is an affect by geography but as has been true so far.

As discussed previously nonwhites are more likely to work as temporary workers than whites. Let's see if residence has any effect on this. Nonwhites in 2002 account for 92.5% of temp workers in Detroit (Table 3). This is a 3.1% increase from their overall proportion of the population. The increase multiplies when suburban nonwhites are looked at. Nonwhite suburbanites account for 35.2% of temporary workers while they make up 11.8% of all workers (Table 3). This is a 23.4% increase. Nonwhites account for 92.5% of temporary workers in the city of Detroit, while nonwhites represent 89.4% of all workers (Table 3). The trend continues into the suburbs, where nonwhites account for 11.8% of all workers and they represent 15.4% of the population (Table 3). This is almost a 100% increase. Geography does not explain the distribution of workers by race clearly enough because in both locations nonwhites represented a greater proportion of the temporary workforce then they did all workers.

In regards to question four, the data show that in 2002 both the city and the suburbs saw increase in representation in the temporary workforce based on education in the following categories: Less than high school, high school and some college, whereas the other education categories had decreases in their representation in the temporary work forces. What this all means is geography is not an important indicator of placement in the temporary workforce when education is brought into the picture. Education seems to be a better variable to explain the distribution of workers in the labor force. I had the expectation that lower the amount of education a person has the more likely they will work in the temporary labor force.

Looking at race and education, I find that in 2002 nonwhite residents were only over represented in the temporary work force if they had less a high school education; otherwise they experienced decreases in all other education categories (Table 5). Whites in 2002 who lived in Detroit

were over represented in the temporary workforce if they had less than a high school education (Table 5). The stats change when I look at the suburbs. In 2002 I found that nonwhites were over represented in their education category for the temporary work force if they had less than high school or some college (Table 5). Whites had an over representation in the temporary workforce for those respondents who had at least a high school/equivalent diploma or less (Table 5).

Race and human capital have shown to have an effect on a respondent working a temporary job. Whites had two education categories for which they were represented in less than high school and high school (Table 5). Nonwhites experienced over representation in the following education categories: less than high school, high school, some college, an associates and graduate degree (Table 5). Geography did not have a significant role in the interaction of race and human capital. Whites maintained their over representation in the temporary work force if they only had a high school diploma. Geography had no effect on nonwhites because in both geographies a type of college education was over represented for nonwhite temporary workers.

Gender is the final part of research question to be analyzed and it has some interesting outcomes. In 2002 female residents of Detroit experienced 3 education categories that had increases in their proportion of respondents who worked in the temporary work force (Table 7). This ranged from some college to less than a high school diploma. Male residents of Detroit in 2002 only experienced two proportion increases for education categories; Bachelor's and high school/equivalent (Table 7). Both genders living in the suburbs experienced two proportional increases in their representation of certain educational categories (Table 7). Women experienced increases in high school and Bachelor's, while men experienced increases in less than high school and some college (Table 7).

This study did not find what it was looking for in regards to geography and human capital. I had set out on the premise that geography could possibly be a replacement for inequality intersectionality. Metropolitan Detroit is so segregated by race and class I believed it would show up in the data. However the data was not clear explaining geography. It definitely showed that if a respondent is not white they are more likely to be a temporary worker especially if they live in the suburbs.

There were some flaws with this analysis. One of them was use of descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics are handy but they are not able to draw any real relationship. I tried using logistic regression in a previous version but the variables did not behave like they should have. One reason it might have failed is the data was entered or merged correctly in the past. There was not enough time to go through each survey and input it by hand. A deep descriptive analysis was all I had in my quantitative tool box to use on data that was suspect.

Another flaw in this research was not having a variable asking a respondent where they worked. If this was available I would have truly been able to see if geography had an effect on the distribution of the labor force. I had to analyze from the aspect of residency instead of being able to look at residency and location of employment. The addition of this type of variable in the future would be interesting. I would suspect that most temporary work performed in the suburbs is performed by residents of Detroit.

