

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and  
Social Sciences

Great Plains Studies, Center for

---

October 1996

## Occupational Segmentation in Kansas and Nebraska, 1890-1900

Lisa M. Frehill

*New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch>



Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

---

Frehill, Lisa M., "Occupational Segmentation in Kansas and Nebraska, 1890-1900" (1996). *Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*. 289.  
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch/289>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Great Plains Studies, Center for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

## OCCUPATIONAL SEGMENTATION IN KANSAS AND NEBRASKA, 1890-1900

Lisa M. Frehill

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
New Mexico State University  
Las Cruces, NM 88003*

**Abstract.** *Population growth in the states of Kansas and Nebraska between 1870-1900 was largely due to the influx of migrants from other parts of the United States and from Europe in search of fertile land to own and till. However, not all migrants were equally successful in attaining this goal. This paper discusses differences in occupational positions of African-American, Native-Born White and Foreign-Born White migrants in Kansas and Nebraska. Evidence from the U.S. censuses from 1890 and 1900 indicates that African Americans occupied positions of relative disadvantage in the occupational structures of Nebraska and Kansas, being more likely to be relegated to the lowest positions in the urban labor markets and were less likely than white migrants—both from Europe and other parts of the U.S.—to take up farming. This was especially true of African-American women who were highly concentrated in the least desirable occupations in 1890 and 1900 in both states. Finally, African-American migrants to Nebraska were less likely than those to Kansas to be employed in agricultural occupations.*

In the late 1800s, the United States experienced a period of rapid economic, political, and social change. After the blood-letting of the Civil War, the processes of industrialization in the cities and mechanization of agriculture quickened. During the waning decades of the 1800s, the “Frontier” was secured, with the remaining Indians rounded up and subdued. While coastal cities boomed with the proliferation of factories and swelled with waves of migrants from European nations, the largely agricultural plains states and territories also experienced rapid growth.

Between 1870 and 1900, the population of the United States doubled, with foreign immigration from Europe accounting for about 13% of this growth. States such as Kansas and Nebraska, however, experienced even faster growth. Between 1870 and 1900, the population of Kansas grew by more than 300%, while that of Nebraska grew by nearly 800%. European immigration accounted for proportionately less growth in Kansas than in the country as a whole, accounting for only 7% of population growth in Kansas.

A higher percentage, 15.5%, of the population growth in Nebraska was due to the influx of European immigrants between 1870-1900.

The late nineteenth century population growth in the states of Kansas and Nebraska was due largely to the influx of migrants from other parts of the United States and Europe in search of fertile land to own and till. However, not all migrants were equally successful in attaining this goal. This paper will discuss the differences in the labor market positions of African-American, Native-Born White, and Foreign-Born White migrants in the Kansas and Nebraska labor markets. Lieberman's (1980) "queue" model of ethnic labor market segmentation, and Barrera's (1979) internal colonial model will be used to explain occupational differences in terms of ethnic relations in order to understand the ways these initial distributions hold long-term occupational implications for different migrant groups.

Evidence from the U.S. censuses from 1890 and 1900 will be used to show that African Americans occupied positions of relative disadvantage in the occupational structures of Nebraska and Kansas. African Americans were more likely to be relegated to the lowest positions in the urban labor markets and were less likely than White migrants—both from Europe as well as other parts of the U.S.—to take up farming. The years 1890-1900 are interesting because the majority of late 1800s African-American and European migration to these states occurred in the 1870s through early 1880s, hence, data from 1890 and 1900 provide a macro-level glimpse of the long-term occupational fortunes of these migrants.

After a brief overview of Lieberman's (1980) and Barrera's theories of labor market segmentation, I will focus attention on occupations in the late 1800s economy. This paper takes a comparative perspective to examine data about occupational segmentation by race and nativity, while controlling for sex, in Kansas and Nebraska. The positions of African Americans, Native-Born Whites, and Foreign-Born Whites will be compared within each state. Also, the status of each group will be compared between the two states and to the U.S. occupational distribution for that group.

## **Background**

### **Labor Market Segmentation**

Occupational segmentation whereby individuals are systematically assigned to jobs based on race, ethnicity, nativity, and sex is one mechanism by which members of a dominant group maintain their position of power and

relative privilege. Jobs are one of the privileges in complex social systems with an extensive division of labor. This process enables dominant group members an advantage in securing "good" jobs. As "good" jobs become filled, jobs lower in the occupational queue come to be filled by non-dominant group members (Lieberson 1980).

The market for labor, as with any other market under the capitalist system of production, is regulated by the laws of supply and demand. However, the market for labor in the U.S. has rarely been characterized by free and open competition, especially in the late 1800s. Within the U.S. labor hierarchy of the late 1800s, males, especially those who were native born and white, tended to hold occupations that paid relatively better wages, had relatively more favorable working conditions and were accorded higher levels of prestige, than the less desirable occupations that were filled with workers who were not white or male or of native birth.

According to Lieberson (1980), labor markets can be conceptualized as queues for jobs. New entrants to labor markets lacking specialized skills enter the queue at the lowest and worst positions. These positions are usually assigned to newcomers *because* they are new. That is, newly-arrived migrants often lack a community power-base, are in dire economic need (or else they might not have migrated), and lack specialized skills. As even newer migrant groups arrive, previous migrants are able to move up in the labor queue, as the newer migrants take the lowest positions. Furthermore, because jobs that need to be filled are independent of the racial and ethnic composition of the area, upward mobility of workers in an expanding economy necessitates that new workers enter the queue at the bottom.

In addition to recency of immigration, race and sex are two other criteria that have affected job placement in the United States. Occupational sex segregation and wage setting based on sex in the United States have a long history (Kessler-Harris 1990; Reskin and Hartman 1986). Women have often been placed in jobs considered appropriate based on gender, therefore, women have not, necessarily occupied the lowest jobs in the queue. Indeed, in the case of women's labor market positions, it may be more accurate to view women as occupying a different "women's labor queue" with its own nativity and racial segmentation, separate from that of male workers (Jones 1993; Mason 1984).

Racial job discrimination has also been historically common in the United States (Lieberson 1980; Massey and Denton 1993). Lieberson argues that Blacks' long-term placement at the bottom of the queue, while European immigrants advanced, was due to more severe discrimination against

Blacks as compared to European immigrants. However, this is only part of the explanation for the perpetuation of racial labor market segmentation. Barrera's (1979) internal colonial model of labor segmentation in the Southwest can be used to shed more light on African Americans' position in the labor markets of Kansas and Nebraska in the 1890-1900 period.

