# THE IMPACT OF INDIVIDUAL GENDER BELIEFS ON JOB SELECTION AND SEX SEGREGATION OF OCCUPATIONS

by

James Kevin Benson

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in
Sociology

Charlotte

2019

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Scott Fitzgerald

_____
Dr. Jill Yavorsky

_____
Dr. Wei Zhao

# ABSTRACT

JAMES KEVIN BENSON. The Impact of Individual Gender Beliefs on Job Selection and Sex Segregation of Occupations.
(Under the direction of DR. SCOTT FITZGERALD)

Moving beyond occupational aspirations to actual selection of occupations, the current research considers the impact of individual gender beliefs on selection of occupations for men who work in male-dominated occupations compared to men who work in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations and for women who work in female-dominated occupations compared to women who work in mixed-sex or male-dominated occupations. Using a nationally representative sample from the General Social Survey, I compare the sex composition of occupations and responses to survey questions regarding gender beliefs for analyzing the impact of gender beliefs on the occupations people choose. I examine gender beliefs involving women's roles outside the home and beliefs regarding homosexuality, political views, and religiosity. I find that compared to other men, men who have traditional gender beliefs regarding the role of women in the private sphere are more likely to have male-dominated occupations than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. As men's level of education increases, however, the relationship between these variables no longer reaches statistical significance and the likelihood of men working in male-dominated occupations decreases. I also find that compared to other men, men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. For women, however, the impact of gender

beliefs on selection of occupations is not statistically significant. These findings have implications for determining methods for eliminating occupational sex segregation.

# DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the women and men who, like me, engage in educational pursuits later than is typical in the course of life.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Scott Fitzgerald of the College of Arts and Sciences / Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina Charlotte. Dr. Fitzgerald guided me well through this endeavor demonstrating flexibility and patience with my schedule and providing scholarly advice and personal encouragement when I encountered difficulties.

I would also like to thank the other members of my thesis committee Dr. Jill Yavorsky and Dr. Wei Zhao of the College of Arts and Sciences / Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina Charlotte. Dr. Yavorsky and Dr. Zhao were enthusiastic supporters of my effort to conduct this thesis. Both provided helpful feedback and asked difficult questions challenging me to produce a strong thesis. I appreciate the flexibility and patience they showed throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER 1: PROBLEM DEFINITION

Workplaces are principal locations where individuals obtain economic resources, power, and social status (Cech 2013; Ridgeway 2011; Reskin 1993). Presently, men receive the bulk of these rewards resulting in economic and status inequalities for women (Ridgeway 2011; Connell 1987). Formal egalitarian forces implemented since the 1960s, such as governmental regulations preventing discrimination based on sex, have "stalled" and reached their potential for reducing workplace inequality and sex segregation of jobs (England 2010: 150; Friedman 2015; Berdahl et al., 2018). Today, many jobs continue to be filled by people of the same sex (Okamoto and England 1999). The remaining barriers to workplace sex integration are largely informal, cultural barriers, such as cognitive bias, that will require changes in cultural schemas, such as belief that traditionally female activities are not as valuable as traditionally male activities and thus, are not worthy of equal rewards (Risman 2004; England 2010; Connell 1987).

There are several phenomena complicating our understanding of sex-segregation of jobs. First, during the period before "the stall," women were moving into male-dominated jobs at a more rapid pace than men were moving into female-dominated jobs (England 2010; Friedman 2015). Second, as the United States economy transitions from providing more physical/manual jobs (male-dominated) than service/caregiving jobs(female-dominated) to providing more service/caregiving jobs than physical/manual jobs, men are continuing to pursue physical/manual jobs despite the dwindling availability of these jobs (Dwyer 2013). Third, women are surpassing men in levels of educational attainment and labor force participation (Scarborough and Risman 2017; Friedman 2015, Ridgeway 2011). Even so, the rates at which women are moving into