The final flaw to be discussed is the lack of a robust human capital variable. I attempted to use education and computer skill but computer skill did not change between geography, race or gender. That is why I did not report it. In the future I would like to use a more varied set of skills. It would

have been helpful if I had a variable that measured communication skills, management skills, and tenure for all workers. Relying solely on education does not give the full spectrum of human capital.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics, for All Respondents versus Temporarily Employed Respondents, 2002. Percentages (Ns') are weighted

	2002	
	All	Temporary
Gender		
Female	46.3 (851,873)	45 (52,900)
Male	53.7 (989,301)	55 (64,692)
Race		
White	73.7 (1,342,526)	52.8 (61,785)
Non-White	26.3 (479,911)	47.2 (55,135)
Age		
18-24	9.8 (181,303)	44.5 (52, 379)
25-34	26.4 (485,575)	19.8 (23,292)
35-54	54.8 (1,009,804)	26.1 (30,726)
55 or older	8.9 (164,492)	9.5 (11,194)
Education		
LT HS	2.5 (45,283)	15.8 (18,565)
HS	36.3 (649,361)	40.3 (47,212)
Some College	7.2 (128,994)	16.8 (19,626)
Associates	11.2 (201,213)	3.1 (3,589)
BA	27.3 (487,624)	19.1 (22,381)
Grad Degree	15.5 (276,680)	4.9 (5,785)

Table 2: Workforce Characteristics in the Region, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondents, 2002. Percentages (Ns') are weighted

	2002	
	All	Temporary
Computer Skills		
Mean	4.4	3.7
Median	5	4
s.d.	1.7	1.3
Range (0-7)	8	8
Personal Income		
Below $20,000	46 (87,142)	52 (4,941)
$20-$29,999	16.4 (31,129)	0
$30-$39,999	11.3 (21,706)	16 (1,547)
$40-$49,999	3 (5,017)	0
$50-$74,999	8 (15,036)	0
$75,000 Plus	15.3 (29,037)	32 (3,083)
Occupation		
Manager	14.3 (230,228)	17.3 (18,804)
Bus Professional	20.1 (323,395)	16 (17,323)
Med/Education	20 (320,653)	5.4 (5,820)
Supervisor	6.7 (106,855)	7.3 (7,886)
Skill/Manual	13.4 (215,257)	4.8 (5,175)
Clerical/Admin	9.9 (158,416)	18 (19,555)
Operative	2.7 (43,227)	0
Sales/Service	12.9 (207,109)	31.3 (34,040)
Work Tenure for Temps		
Less Than 1 yr		47.9 (56,284)
1-2 years		30.6 (35,983)
3-4 years		5.5 (6,423)
5-6 years		1.8 (4,302)
7 years or more		14.3 (16,789)
Mean Hours worked at additional jobs	15.6	9.9
Mean Hours worked Main	41.6	32.3
Job Type		

Full-time	81.4 (1,369,738)	39.5 (38,292)
Part-time	18.6 (313,558)	60.5 (58,543)

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics, by Geography, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002. Percentages and (Ns') are weighted

	2002			
	Detroit		Suburbs	
	All	Temporary	All	Temporary
Gender				
Female	50.7 (177,356)	63 (15,788)	45.2 (674,517)	40.1 (37,113)
Male	49.3 (172,243)	37 (9,267)	54.8 (817,058)	59.9 (55,426)
Race				
White	10.6 (36,150)	7.5 (1,826)	88.2 (1,306,376)	64.8 (59,960)
Non-White	89.4 (305,884)	92.5 (22,557)	11.8 (174,027)	35.2 (32,579)
Age				
18-24	12.1 (42,323)	45.1 (11,288)	9.3 (138,980)	44.4 (41,092)
25-34	31.6 (110,315)	26 (6,522)	25.1 (374,960)	18.1 (16,770)
35-54	47.9 (167,380)	24.3 (6,093)	56.5 (842,424)	26.6 (24,633)
55 or older	8.4 (29,281)	4.6 (1,151)	9.1 (135,211)	10.9 (10,043)
Education				
LT HS	3.1 (10,711)	9.4 (2,320)	2.4 (34,572)	17.6 (16,245)
HS	43.1 (147,096)	63.1 (15,526)	34.7 (502,265)	34.2 (31,686)
Some College	9.2 (31,438)	10 (2,471)	6.7 (97,556)	18.5 (17,155)
Associates	14.8 (50,492)	2.3 (576)	10.4 (150,721)	3.3 (3,013)
BA	18.7 (63,844)	12.4 (3,055)	29.3 (423,780)	20.9 (19,326)
Grad Degree	11 (37,624)	2.7 (672)	16.5 (239,056)	5.5 (5,113)