Barrera claims that both the racial and the class background of incumbents are important in understanding the long-term implications of labor market segmentation. According to Barrera, minority group workers are assigned to the least desirable jobs. Over time, these jobs come to be defined as appropriate only for members of the minority group. In the American Southwest, for example, certain jobs came to be known as "Mexican jobs," just as jobs in the American South often came to be defined as "Black jobs." Once established, such a system of job assignment becomes difficult to change. Since the occupations performed by subordinate group members are vital to the economy, and since these jobs are viewed as inappropriate for members of the dominant ethnic group, a degree of labor repression is a central element in such a system (Barrera 1979). Barrera's theory offers an explanation for why Blacks and other minority groups appear to have been left at the bottom of the labor queue.

However, class is another feature of Barrera's model. Not all minority workers occupy the least desirable jobs. Prior class positions of minority group members can mediate their job assignments. In the case of the American Southwest, a well-developed social structure already existed in some areas when the land was annexed by the U.S. in 1848. Because some Mexicans were already placed in higher class positions, this enabled the formation of class solidarity with newly-arriving Anglos on the basis of shared class position. Hence, Barrera's model permits a greater understanding of within-group variation as well as an explanation for the severe discrimination cited by Lieberman, while shifting our attention to the interaction of race and class as joint determinants of labor market outcomes.

### **Jobs in the Late 19th Century Economy**

In the post Civil War era, there were two primary developments that affected the kinds of jobs people performed. First, the pace of industrialization quickened. More goods were produced in the market sector and fewer in the private household sector. As more goods were produced in the market sector, more people were employed at wage labor to produce, transport, and sell these goods. Furthermore, as firms grew in size, more people were

employed in managerial types of jobs: accounting, supervision, etc. As the middle class grew, so too did the demand for domestic and personal services. Standards of cleanliness had increased, which meant that most households, especially those of the growing urban middle class, required an enormous amount of work to maintain (Strasser 1982).

Another important development that affected the types of jobs that Americans performed was the mechanization and general improvement of agriculture. Although the pace of mechanization varied substantially from region to region in the U.S., over time much of the work performed by people as agricultural laborers came to be done by machines. Agricultural mechanization meant that fewer people were required to participate in food production occupations. The capital required to operate a profitable farm led to a general increase in farm size, but with less human labor. The need for capital further emphasized the need for farms to be competitive in order for debts to be repaid.

The relative status of occupations in the late 1800s was somewhat different than that accorded jobs today. First, it is clear that agricultural labor, especially that of a yeoman farmer, working his (or her) own land, was considered an ideal in the U.S. in the late 1800s (Emmons 1971). In the case of Kansas and Nebraska, many migrants aspired to own land, hence agricultural pursuits were highly valued in these states.

Second, people who worked in professional services occupations tended to accrue somewhat higher status as the century came to a close. Not only is this seen in the Bureau of the Census' decision to separate "Professional" from "Domestic and Personal" services, but also in the increasing strength of members of occupations classified as "Professional" to establish their monopoly on work performed. Occupations such as law, medicine, teaching, etc., were included in this category. These occupations as well as others in this category, often required formal education and/or certification and workers in these jobs held a modicum of prestige. Indeed, the fact that the occupants of many of these jobs were able to professionalize in the late 1800s and early 1900s reflects the increasingly positive light in which people who performed these occupations were held by the general public (Hall 1994).

The Census Bureau also placed many "white collar" jobs in the "Trade and Transportation" category during the late 1800s. The growth of firms and the nation—especially the changes in transportation and communications technology—meant that there were more bankers, railroad workers, teamsters, and sales workers, all of whom were counted in this category by the

census. Although "Trade and Transportation" workers performed a wide variety of jobs, for the most part, workers in this category (with the exception of the laborers who were involved in laying track for railroads) were relatively advantaged in terms of wages, working conditions, etc. Furthermore, occupations in this category tended to be viewed as desirable, "decent" jobs.

Manufacturing, mining, and domestic service all appear to have ranked quite low in the status hierarchy of jobs in the late 1800s. Not only were most jobs in these categories physically tiring and "dirty," but the social relations embodied in these jobs were considered repugnant to many people of the late 1800s. Working for a wage under the close supervision of another person was likened to slavery. This was especially true of domestic labor, which usually featured a one-on-one relationship between worker and employer that could be rather patriarchal (Katzman 1981; Rollins 1985). Based on comments made by domestic workers in the 1880-1910 timeframe (cited in Katzman 1981), domestic service jobs appeared to have been ranked below those in manufacturing and mining in terms of status, even though wages may have been better for women in domestic service. Wages in manufacturing, mining, and domestic services were often low, with long hours and capricious supervision (Edwards 1979). Workers' power in these jobs during the late 1800s was also quite low. Employers faced with strikes often used strikebreakers, sometimes hiring workers from other states (often African Americans) or other countries to replace striking workers (Kansas State Historical Society 1977; Zinn 1995).

### **The Agricultural Sector of the Economy in Kansas and Nebraska**

Most recent work in the area of the sociology of work and occupations has tended to focus exclusively on urban or industrial labor markets. This is not surprising since agricultural workers now account for a mere 3% of the U.S. labor force. However, in 1870 nearly three-fourths of the U.S. population lived in rural areas, with nearly half of all employed people reporting agricultural occupations. In Kansas, 59% of all employed persons were engaged in agricultural occupations, while in Nebraska, 53% of people were so employed (U.S. Department of Commerce 1873). Hence, understanding employment patterns in the agricultural sector of the economy of the late 1800s is central to understanding the labor markets of that time.

Aggressive promotional campaigns by land speculators, railroads, and state governments encouraged people to come to Kansas and Nebraska to

gain a share of the relatively inexpensive farmland. Recruiters and printed media promoted Kansas and Nebraska as having "Land for the Landless! Homes for the Homeless!" (Emmons 1971). At the time, farming was considered an important occupation, one by which people could have a modicum of independence and control over their lives, especially if one could farm on one's own land. People who were accustomed to farming for a living tended to resist wage labor, referring to working under someone else's rules as "wage slavery."

The opportunity to own a farm in Kansas or Nebraska was not, in general, illusory. The agricultural occupational structure in both Kansas and Nebraska as compared with the structure of agricultural occupations on a national level indicates that agricultural workers in both Kansas and Nebraska were more likely than farm workers nationally to be in the "farmers and planters" or other ownership agricultural categories in 1870. Whereas about half of all American farmers were in the agricultural ownership categories of the 1870 census, 70% of the agricultural workers in Kansas and 74% of those in Nebraska were in these same categories.

People continued to stake homestead claims throughout the late 1800s, although much of the available land—especially the land considered "good" farmland—was in the hands of land speculators, previous homesteaders, and the railroads (Riegel and Athearn 1964). Much of the land west of the 100° meridian was still available, but this land was reputed to be terrible land for farming (Schafer 1936). Therefore, most of the people who arrived in Kansas and Nebraska in the late 1800s needed to purchase land in addition to the other equipment necessary to farm on the prairie. Furthermore, "[t]he tough prairie sod required a special steel plow pulled by at least three yoke of oxen, which could break possibly one or two acres a day" (Riegel and Athearn 1964). Most sources seem to agree that about \$500 was required to establish a farm on the prairie in the late 1800s.