male-dominated jobs today compared to the 1970s and 80s are lower (Friedman 2015, Cotter et al 2011). Today, levels of sex segregation of jobs are high in many occupations; men greatly outnumber women holding CEO, architect, engineer, security, natural resource, construction, and maintenance positions and women greatly outnumber men in "healthcare support occupations," secretaries, administrative assistants, primary school teaching positions (Berdahl et al., 2018:440). Attempting to understand why sex segregation of jobs persists, why women's movement into male-dominated jobs is slowing, and why men are more reluctant than women to pursue jobs traditionally atypical for their sex (England 2011), this research asks a question involving the supply-side of employment and how it induces sex segregation of jobs: Do individuals' gender beliefs impact self-selection into jobs thereby contributing to workplace sex segregation?

# CHAPTER 2: THEORIES AND EXPLANATIONS

## *Human Capital Theory*

Workplace sex segregation describes the "concentration of men and women in different occupations, jobs, industries, or places of work" (Padavic and Reskin 2002:214). Economists have long applied Human Capital Theory (Becker 1957) to explain occupational sex segregation (Stockdale and Nadler 2013). This neoclassical economic theory of supply-side influences on workplace sex segregation disregards demand-side discrimination and posits that sex segregation of jobs results from informed people making rational job choices considering their human capital and expectations regarding: education, training, skills, experience, orientation toward family, unpaid work, and work-life balance (Stockdale and Nadler 2013; Correll 2004; Padavic and Reskin 2002; Okamoto and England 1999; Reskin 1993). Economists say that men, compared women, evaluate and invest their human capital differently which leads to greater economic and status rewards (Stockdale and Nadler 2013; Reskin 1993). Thus, men and women group into dissimilar jobs resulting in workplace sex segregation. Okamoto and England (1999:560) challenge Human Capital Theory pointing to "a large body of research" ungirding many of the theory's claims involving sex segregation of jobs. For example, women do not necessarily choose certain occupations because the occupations allow them to leave work for extended periods of time to care for their families without suffering personal financial penalties (Correll 2004). While sociologists may agree with Human Capital Theory that male-dominated jobs offer greater rewards than female-dominated jobs explaining sex segregation of jobs, sociologists argue that concern for material interests is only one of many reasons explaining why men pursue male-

dominated jobs rather than female dominated jobs (Friedman 2015, Ridgeway 2011, England 2010).

*Hegemonic Masculinity Theory*

Men's reluctance to pursue female-dominated jobs, thereby hindering sex integration of workplaces, may be attributed to men's behaviors concerning the promotion and protection of patriarchy, gender essentialist beliefs, and beliefs in male primacy. Hegemonic masculinity is "the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (Connell 2005:77). The hegemonically masculine ideal is difficult to attain and maintain over time (Berdahl et al., 2018). Adhering to the hegemonically masculine ideal requires being male, heterosexual, dominant, powerful, and a breadwinner (Berdahl et al., 2018). Adhering to the hegemonically masculine ideal requires that men behave in ways elevating their masculinity rather than "destroy[ing]" it. Such behaviors are expected in all areas of society including politics, at home and particularly, at work (Berdahl et al., 2018:426). Thus, men do not typically pursue jobs that are feminine gender-typed; low-paying, low-status, and/or low-physicality, such as secretary or nanny. Instead, men typically pursue jobs that are masculine gender-typed: high paying, high status, and/or high physicality, such as attorney, mayor, or brick mason. Importantly, men striving to meet the hegemonically masculine ideal pursue life-styles allowing them to "put work first" (Berdahl et al., 2018). Some social scientists posit that Masculinity Contest Cultures exist in workplaces whereby men compete to be

perceived as "real men" by working "extreme… hours" and "express[ing] and enforc[ing] heteronormativity" (Berdahl et al., 2018: 424, 426). Masculinity Contest Cultures are credited with contributing to the stall of sex-integration of jobs because they exist particularly in workplaces and workplaces are places whereby men have the greatest opportunities to attain the hegemonically masculine ideal.