Table 4: Demographic Characteristics, by Geography, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002. Percentages and (Ns') are weighted

	2002			
	Detroit		Suburbs	
	All	Temporary	All	Temporary
Computer Skills				
Mean	4.3	3.6	4.4	3.9
Median	4	4	5	4
s.d.	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.2
Range(0-7)	8	8	8	8
Personal Income				
Below $20,000	47.3 (22,194)	76.2 (4,941)	45.7 (64,948)	0
$20-$29,999	26.5 (12,427)	0	13.3 (18,702)	0
$30-$39,999	12.9 (6,071)	23.8 (1,547)	11 (15,634)	0
$40-$49,999	6.8 (3,195)	0	1.2 (1822)	0
$50-$74,999	5.1 (2,321)	0	8.9 (12,715)	0
$75,000 Plus	1.4 (672)	0	19.9 (28,365)	100 (3,083)
Occupation				
Manager	10.9 (32,102)	8.6 (1,649)	15.1 (198,126)	19.2 (17,155)
Bus Professional	14.2 (41,661)	10.8 (2,062)	21.5 (281,734)	17.1 (15,260)
Med/Education	22.5 (65,996)	11.9 (2,285)	19.4 (254,657)	4 (3,535)
Supervisor	8.3 (24,436)	3 (576)	6.3 (82,419)	8.2 (7,310)
Skill/Manual	18.2 (53,358)	12.4 (2,367)	12.3 (161,898)	3.1 (2,808)
Clerical/Admin	7.3 (21,519)	14.8 (2,830)	10.4 (136,897)	18.7 (16,725)
Operative	2.8 (8,082)	0	2.7 (35,145)	0
Sales/Service	15.8 (46,524)	38.5 (7,377)	12.2 (160,585)	29.8 (26,663)

Table 4: Demographic Characteristics, by Geography, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002 (con't). Percentages and (Ns') are weighted.

	2002			
	Suburbs			
	All	Temporary	All	Temporary
Work Tenure for Temps				
Less Than 1year		48.4 (12,121)		47.7 (44,163)
1-2 years		30.4 (7,614)		30.6 (28,368)
3-4 years		9.8 (2,459)		4.3 (3,964)
5-6years		0		2.3 (2,114)
7 years or more		11.4 (2,860)		15.1 (13,929)
Mean Hours worked additional jobs	18.4	19.6	15.1	8
Mean Hours worked Main	41	32.1	41.8	32.4
Job Type				
Full-time	85.1 (259,133)	32.3 (7,420)	80.6 (1,110,605)	41.8 (30,872)
Part-time	14.9 (45,417)	67.7 (15,538)	19.4 (268,141)	58.2 (43,005)
Work Related Stress	48 (154,438)	24.9 (6,245)	52.2 (743,561)	18.4 (17,016)

Table 5: Demographic Characteristics, by Geography and Race, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002. Percentages and (Ns') are weighted.