The cost associated with establishing a farm meant that the economic resources brought by migrants to Kansas and Nebraska affected the amount of time required to eventually start a farm. Migrants with very little money, equipment, or livestock, for example, might need to work in wage labor for many years before having the means with which to establish a farm. On the other hand, those who arrived with sufficient funds or who already possessed equipment or livestock were able to establish farms shortly after arrival.

Racial discrimination meant that white immigrants from Europe were more likely to secure better paying jobs in towns than African Americans. Because of whites' prejudicial attitudes about African Americans, white



immigrants were also more likely than African Americans to secure employment as agricultural laborers (Athearn 1978). Hence, Lieberman's queue model suggests the following hypotheses:

- H1:** In the occupational distributions, proportionately more Foreign-Born and Native-Born Whites and proportionately less African Americans will be in higher ranking jobs, including agricultural occupations in both Kansas and Nebraska.
- H2:** Between 1890 and 1900, while Foreign-Born and Native-Born White migrants move up in the labor queue, African Americans will stagnate or move down in the labor queue.

However, class had an important impact on African Americans' agricultural outlook in Kansas and Nebraska. Between 1870 and 1881 a number of African-American colonies were established in Kansas by various groups. Private groups of African Americans or land speculators hoping to attract African Americans to new towns established many African-American towns in the West after the Civil War (Athearn 1978; Kansas State Historical Society 1977; Hamilton 1991). African Americans who came to Kansas with the purpose of joining a specific community (or colony) often sold holdings in Kentucky, Tennessee, or Texas (where most of the migrants of this type seem to have originated) and moved for the same reason as white yeoman farmers of the time: the opportunity to acquire more land on which to farm (Athearn 1978; Painter 1977).

The majority of African Americans who arrived in Kansas between 1879-1880, however, came as part of a mass migration mostly from the states of Louisiana and Mississippi in the Exoduster Movement (Lambert 1978; Painter 1977). Depending upon whose estimates are used, anywhere from one-fourth to one-third of the people who arrived in the Exodus had capital and were able to take up farms. But the majority were destitute. Various charitable organizations were formed as a result of this influx to ease the suffering of the thousands of migrants as well as to find someplace for these destitute people to go. The movement had important implications for the way African Americans were treated by Kansans.

First, because African Americans who arrived as part of the mass migration of 1879 tended to be from the Deep South states of Louisiana and Mississippi and were very poor, racial prejudice of Kansas whites was stirred. People who migrated as part of the Exodus responded to a general-

ized belief that Kansas offered the promise of true freedom and citizenship while escaping white southerners' violent repression of their civil rights (Athearn 1978; Painter 1977). When the masses of migrants arrived in Kansas' fledgling settlements without the means to immediately start a farm, they were quite conspicuous. Indeed, one indicator of rising race prejudice in Kansas was segregation of schools in rural areas (Painter 1977).

Second, class prejudice of Kansas African Americans who had previously arrived and formed colonies was also aroused by the influx of so many poverty-stricken African Americans (Cox 1982). The new colonies had been in operation for only a few years and were, themselves, struggling for survival on the prairie. Athearn (1978) goes so far as to say that the Exoduster Movement of 1879-1880 actually dampened efforts to establish African-American colonies in Kansas.

Other authors' views are consistent with this. Woodson (1918) mentions that agents were sent to the South from Kansas to dissuade blacks from migrating. Emmons (1971) mentions that the governors of Kansas and Nebraska engaged in public relations campaigns (letters, speeches, etc.) in which they attempted to discourage blacks from coming to their states unless they had enough money to set up a farm. Finally, Hickey's (1991) account of the fate of the Dunlap Colony highlights the problems that were associated with burdening already stressed communities with large numbers of destitute migrants. According to Hickey, the Dunlap Colony, which had been established by Black migrants with capital, failed in part because of the burden of providing for Exodusters without capital who had been placed in the colony by the Kansas Freedmens Relief Association.

Finally, colonization movements tended to focus upon settlement in Kansas rather than Nebraska. Many of the African Americans who arrived in Nebraska during the late 1800s appear to have been Exodusters who had been sent further upriver, perhaps without their explicit consent (Athearn 1978). Also, the magnitude of African-American migration to Nebraska was far less than that to Kansas, based upon migration estimates using the forward census survival rate method (Frehill-Rowe 1993). Between 1870-1880, while 22,446 African Americans migrated from the "Eastern" states to Kansas, only 1,325 African Americans arrived in Nebraska from these same states. In the 1880-1890 decade, 5,813 African Americans arrived in Nebraska and 5,471 in Kansas. Hence, even over the course of 20 years, the migration of African Americans to Nebraska was substantially less than that to Kansas. Furthermore, in examining migration during the 1890-1900 decade—during which there was a general pattern of migration from many

Midwestern states to Oklahoma—there was a net outmigration of African Americans from Nebraska of 2,153 people while 2,192 African Americans from other states migrated to Kansas during the same decade. This outmigration may indicate that African Americans were not entirely satisfied with the conditions they experienced upon arrival in Nebraska. Barrera's model, in which class occupies an important role, as well as the different migration streams and impressions of Kansas of African Americans suggests a third hypothesis:

**H3:** African-American migrants to Kansas were more likely than those to Nebraska to secure employment in agricultural occupations.

Finally, Barrera's internal colonial model shifts our attention to the phenomenon of occupational concentration, which reflects tighter restrictions for occupational entry placed upon minority rather than dominant group members. That is, not only will the overall occupational structure of the three nativity/race groups vary, but also the extent to which members of these groups are concentrated into a few occupational categories will differ.

**H4:** African Americans, both men and women, will be more likely to be concentrated into fewer occupational categories than Foreign-Born Whites.

**H5:** Foreign-Born Whites, both men and women, will be more likely to be concentrated into fewer occupational categories than Native-Born Whites.

#### **Data: Occupations in the Late 1800s**

The U.S. census provides information about occupations. With each successive census, the number of occupational categories grew and the level of detail about the sex, race, age, marital status, nativity, and parentage of occupation holders increased. The amount of information about occupations grew dramatically from the 50 pages in 1870 to the special volume which was required to contain the detailed information about occupations in 1900.