	2002							
	Detroit				Suburbs			
	All		Temporary		All		Temporary	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Gender								
Female	50.2 (18,150)	51.8 (158,534)	100 (1826)	58.9 (13,290)	45.1 (589,452)	44.4 (77,185)	49.1 (29,424)	23.6 (7,689)
Male	49.8 (18,000)	48.2 (147,350)	0	41.1 (9,267)	54.9 (716,924)	55.6 (96,842)	50.9 (30,536)	76.4 (24,889)
Age								
18-24	5.8 (2,086)	12.2 (37,384)	76.2 (1,391)	43.9 (9,897)	8.7 (114,016)	13.2 (22,928)	49.7 (29,817)	34.6 (11,274)
25-34	27.5 (9,930)	32.4 (99,036)	0	28.9 (6,522)	24.2 (316,316)	33.7 (58,644)	21 (12,621)	12.7 (4,149)
35-54	52.3 (18,895)	47.9 (146,562)	23.8 (435)	22.1 (4,986)	57.9 (756,892)	46.9 (81,624)	12.5 (7,478)	52.7 (17,155)
55 or older	14.5 (5,239)	7.5 (22,901)	0	5.1 (1,151)	9.1 (119,152)	6.2 (10,831)	16.8 (10,043)	0
Education								
LT HS	3.3 (1130)	3.2 (9581)	50 (695)	7.2 (1,625)	2 (24,813)	5.6 (9,759)	18.9 (11,313)	15.1 (4,932)
HS	50.3 (17,460)	42.2 (126,085)	50 (695)	65.7 (14,830)	35.4 (448,640)	31 (53,624)	44.8 (26,848)	14.9 (4,838)
Some College	4.5 (1,565)	9.6 (28,732)	0	11 (2,471)	5.2 (65,639)	18.5 (31,916)	0	52.7 (17,155)
Associates	1.3 (435)	16.7 (50,057)	0	2.6 (576)	10.5 (132,408)	9.4 (16,277)	5 (3,013)	0
BA	12.5 (4,352)	19.2 (57,291)	0	13.5 (3,055)	29.8 (37,724)	25.1 (43,415)	22.8 (13,673)	17.4 (5,654)
Grad Degree	28.2 (9,791)	9.1 (27,161)	0	0	17.2 (217,321)	10.3 (17,827)	8.5 (5,113)	0

Table 6: Workforce Characteristics, by Geography and Race, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002. Percentages and (Ns') are weighted.

	2002							
	Detroit				Suburbs			
	All		Temporary		All		Temporary	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Computer Skills								
mean	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.6	4.4	4.7	3.8	4.6
median	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
s.d.	1.7	1.9	0.0	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.2	0.8
Personal Income								
Below $20,000	50.0 (695)	45.3 (19,850)	38.1	73.3 (4,245)	42.3 (48,985)	66.9 (12,838)	0.0	0.0
$20-$29,999	0.0	28.4 (12,427)	0.0	26.7 (1,547)	15.2 (15,895)	0.0	0.0	0.0
$30-$39,999	0.0	13.8 (6,071)	0.0	0.0	11.5 (14,130)	7.8 (1,504)	0.0	0.0
$40-$49,999	50.0 (695)	5.7 (2,500)	0.0	0.0	1.1 (1,184)	3.4 (638)	0.0	0.0
$50-$74,999	0.0	5.3 (2,321)	0.0	0.0	7.6 (9,459)	16.9 (3,256)	0.0	0.0
$75,000 Plus	0.0	1.5 (672)	0.0	0.0	22.3 (24,343)	4.9 (939)	100.0 (3,083)	0.0
Occupation								
Manager	8.1 (2,142)	11.5 (29,960)	0.0	9.3 (1,649)	14.3 163,337)	19.7 (30,881)	0.0	52.7 (17,155)
Business/ Professional	16.7 (4,399)	13.9 (36,311)	0.0	11.6 (2,062)	22.4 (256,361)	16.2 (25,373)	26.8 (15,260)	0.0
Med/Education	34.8 (9,167)	21.0 (54,907)	0.0	9.1 (1,613)	19.6 (223,951)	17.0 (26,734)	3.6 (2,031)	4.6 (1,504)
Supervisor	6.8 (1,782)	8.7 (22,654)	0.0	3.2 (576)	6.2 (70,399)	6.0 (9,433)	12.9 (7,310)	0.0
Skill/Manual	14.7 (3,873)	18.6 (48,535)	0.0	13.3 (2,367)	12.8 (146,492)	9.4 (14,701)	4.9 (2,808)	0.0
Clerical/Admin	4.5 (1,192)	7.4 (19,376)	0.0	15.9 (2,830)	10.1 (115,524)	13.6 (21,374)	22.1 (12,575)	12.7 (4,149)
Operative	6.8 (1,782)	2.4 (6,300)	0.0	0.0	3.1 (34,145)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales/Service	7.6 (2,000)	16.4 (42,875)	100.0 (695)	37.6 (6,681)	11.5 (132,020)	18.2 (28,565)	29.7 (16,893)	30.0 (9,770)

Table 6: Workforce Characteristics, by Geography and Race, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002 (con't). Percentages and (Ns') are weighted.