Starting in 1890, the census summary volumes reported information about occupations by race, sex, and selected nativity at two levels of occupational aggregation. At the first level, five main headings of occupations were reported as follows:

Agricultural, Fisheries (and Mining in 1890)  
Professional Services  
Domestic and Personal Services  
Trade and Transportation  
Manufacturing, Mechanical Industries (and Mining in 1900)

A second level of aggregation available at the state level of analysis specified a large number of detailed occupations within these five main headings. For women, more than twenty detailed occupations were listed, while for men, more than 50 in 1890 and more than 80 in 1900 were listed. In order to understand the occupational structures of Kansas and Nebraska in comparative perspective with those of the United States at the time, occupational data were analyzed separately by state, sex, nativity, and race. Three nativity/race groups were defined as follows:

Native-Born Whites (NBW)  
Foreign-Born Whites (FBW)  
African Americans

A number of relevant comparisons were performed to test Hypotheses H1-H5 and to describe the extent to which occupations for each group varied in Kansas and Nebraska as compared to those for the nativity-race-sex group in the United States in 1890 and 1900. Information about occupational distributions for these groups in the United States are provided to give a general sense of the broader context of labor market outcomes in Kansas and Nebraska. Two basic types of comparative analysis were performed. First, occupational segmentation by nativity/race within each sex and state was computed and compared by means of an index of occupational dissimilarity. Then, occupational concentration within subheadings of the five main occupational categories was examined. These analyses will be described in turn.

### **Occupational Segmentation**

The first set of analyses examined occupations for 1890 and 1900 via Equation (1). This equation compares the occupational distributions for each nativity/race group among the five major occupational categories of the census in 1890 and 1900 separately for men and women within each state and for the United States. The fundamental question answered in this analysis of occupations was: Within each nativity/race group, what occupations did members of that group report?

$$\frac{X_{ijk}}{\sum_{k=1}^5 X_{ijk}} * (100) = \% \text{ of Group } ij \in \text{Occupation } k \quad (1)$$

Where:  $i$  = {female, male},  
 $j$  = {"African American," "Native-Born White," "Foreign-Born White"}  
 $k$  = {five major occupational categories}  
 $X_{ijk}$  = members of group  $i, j$  in occupation  $k$ .

The chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistic was used to test whether there were statistically significant differences between the occupational distributions reported by each nativity/race group within each state, while controlling for sex. If there were no occupational segmentation, then there would be no statistical difference in the occupational distributions of each nativity/race group.

In order to further compare different nativity/race groups,  $D_{xy}$ , a measure of occupational dissimilarity, was computed via Equation (2). This measure ranges from 0 - 1, with values closer to 0 representing lower levels of dissimilarity (i.e., greater similarity) and values closer to 1 representing a greater degree of occupational segregation.

$$D_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} \sum \left| \frac{x_i}{X} - \frac{y_i}{Y} \right| \quad (2)$$

Where:  $X$  = total number of members of group  $X$  in the labor force.

$Y$  = total number of members of group  $Y$  in the labor force.

$x_i$  = members of group  $X$  in occupation  $i$ .

$y_i$  = members of group  $Y$  in occupation  $i$ .

$i$  = index on the five main occupational headings.

By computing  $D_{xy}$ , pairwise comparisons of occupational distributions (computed via Equation 1) were possible to assess the extent to which nativity/race group occupational distributions differed within Kansas and Nebraska. Furthermore, the occupational distribution of each nativity/race group in Kansas could be compared to that in Nebraska and those for each of these states' could be compared to that for the nativity/race group in the United States. Finally, the trend in occupational segmentation between 1890

and 1900 could be examined when  $D_{xy}$  was computed for each nativity/race group within each state. Since  $D_{xy}$  is commonly interpreted as the percentage of people in group  $x$  who would have to change jobs in order to have an occupational distribution identical to that of people in group  $y$  (King 1992; Massey and Denton 1988), the computed value of  $D_{xy}$  was multiplied by 100.

For example, if African Americans occupied lower positions in the labor queue than did Foreign-Born Whites, then this would be reflected in a greater level of dissimilarity when the African-American occupational distribution is compared to that of Native-Born Whites than when the Foreign-Born White distribution is compared to Native-Born Whites' distribution. That is, we should expect two conditions to be met:

$$D_{AA-NBW} > D_{NBW-FBW} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{AA-FBW} < D_{NBW-FBW}$$

### Occupational Concentration

A second analysis examined detailed occupations within the five main headings. The degree to which members of a particular group were concentrated in a few occupational categories is another indicator of a segmented labor force. To examine occupational concentration, I first identified the top three female occupations and the top four male occupations for each nativity/race group. Only the top three were identified for women because women have, historically, tended to be more highly concentrated in a few occupational categories than have been men (Reskin 1984).

In 1890, there were 25 detailed occupational categories reported for women in Kansas and Nebraska. Men were distributed among twice as many detailed occupational categories. Information about 50 detailed occupations for men was available in 1890 for both Kansas and Nebraska. In 1900, 27 detailed occupational categories were specified for female workers in Kansas and Nebraska. Again, men's work was described by more categories in 1900. Males in Kansas were recorded in 92 detailed categories, while 86 detailed occupations were reported for males in Nebraska.

Once the top three female occupations and the top four male occupations were identified for each race/nativity group, I then computed a measure of occupational concentration via Equation (3).

$$C_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n x_{ijk}}{X_{ij}} \cdot 100 \quad (3)$$

Where:  $i$  = {female, male},  
 $j$  = {"African American," "Native-Born White," "Foreign-Born White"},  
 $k$  = {top  $n$  occupational categories using detailed categories},  
 $n$  = 3 for females and 4 for males,  
 $x_{ijk}$  = members of group  $i, j$  in occupation  $k$ ,  
 $X_{ij}$  = total number of members of group  $i, j$  in labor force.

Concentration ranges from 0-100%, with numbers closer to 100% indicating a higher degree of occupational concentration. As concentration of group members increases, crowding becomes more likely. Crowding refers to the situation where labor market discrimination limits minority group members to a relative few occupational categories. A surplus of minority group members, combined with limited labor market opportunities keeps wages and benefits low in these jobs (England 1992). The long-term consequences of crowding are theoretically salient within the framework discussed by Barrera (1979). Because a minority group is concentrated into a particular kind of work, over time that occupation comes to be laden with racial/ethnic meaning, not entirely dissimilar to the process by which occupations become "gendered."

Although based upon the same fundamental way of examining occupations—i.e., distribution among occupational categories within ethnic group—concentration and occupational dissimilarity are two important components of occupational segmentation. While occupational dissimilarity provides a metric of the extent to which the occupational distributions of two specified groups vary, the concentration measure gives an indication of the extent to which members of a nativity/race group are concentrated in only a few occupational categories. High levels of occupational concentration and dissimilarity combined with group over-representation in some and under-representation in other occupations indicates strong evidence for the existence of a segmented occupational structure. Over time, these occupational structures would become institutionalized and racist ideologies perpetuate assignment to jobs based on ethnicity (Barrera 1979).

By examining occupational concentration in addition to occupational segmentation, the extent to which African Americans' placement into positions of relative disadvantage can be viewed. The trend in occupational concentration between 1890 and 1900 will provide some insight into whether African Americans' labor market disadvantage was increasing or decreasing at the turn of the century.

## Results

### Occupational Segmentation

Tables 1 and 2 report the occupational distributions for each of the three nativity/race groups in 1890 and 1900 in the United States, Kansas, and Nebraska for males and females, respectively. The chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) values reported in Tables 1 and 2 indicate that within each sex, African Americans, Foreign-Born Whites (FBW), and Native-Born Whites (NBW) reported significantly different ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ) occupational distributions within each state and the U.S. in general.