	2002							
	Detroit				Suburbs			
	All		Temporary		All		Temporary	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Work Tenure for Temps								
Less Than 1 year			23.8 (435)	51.8 (11,696)			33.5 (20,057)	74.0 (24,107)
1-2years			38.1 (695)	30.7 (6,919)			35.7 (21,401)	21.3 (6,968)
3-4 years			38.1 (695)	7.8 (1,763)			4.1 (2,460)	4.6 (1,504)
5-6 years			0.0	0.0 (0)			3.5 2,114)	0.0
7 years or more			0.0	9.7 (2,188)			24.2 (13,929)	0.0
Mean Hours worked additional to main job	21.0	17.6	23.4	18.4	15.3	13.4	7.8	10.0
Mean Hours worked Main	43.0	40.7	38.5	31.4	41.9	40.2	31.4	34.4
Job Type								
Full-time	88.7 (28,381)	84.3 (224,328)	100.0 (1,826)	24.1 (4,923)	80.1 (982,677)	84.2 (118,692)	39.6 (23,138)	50.1 (7,734)
Part-time	11.3 (3,627)	15.7 (41,791)	0.0	75.9 (15,538)	19.9 (243,995)	15.8 (22,211)	60.4 (35,136)	49.9 (7,689)
Work Related Stress	56.5 (19,668)	47.1 (131,897)	61.9 (1,130)	19.7 (4,443)	51.8 (647,455)	52.3 (84,933)	25.9 (15,511)	4.6 (1,504)

Table 7: Demographic Characteristics, by Geography and Gender, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002. Percentages and (Ns') are weighted.

	2002							
	Detroit				Suburbs			
	All		Temporary		All		Temporary	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Race								
White	9.0 (19,788)	10.4 (20,172)	12.1 (1,826)	0.0	87.9 (638,330)	85.9 (763,538)	79.3 (29,424)	55.1 (30,536)
Non-White	91.0 (201,185)	89.6 (174,090)	87.9 (13,290)	100.0 (9,267)	12.1 (87,824)	14.1 (125,392)	20.7 (7,689)	44.9 (24,889)
Age								
18-24	16.8 (37,341)	17.5 (35,190)	41.4 (6,532)	51.3 (4,755)	15.4 (113,380)	10.4 (93,068)	44.4 (16,465)	44.4 (24,627)
25-34	28.5 (63,119)	32.5 (65,452)	30.9 (4,874)	17.8 (1,649)	23.0 (168,585)	25.4 (226,665)	45.2 (16,770)	0.0
35-54	48.2 (106,758)	41.4 (83,366)	20.5 (3,231)	30.9 (2,862)	52.8 (387,476)	55.1 (492,303)	0.0	44.4 (24,633)
55 or older	6.5 (14,427)	8.5 (17,146)	7.3 (1,151)	0.0	8.8 (64,593)	9.1 (81,126)	10.4 (3,878)	11.1 (6,165)
Education								
LT HS	6.3 (13,642)	5.0 (9,878)	15.1 (2,320)	0.0	2.7 (19,096)	5.6 (48,246)	0.0	29.3 (16,245)
HS	47.7 (103,207)	44.7 (88,112)	57.5 (8,823)	72.3 (6,703)	40.4 (288,478)	32.1 (279,200)	50.8 (18,839)	23.2 (12,848)
Some College	7.6 (16,504)	11.7 (23,106)	9.9 (1,520)	10.3 (951)	4.3 (30,447)	8.4 (72,984)	0.0	31.0 (17,155)
Associates	13.1 (28,467)	13.6 (26,880)	3.7 (576)	0.0	9.3 (66,503)	9.7 (84,218)	0.0	5.4 (3,013)
BA	15.8 (34,182)	15.9 (31,321)	9.4 (1,442)	17.4 (1,613)	27.6 (197,595)	29.1 (253,004)	43.8 (16,244)	5.6 (3,083)
Grad Degree	9.5 (20,551)	9.0 (17,746)	4.4 (672)	0.0	15.8 (112,806)	15.1 (130,993)	5.5 (2,031)	5.6 (3,083)

Table 8: Workforce Characteristics, by Geography and Gender, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002. Percentages and (Ns') are weighted.