These data offer strong support for hypothesis H1, that proportionately more NBW and FBW workers were in higher ranking occupations, including agricultural occupations than African-American workers. In both Kansas and Nebraska, in both 1890 and 1900, agricultural occupations were the most commonly reported jobs by FBW and NBW males. And, although not the most popular occupation among women in these same groups, in both Kansas and Nebraska, FBW and NBW females were far more likely than African-American women to report agricultural occupations. In both states, jobs in "Domestic and Personal Service" were the most commonly reported occupations by both male and female African-American workers. Indeed, nearly nine out of ten female African-American workers reported these kinds of jobs in 1890 and 1900.

The data in Tables 1 and 2 also offer support for hypothesis H3, that African-American migrants to Kansas were more likely than those to Nebraska to be employed in agricultural occupations. Within about a decade of the Exodus, 30% of African-American males and 3.2% of African-American females were employed in agricultural occupations in Kansas. In Nebraska, however, only 6.5% of African-American males and 0.3% of African-American females were engaged in agricultural pursuits. This point is further underscored by the data on occupational dissimilarity in Table 3. In comparing the occupational distributions of each nativity/race group in Kansas to that reported by the same group in Nebraska, 24% of African-American males would have had to change jobs in Nebraska in order to replicate the occupational distribution of this group in Kansas, in sharp contrast to the 8% of FBW males and the 13% of NBW males who would have had to switch jobs.

However, the same was not true for African-American females, whose high level of participation in domestic and personal service jobs was almost





TABLE 2  
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS, FEMALES

	United States				Kansas			Nebraska		
	$\chi^2_{1890} = 110.3^*$ $\chi^2_{1900} = 107.6^*$				$\chi^2_{1890} = 125.9^*$ $\chi^2_{1900} = 143.0^*$			$\chi^2_{1890} = 111.4^*$ $\chi^2_{1900} = 126.8^*$		
	Native-Born Whites	Foreign-Born Whites	African-Americans		Native-Born Whites	Foreign-Born Whites	African-Americans	Native-Born Whites	Foreign-Born Whites	African-Americans
1890										
Agriculture, Fisheries & Mining	10.0%	4.3%	44.0%		14.1%	25.1%	3.2%	7.1%	11.4%	0.3%
Professional Service	13.1%	2.5%	0.9%		22.7%	6.0%	2.0%	22.6%	3.6%	0.7%
Trade & Transportation	8.8%	4.5%	0.2%		7.2%	3.2%	0.6%	10.5%	3.0%	0.4%
Manufacturing & Mechanical Industries	35.7%	29.3%	2.8%		21.4%	12.1%	3.6%	21.6%	11.3%	6.7%
Domestic & Personal Service	32.3%	59.4%	52.1%		34.6%	53.6%	90.5%	38.3%	70.6%	91.9%
1900										
Agriculture & Fisheries	11.2%	4.7%	44.2%		10.9%	30.2%	2.2%	6.9%	18.9%	1.6%
Professional Service	12.5%	3.0%	1.2%		22.0%	6.4%	3.3%	24.1%	5.0%	2.1%
Trade & Transportation	14.0%	7.2%	0.3%		12.7%	5.7%	0.8%	13.4%	6.3%	1.6%
Manufacturing, Mechanical Industries & Mining	32.0%	32.0%	2.5%		19.9%	13.0%	5.0%	18.5%	14.8%	5.3%
Domestic & Personal Service	30.3%	53.1%	51.8%		34.6%	44.7%	88.8%	37.1%	55.2%	0.895

\* indicates significance at  $\alpha = 0.01$

Note: Numbers do not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 3  
OCCUPATIONAL DISSIMILARITY, 1890

	As compared to ...				
	Same Group, 1900	Same Group, USA	Same Group, Nebraska	Native-Born Whites, Same State	Foreign-Born Whites, Same State
<b>Males</b>					
African-Americans					
Kansas	.23	.33	.24	.42	.42
Nebraska	.18	.57	N/A	.63	.60
United States	.10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foreign-Born Whites					
Kansas	.12	.37	.08	.07	
Nebraska	.07	.29	N/A	.12	
United States	.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Native-Born Whites					
Kansas	.07	.16	.13		
Nebraska	.11	.06	N/A		
United States	.09	N/A	N/A		
<b>Females</b>					
African-Americans					
Kansas	.06	.41	.04	.56	.37
Nebraska	.08	.44	N/A	.54	.21
United States	.01	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foreign-Born Whites					
Kansas	.18	.33	.37	.30	
Nebraska	.31	.19	N/A	.37	
United States	.12	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Native-Born Whites					
Kansas	.11	.16	.30		
Nebraska	.09	.17	N/A		
United States	.13	N/A	N/A		

TABLE 4  
OCCUPATIONAL DISSIMILARITY, 1900

	As compared to ...			
	Same Group, USA	Same Group, Nebraska	Native-Born Whites, Same State	Foreign -Born Whites, Same State
<b>Males</b>				
African-Americans Kansas	.35	.24	.42	.39
Nebraska	.52	N/A	.54	.58
Foreign-Born Whites Kansas	.40	.05	.08	
Nebraska	.40	N/A	.09	
Native-Born Whites Kansas	.18	.06		
Nebraska	.12	N/A		
<b>Females</b>				
African-Americans Kansas	.42	.02	.54	.44
Nebraska	.43	N/A	.52	.34
Foreign-Born Whites Kansas	.29	.13	.29	
Nebraska	.18	N/A	.30	
Native-Born Whites Kansas	.14	.05		
Nebraska	.18	N/A		

identical ( $D = 0.04$ ) in both states. The NBW and FBW female occupational distributions for Kansas and Nebraska were substantially different. By 1900, there was considerably less dissimilarity between the occupations reported by NBW and FBW women in Kansas and Nebraska. By 1900, the occupational distributions of NBW women in both states were very similar ( $D = 0.05$ ), while for FBW the occupational distributions were considerably more similar in 1900 ( $D = 0.13$ ) than in 1890 ( $D = 0.37$ ).

Tables 1-4 also shed light on the nature of the occupational queues in Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and 1900. When the occupational distributions of the three nativity/race groups were compared, African Americans were found in more different occupational categories than were FBW or NBW. Furthermore, the occupational distributions of FBW and NBW were far more similar than they were different in both 1890 and 1900 for male workers.

Again, however, findings regarding the women's occupational distributions were somewhat different. In terms of the three comparisons, more than half of all African-American women would have had to change jobs in order to copy NBW females' occupational distributions in Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and 1900. African-American and FBW women's occupational distributions were also quite different, but less so than for the African-American-NBW comparison. Finally, NBW women and FBW women, unlike their male peers, reported somewhat different occupations in both states in 1890 and 1900. Approximately 30% of FBW women would have had to change jobs in order to be distributed among the occupational categories the same as were NBW women. The gap in FBW and NBW women's distribution—like the gap between African-American and NBW women—was largely due to the lower level of FBW women in "Professional Service" occupations (which included teaching and clerical work) and much greater representation in domestic and personal services.

Although hypotheses H1 and H3 are clearly supported by the data in Tables 1-4, the evidence related to hypothesis H2 is less clear. Hypothesis H2 stated that between 1890 and 1900, African-American workers would be stagnant or move into lower occupations in the queue while NBW and FBW workers moved up in the queue. Table 3 reports the index of dissimilarity for each group when the occupational distributions for 1890 and 1900 were compared. Occupations reported by African-American males and FBW females were the most changed over the decade in both states. Indeed, the evidence for men appears to contradict hypothesis H2. In Kansas, proportionately fewer African-American men were employed in agriculture and

domestic and personal services and proportionately more were in manufacturing types of jobs in 1900 than in 1890. Occupational change was somewhat different in Nebraska, where proportionately more African-American men reported jobs in trade and transportation rather than in domestic and personal services. Hence, while as a group African-American men moved both up and down in the Kansas labor queue and up in the Nebraska labor queue, in both states, there was very little change in FBW and NBW males' occupational distributions over the decade.

However, hypothesis H2 has slight support in terms of occupational changes among women. Between 1890 and 1900, FBW women moved out of the least desirable jobs in domestic and personal services and into the more desirable jobs in agriculture. At the same time, African-American women remained in domestic and personal service jobs. NBW women shifted slightly (proportionately) into trade and transportation jobs from manufacturing jobs (an upward movement) in both states. In Kansas, however, the proportionate increase in women in trade and transportation jobs also came at the expense of agricultural jobs.

Hence, the notion put forward by hypothesis H2, that between 1890 and 1900 FBW and NBW workers would move up in the labor queue, while African-American workers stagnated or moved down, has only partial support. On the one hand, it appears that among men, it was White workers rather than African Americans who had stagnated while occupational change among African-American males was both up and down the queue. On the other hand, among female workers, FBW women did move up in the queue while African-American women stagnated at the bottom of the labor queue.

### **Occupational Concentration**

Tables 5-8 report occupational concentration in the top three occupations among females and the top four occupations among males in Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and 1900. Tables 4 and 5 indicate that three of the top four occupations for White men (both Native and Foreign Born) in both Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and 1900 were "Agricultural Laborers," "Farmer and Planters" and "Laborers." The fourth most popular occupation among NBW males in Kansas in both 1890 and 1900 and in Nebraska in 1900 was "Merchants and Dealers." In Nebraska in 1890 the fourth most popular occupation was "Bookkeepers and Clerks." In Kansas, mining was another important occupation among Foreign Born males in both 1890 and 1900. In Nebraska, Foreign Born males were likely to be "Merchants and

TABLE 5  
OCCUPATIONAL CONCENTRATION, 1890, MALES

	Kansas		Nebraska	Occupational Concentration
	Top Four Occupations for Each Group	Occupational Concentration	Top Four Occupations for Each Group	
Native-Born White	(1) Farmers, planters, & overseers	69.0%	(1) Farmers, planters, & overseers	59.6%
	(2) Agricultural laborers		(2) Agricultural laborers	
	(3) Laborers (not specified)		(3) Laborers (not specified)	
	(4) Merchants, dealers, peddlers, etc.		(4) Bookkeepers, clerks, etc.	
Foreign-Born White	(1) Farmers, planters, & overseers	70.2%	(1) Farmers, planters, & overseers	70.2%
	(2) Agricultural laborers		(2) Agricultural laborers	
	(3) Laborers (not specified)		(3) Laborers (not specified)	
	(4) Miners		(4) Merchants, dealers, peddlers, etc.	
African-American	(1) Laborers (not specified)	70.1%	(1) Servants	57.3%
	(2) Farmers, planters, & overseers		(2) Laborers (not specified)	
	(3) Agricultural laborers		(3) Barbers & hairdressers	
	(4) Servants		(4) Agricultural laborers	

TABLE 6  
OCCUPATIONAL CONCENTRATION, 1900, MALES

	Kansas		Nebraska	
	Top Four Occupations for Each Group	Occupational Concentration	Top Four Occupations for Each Group	Occupational Concentration
Native-Born White	(1)Farmers, planters, & overseers	65.2%	(1)Farmers, planters, & overseers	63.5%
	(2)Agricultural laborers		(2)Agricultural laborers	
	(3)Laborers (not specified)		(3)Laborers (not specified)	
	(4)Merchants & dealers (exc. wholesale)		(4) Merchants & dealers (exc. wholesale)	
Foreign-Born White	(1)Farmers, planters, & overseers	70.0%	(1)Farmers, planters, & overseers	70.2%
	(2)Agricultural laborers		(2)Agricultural laborers	
	(3)Miners		(3)Laborers (not specified)	
	(4)Laborers (not specified)		(4)Merchants & dealers (exc. wholesale)	
African-American	(1)Laborers (not specified)	63.4%	(1)Laborers (not specified)	63.7%
	(2)Farmers, planters, & overseers		(2)Servants & waiters	
	(3)Agricultural laborers		(3)Porter & helpers (in stores, etc.)	
	(4)Miners		(4)Barbers & hairdressers	



TABLE 7  
OCCUPATIONAL CONCENTRATION, 1890, FEMALES

	Kansas		Occupational Concentration	Nebraska	
	Top Three Occupations for Each Group			Top Three Occupations for Each Group	
Native-Born White	(1) Servants	65.2%	(1) Servants	70.0%	
	(2) Professors & Teachers		(2) Professors & Teachers		
	(3) Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc.		(3) Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc.		
Foreign-Born White	(1) Servants	78.1%	(1) Servants	81.7%	
	(2) Farmers, planters & overseers		(2) Farmers, planters & overseers		
	(3) Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc.		(3) Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc.		
African-American	(1) Servants	89.0%	(1) Servants	90.0%	
	(2) Laundresses		(2) Laundresses		
	(3) Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc.		(3) Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc.		

TABLE 8  
OCCUPATIONAL CONCENTRATION, 1900, FEMALES

	Kansas		Nebraska	
	Top Three Occupations for Each Group	Occupational Concentration	Top Three Occupations for Each Group	Occupational Concentration
Native-Born White	(1) Servants & waitresses	49.0% (55.1%)*	(1) Servants & waitresses	55.6% (61.1%)*
	(2) Teachers & professors in colleges, etc.		(2) Teachers & professors in colleges, etc.	
	(3) Dressmakers		(3) Dressmakers	
Foreign-Born White	(1) Servants & waitresses	62.7% (64.9%)*	(1) Servants & waitresses	60.9% (64.7%)*
	(2) Farmers, planters & overseers		(2) Farmers, planters & overseers	
	(3) Housekeepers and stewardesses		(3) Dressmakers	
African-American	(1) Servants & waitresses	81.9% (81.9%)*	(1) Servants & waitresses	83.5% (84.0%)*
	(2) Laundresses		(2) Laundresses	
	(3) Laborers (not specified)		(3) Laborers (not specified)	

\* Percentages in parentheses represent the level of occupational concentration for each group when the women in the three separate categories "dressmakers," "milliners" and "seamstresses" are included in one category "Dressmakers, milliners and seamstresses." This larger category was reported in the 1890 census but was split into three categories in 1900. Hence, part of the reduction in women's occupational concentration is due to this measurement change.