	2002							
	Detroit				Suburbs			
	All		Temporary		All		Temporary	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Computer Skills								
mean	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.6	3.9	4.1
media	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
s.d.	1.7	2.1	1.7	0.0	1.5	1.7	0.8	1.7
Personal Income								
Below $20,000	51.0 (22,729)	65.3 (19,855)	63.9 (2,740)	100.0 (2,201)	57.5 (64,796)	38.2 (23,332)	0.0	0.0
$20-$29,999	28.7 (12,637)	14.6 (4,466)	0.0	0.0	15.9 (18,009)	4.6 (2,808)	0.0	0.0
$30-$39,999	13.7 (6,071)	3.1 (951)	36.1 (1,547)	0.0	9.7 (10,964)	7.7 (4,670)	0.0	0.0
$40-$49,999	1.6 (695)	8.2 (2,500)	0.0	0.0	1.1 (1,184)	1.0 (638)	0.0	0.0
$50-$74,999	1.5 (672)	5.4 (1,649)	0.0	0.0	10.3 (11,670)	1.8 (1,045)	0.0	0.0
$75,000 Plus	3.0 (5,716)	3.1 (951)	0.0	0.0	5.3 (6,078)	46.7 (28,483)	0.0	100.0 (3,083)
Occupation								
Manager	9.2 (13,688)	12.7 (18,414)	0.0	19.8 (1649)	11.7 (72,501)	18.2 (125,625)	0.0	32.8 (17,155)
Bus/ Professional	13.9 (20,676)	14.5 (20,985)	7.5 (812)	15.0 (1,250)	16.6 (102,751)	25.9 (178,983)	28.5 (10,590)	8.9 (4,670)
Med/Education	29.7 (44,145)	15.1 (21,851)	6.2 (672)	19.4 (1,613)	31.7 (196,570)	8.4 (58,087)	9.5 (3,535)	0.0
Supervisor	8.1 (12,019)	8.6 (12,417)	5.3 (576)	0.0	4.3 (26,658)	8.1 (55,761)	11.4 (4,227)	5.9 (3,083)
Skill/Manual	12.3 (18,266)	24.2 (35,092)	13.1 (1,416)	11.4 (951)	3.2 (20,000)	20.5 (141,899)	0.0	5.4 (2,808)
Clerical/Admin	10.8 (16,057)	3.8 (5,462)	26.1 (2,830)	0.0	18.2 (112,981)	3.5 (23,916)	45.1 (16,725)	0.0
Operative	1.7 (2,523)	3.8 (5,559)	0.0	0.0	1.0 (5,960)	4.2 (29,186)	0.0	0.0
Sales/Service	14.4 (21,347)	17.4 (25,176)	41.8 (4,523)	34.3 (2,853)	13.3 (82,454)	11.3 (78,132)	5.5 (2,036)	47.0 (24,627)

Table8: Workforce Characteristics, by Geography and Gender, for All versus Temporarily Employed Respondent 2002 (con't). Percentages and (Ns') are weighted

	2002							
	Detroit				Suburbs			
	All		Temporary		All		Temporary	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Work Tenure for Temps								
Less Than 1 year			44.8 (7,067)	54.5 (5,054)			11.2 (4,149)	72.2 (40,014)
1-2 years			37.8 (5,965)	17.8 (1,649)			63.1 (23,436)	8.9 (4,932)
3-4 years			9.5 (1,508)	10.3 (951)			6.7 (2,457)	2.7 (1,507)
5-6 years			0.0	0.0			5.7 (2,114)	0.0
7 years or more			7.9 (1,248)	17.4 (1,613)			13.4 (4,956)	16.2 (8,973)
Mean Hours worked at additional job	14.7	23.2	18.1	20.7	12.4	16.0	7.5	9.2
Mean Hours worked Main	39.1	43.0	30.6	34.6	36.4	46.4	26.6	36.0
Job Type								
Full-time	81.3 (128,749)	89.2 (130,384)	34.5 (4,857)	27.7 (2,564)	70.7 (455,262)	89.1 (655,343)	37.4 (13,878)	46.2 (16,994)
Part-time	18.7 (29,698)	10.8 (15,719)	64.5 (8,835)	72.3 (6,703)	29.3 (188,281)	10.9 (79,860)	62.6 (23,235)	53.8 (19,770)
Work Related Stress	50.9 (83,989)	45.1 (70,448)	29.3 (4,633)	17.4 (1,613)	50.0 (327,938)	54.1 (415,623)	38.3 (14,208)	5.1 (2,808)

REFERENCES

Automationalley.org. http://www.automationalley.com/page?pageid=a0E60000001I6Jh. Retrieved on April 29, 2012

Becker, Gary S. (1993) *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education 3rd edition.* The University of Chicago Press.