Dealers" if they were not in agricultural jobs or did not work as "Laborers (not specified)." In short, the popular occupations among white males did not vary substantially by nativity or state. However, FBW males' occupational concentration was higher than that of NBW males in Nebraska in both 1890 and 1900 and somewhat higher in Kansas in 1900, which supports hypothesis H5.

Occupational concentration of African-American males was comparable to that of NBW males in Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and 1900, which is not consistent with hypothesis H4 that African-American males would be more highly concentrated than NBW males. African-American males in Kansas as compared to those in Nebraska tended to report somewhat better occupations. Specifically, in Kansas the top three occupations of African-American males were the same as the top three jobs of white males. In 1890 the fourth most popular job among African-American males in Kansas was "Servants," while in 1900 the fourth most popular job among African-American males in Kansas was "Miners," the same as that among FBW males. This change between 1890 and 1900 was likely due to the recruitment of about 1,300 African-American males from Alabama to break a miners' strike in Crawford County in 1899 (Kansas State Historical Society 1977).<sup>1</sup>

The level of occupational concentration among NBW and African-American males in Kansas decreased somewhat between 1890 and 1900, possibly due to the increase in the number of occupational categories. In Nebraska, however, both NBW and African-American males' level of occupational concentration increased between 1890 and 1900. This finding is puzzling in light of the increase in the number of census categories during that same time period. However, given that there was a net outmigration of both African-Americans and NBW who had originally emigrated to Nebraska, it may be that workers who remained in the state settled for less desirable positions in a tight labor market. Occupational concentration of Foreign Born males did not change between 1890 and 1900, possibly due to a significant decrease in foreign migration to Nebraska during that decade.

Tables 7 and 8 indicate a clear pattern of segmentation vis-a-vis occupational concentration for females in Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and 1900, with strong support for hypotheses H4 and H5. NBW women's level of concentration was less than that of FBW women which was subsequently less than that of African-American women. However, it should also be noted that white (Native and Foreign Born) women's decrease in occupational concentration between 1890 and 1900 was substantially greater than that of African-American women in both states.<sup>2</sup> This means that if there was any

general expansion of employment opportunities for women between 1890 and 1900, NBW and FBW women were much more likely to have taken advantage—or perhaps were more likely to be given these opportunities—than were African-American women.

Indeed, African-American women evinced a high level of occupational concentration in some of the least desirable jobs. In 1890, 89% of Kansas' and 90% of Nebraska's African-American female labor forces were concentrated into only three occupational categories, two of which were under the heading "Domestic and Personal Services." More than 80% of all employed African-American women in Kansas and Nebraska in 1890 and more than 75% in 1900 were employed as servants or laundresses.

Although "Servants" was the most common occupation reported by women, proportionately fewer NBW women compared to FBW and African-American women were employed in these jobs. The second most popular occupation among NBW women, not surprisingly, was teaching. Overall, however, Tables 7 and 8 support hypotheses H4 and H5 in that NBW women were far less concentrated into a few categories than either their immigrant or African-American counterparts.

### Conclusions

This paper has examined occupations from a macro-level perspective in Kansas and Nebraska at the turn of the twentieth century. The aggregate level analysis procedures were consistent with both Lieberman's and Barrera's theories about the role of nativity and race in labor markets, since, in this regard, labor markets are a macro-level social institution. This kind of analysis would be well-complimented by micro-level analyses focussed on individuals' experiences within local labor markets.

In the late 1800s, when Kansas and Nebraska were important destinations for agricultural migrants, members of different groups varied in terms of their relative success in achieving the goal of being a self-sustaining farmer. The data here indicated strong support for hypothesis H1, that among migrants to Kansas and Nebraska, African Americans were the least successful in acquiring farms. Native-Born Whites and European immigrants in Kansas and Nebraska in the late 1800s were more likely to farm than comparable groups in the U.S. or compared to African-American migrants to these same states. Furthermore, the evidence here suggests that white workers in Kansas and Nebraska, on average, tended to be in slightly more advantaged positions than workers in the U.S. in general. In short, while

many European immigrants worked in Northern industrializing cities at this time, those who found their way to Kansas and Nebraska were able to achieve the American ideal of farming.

It is important to note support for hypothesis H3, that African Americans who migrated to Kansas were much more likely to be able to establish a farm than those who went to Nebraska. Whereas almost a fourth of African-American migrants (males and females combined) were able to remain in the agricultural sector in Kansas in the late 1800s, less than one twentieth of African Americans in Nebraska were in these occupations. For African Americans, the migration to Kansas and Nebraska meant a radical change in the nature of work. While in the late 1800s and early 1900s the majority of the African-American population in the United States was employed in agricultural occupations in the South, African Americans in Kansas and Nebraska were likely to be employed in various other occupations. For males, there was work in mining, manufacturing, trade and transportation, and domestic and personal services. For women, the move to Kansas and Nebraska almost surely meant employment in domestic and personal services.

Part of the difference in occupational positions of African Americans in Kansas versus Nebraska lies in the class differences among African-American migrants and the time of arrival of migrants to these states. In Kansas, when the Exodusters began arriving in 1879, the Kansas Freedmens Relief Association (KFRA) was able to place some African Americans in rural counties in the state (Kansas State Historical Society 1977). Also, many African Americans who did have capital were drawn to specific colonies in Kansas rather than Nebraska. Hamilton's (1991) list of black towns in the West, for example, does not list any towns in Nebraska. Therefore, the relatively advantaged Kansas migrants were able to have a migratory experience—in terms of labor market outcomes—not unlike that of white migrants.

Those who went to Nebraska or who arrived in Kansas with little capital, however, ended up in a dramatically different labor market position. Upon arrival in Nebraska, without a relief program nor the prior established African-American communities (Cox 1982) similar to those in Kansas, African-American migrants to Nebraska were forced to accept jobs in the urban labor market of Omaha. Indeed, 64% of the African-American population of Nebraska lived in Omaha or South Omaha in 1900 (U.S. Department of Commerce 1901). Furthermore, in both Kansas and Nebraska, because they were African American, these migrants were relegated to the

lowest jobs in the occupational structure: day labor, laundering, service, etc. The census category "Laborers (not specified)" coded people who were in the labor force but who were not in a particular occupation. Unemployment among people in this category was often quite high, since employment opportunities tended to be rather erratic.

Finally, sex differences were important in terms of hypotheses H2 and H4. That is, while these hypotheses were supported by evidence of women's occupational distributions, there was either weak support or no support for these same hypotheses when the men's occupational distributions were analyzed. There was strong evidence that an occupational queue existed among female workers in both states and that the queue functioned as per hypotheses H1-H5 based on Lieberman's theory of labor queues. Native-Born White women were most advantaged, with Foreign-Born White women occupying a middle position and African-American women highly concentrated in the least desirable jobs.

For men, although occupational segmentation supported the queue theory, important features associated with labor queues (i.e., change/movement over time as suggested by hypothesis H2) were not borne out in the evidence discussed here. African-American males did tend to occupy less desirable jobs and to be less likely to work in agricultural occupations than either NBW or FBW men, but African-American men were not any more concentrated in occupations nor did they substantially move down or stagnate in the queue between 1890 and 1900 as had been predicted. However, as with women, hypothesis H5, that FBW males were more likely to be concentrated than NBW males was supported by the data here.

In short, with the exception of the families who were able to participate in colonies and those who quietly left the Kansas cities to farm, the majority of African Americans who arrived during the Exodus of 1879-1880 were likely to be relegated to the lowest rungs of the labor market in the Kansas towns and Nebraska's developing urban centers. Racial labor market discrimination meant that these people would have to work longer in the wage labor sector of the economy in order to afford to set up farms at a later time. Simultaneously, however, the longer these migrants were stalled in their desire to establish a farm, the more expensive it became to set up a farm as land and equipment prices increased.

In the urban labor markets in which the majority of African-American migrants were located, African Americans, especially females, tended to perform the relatively less desirable service sector jobs. Furthermore, the levels of very high occupational concentration among African-American

females in both states and the apparently increasing concentration of African-American males in Nebraska in 1900 are further evidence of occupational segmentation. Since systems of ethnic occupational segmentation often feature a certain amount of labor repression (Barrera 1979), many of the social conditions from which the Exodusters fled were likely to eventually be replicated at an institutional level in Nebraska (to some extent) and Kansas (to a somewhat lesser extent).

### Notes

1. The Census Bureau's decision to move mining out of the "Agriculture" and into the "Manufacturing" category does not, alone, account for the shift in African-American men's participation in agricultural occupations. In 1890 1.7% of African-American males in Kansas were employed as "miners and quarrymen," while 7.3% were so employed in 1900. Instead, it is more likely that the increased proportion of African-American males employed in mining in Kansas in 1900 was due to a shift from agricultural occupations into mining, rather than a statistical change in categorization by the Census Bureau.
2. One primary explanation for the difference in occupational concentration among women workers between 1890 and 1900 appears to be the disaggregation of the 1890 category "Dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, etc." into three separate categories in 1900. This change in the level of aggregation of occupations accounts for 6.1% of the decrease in NBW women's level of occupational concentration in Kansas and 5.5% of that for the same group in Nebraska between 1890 and 1900. In other words, if NBW women reported in the separate 1900 categories of "Milliners" and "Seamstresses" had been included in a broader category "Dressmakers, Milliners and Seamstresses" similar to the 1890 occupational reporting, NBW women's occupational concentration in 1900 would have been 55.1% in Kansas and 61.1% in Nebraska. This measurement difference had a smaller effect on occupational concentration among FBW women, resulting in a 2.2% decrease in occupational concentration in Kansas and a 3.8% decrease in occupational concentration in Nebraska. The smallest effect of this census change was evident among employed African-American women. This change in the census had no effect on occupational concentration of African-American women in Kansas and resulted in only a 0.5% decrease in occupational concentration among employed African-American women in Nebraska between 1890 and 1900.

### References

- Athearn, R. G. 1978. *In Search of Canaan: Black Migration to Kansas, 1879-80*. Lawrence, KS: Regents Press of Kansas.
- Barrera, M. 1979. *Race and Class in the Southwest*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Cox, T. C. 1982. *Blacks in Topeka, Kansas 1865-1915*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Edwards, R. 1979. *Contested Terrain*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Emmons, D. M. 1971. *Garden in the Grasslands*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- England, P. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Frehill-Rowe, Lisa M. 1993. Post-Bellum race relations and rural land tenure: Migration of blacks and whites to Kansas and Nebraska, 1870-1890. *Social Forces* 72(1):77-92.
- Hall, R. 1994. *Sociology of Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Hamilton, K. M. 1991. *Black Towns and Profit*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Hickey, J. V. 1991. 'Pap' Singleton's Dunlap Colony: Relief agencies and the failure of a black settlement in Eastern Kansas. *Great Plains Quarterly* 11 (Winter):23-36.
- Jones, B. W. 1993. "Race, sex, and class: Black female tobacco workers in Durham, North Carolina, 1920-1940, and the development of female consciousness. In *Feminist Frontiers III*, ed. L. Richardson and V. Taylor, 211-17. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Katzman, D. M. 1981. *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kansas State Historical Society. 1977. *Historic Preservation in Kansas: Black Historic Sites: A Beginning Point*. Topeka, KS: Kansas State Division of Printing.
- Kessler-Harris, A. 1990. *A Woman's Wage: Historical Meanings and Social Consequences*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.
- King, M. C. 1992. Occupational segregation by race and sex, 1940-1988. *Monthly Labor Review* 15 (April):30-36.
- Lambert, P. 1978. Ho for Kansas! The origins and spread of 'Kansas Fever' 1870-1880. Discussion Paper Series, Syracuse University.
- Liebersohn, S. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.



- Mason, K. O. 1984. Commentary: Strober's theory of occupational sex segregation. In *Sex Segregation in the Workplace*, ed. B. Reskin, 157-70. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Massey, D. S. and N. A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Massey, D. S. and N. A. Denton. 1988. The dimensions of residential segregation. *Social Forces* 67:281-315.
- Painter, N. I. 1977. *Exodusters: Black Migration to Kansas after Reconstruction*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Riegel, R. E. and R. G. Athearn. 1964. *America Moves West 4th Edition*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Reskin, B., ed. 1984. *Sex Segregation in the Workplace*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Reskin, B. F. and H. I. Hartman. 1986. *Women's Work, Men's Work: Sex Segregation on the Job*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Rollins, J. 1985. *Between Women: Domesticity and Their Employers*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple.
- Schafer, J. 1936. *The Social History of American Agriculture*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Strasser, S. 1982. *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1873. *Ninth Census of the United States, 1870*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1883. *Tenth Census of the United States, 1880*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1893. *Eleventh Census of the United States, 1890*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1901. *Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1918. *Negro Population, 1790-1915*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Woodson, C. 1970 (1918). *A Century of Negro Migration*. New York, NY: AMS Press.
- Zinn, H. 1995. *A People's History of the United States, 1492-Present*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.