Berry, William D. and Stanley Feldman. (1985) Multiple Regression in Practice (50). *A Sage University Paper.* Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Carnevale, Anthony and Stephen Rose. (1998) *Education for What?: The New Office Economy.* Educational Testing Service, Washington D. C.

Gottfried, Heidi. (2006) Feminist Theories of Work. *Social Theory at Work.* Edited by Marek Korczynski, Randi Hodson and Paul Edwards. Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y.

Granovetter, Mark (1995) *Getting a job: a study of contracts and careers,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL

Harvey, David. (2000) *Spaces of Hope.* University of California Press, Berkley, CA.

Hunter, Alfred and Jean Leiper. (1993) On Formal Education, Skills and Earnings: The Role of Educational Certificates in Earnings Determination. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology.* 18:1, pp. 21-42.

Kain, J (1968) Housing segregation, Negro employment and metropolitan decentralization. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 82:pp 175-197

Kalleberg, Arne, Barbara Reskin and Ken Hudson. (2000) Bad Jobs in America: Standard and Nonstandard Employment Relations and Job Quality in the United States. *American Sociological Review.* 65, pp. 256-278.

Machin, Steve. (2006) The Economic Approach to Analysis of the Labor Market. *Social Theory at Work.* Editted by Marek Korczynski, Randi Hodson and Paul Edwards. Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y.

Marable, Manning. (1983) *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America.* South End Press. Cambridge, MA.

Menard, Steve. (2002) Applied Logistic Regression Analysis 2nd Edition (106). *A Sage University Paper.* Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Pampel, Fred. (2000) Logistic Regression: A Primer (132). *A Sage University Paper.* Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Polivka, Anne, Sharon Cohany and Steven Hipple (2000) Definition, Composition and Economic Consequences of the Nonstandard Workforce. *Nonstandard Work.* Edited by Francoise Carre and Marianne Ferber, Lonnie Golden and Stephen Herzenberg. Industrial Relations Research Association Series. Champaign, IL.

Rose, Stephen J. & Heidi. I. Hartmann. (2008) Still a Man's Labor Market: The Long-Term Earnings Gap A Report on the Wage Gap and its Implications for Women, Families and the Labor Market. *Institute for Women's Policy Research*. Washington, DC.

Sakamoto, Arthur. (1988) Labor Market Structure, Human Capital, and Earnings Inequality in Metropolitan Areas. *Social Forces.* 67:1, pp.86-107.

Sennett, Richard and Jonathan Cobb. (1972) *The Hidden Injuries of Class.* Norton and Company. New York, N.Y.

Tilly, Chris (1996) *Half a Job: Bad and Good Part-Time Jobs in a Changing Labor Market.* Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Wilson, Julius W (1997) *When Work Disappears: The world of the new urban poor,* Vintage Books, New York, NY

ABSTRACT

HUMAN CAPITAL IN THE CONTEXT OF RACE, GENDER AND GEOGRAPHY: HOW DOES IT REALLY HELP TO GET A GOOD JOB?

IAN PALMER

August, 2013

Adviser David Fasenfest

Major Sociology (Labor)

Degree Masters of the Arts

Human capital appears to be no longer adequate to explain why some people get good jobs and others get bad jobs. Increasingly, a person's race, gender, class and geographical location seem to be better predictors for the type of jobs people secure. The data that is used to explore the problem comes from a phone survey of Southeastern Michigan conducted during 2002 and 2003. Geographic space definitely affected demographic variables when looking at the makeup of the temporary workforce.

I am a student of Sociology who is interested in how work is constructed in the economy and who holds what position.