*Gender Structure Theory*

Arguing that people seldom have all the information necessary for determining what is in their best interests, material or otherwise, many sociologists attribute workplace segregation to structural constraints including biased employment criteria and processes, as well as conscious discrimination (England and Folbre 2005). Critics of "purely structural" theories say these theories are deterministic and disregard the influences of culture and human agency on workplace sex segregation (Risman 2004:432; Sewell 1992). Addressing these criticisms of social structure theory, sociologists William Sewell and Barbara Risman build on Anthony Giddens' (1984) structuration theory which introduces the notion of a "recursive relationship between social structure and individuals" (Risman 2004:432). Sewell (1992) expands structural theory by positing that the relationship between social structure and individuals is more than a duality, that mutually constitutive relationships exist between structures, cultural schemas, and resources. In explaining the dynamic social interactions among these concepts, Sewell (1992:3) "recognize(s) the agency of social actors" while also accounting for the changeability of structures without diminishing their power. Furthering developing his theory, Sewell (1992:8,17) combines Giddens' and Bourdieu's

definitions of cultural schemas stating that they are informal, "transposable" "procedures applied in the enactment/reproduction of social life" rather than formal rules. Redefining the term cultural schemas in this way makes it easier to envision this theory's applicability to various situations.

In her expansion of gender structure theory, Risman (2004) emphasizes how the conscious and subconscious influence of gender guides behavior at every level of society from individuals to institutions, such as marriage, the economy and government. Risman (2004) posits that schemas involving gender "structure" social practices in three dimensions: individual, interactional, and institutional and that these three dimensions are equal in their effect on one another. Again recently, Risman (2017) expanded gender structure theory further developing the three dimensions described above to include "cultural and material processes taking place at each social dimension" (Scarborough and Risman 2017: 2). Formal egalitarian challenges to the gender structure during the 1960s, 70s and 80s led to higher levels of sex integration of jobs. But because these formal challenges addressed flaws primarily effecting the institutional domain, such as organizational practices, sex integration stalled (Risman 2004). Risman (2004) argues that the next step toward mitigating gender inequalities is to develop mechanisms that challenge the gender structure at the interactional cultural dimension, such as status expectations and cognitive bias.

Although it may not have been their primary intention, Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman provide evidence supporting gender structure theory in their 2011 research. These researchers explain that during the 1990s liberalization of gender beliefs and sex integration of jobs stalled due to the emergence of an "alternative [cultural] frame" in

which "equality meant the right of women to choose-so choosing a stay-at-home mother role could represent as much of a feminist choice as pursuing an independent career" (Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2011:283). Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman (2011) provided evidence for this claim in their analysis of data from the General Social Survey (GSS) involving changes over time in respondents' answers to questions regarding gender attitudes. Thus, just as Sewell and Risman have theorized, we see how cultural schemas can be informal, transposable, and interactional in the cultural dimension.

*Gender Role Socialization, Gender Beliefs (Male Primacy and Gender Essentialism), and Gender Status Beliefs*

Gender role socialization is an ongoing process affecting an individual's gender beliefs throughout her or his lifetime (Okamoto and England 1999). The gendered beliefs and schemas (plans) people adopt through socialization are influenced by "outside social forces" including "reference group members" (England 2011). Outside social forces include culture, parents, spouse or partner, education, occupation, income, and members of one's race, sex, and class. Sometimes, however, peoples' behaviors contradict their gender beliefs and schemas. Empirically, Irene Padavic (1992:225) found in her research regarding sex segregation of blue-collar and white-collar jobs that despite women's gender role socialization toward performing clean, non-physical jobs, this gender schema did not prevent them from "transferring to blue-collar jobs" in a utility plant when the opportunity arose. Anecdotally, a husband's income level affected whether his wife was able to adhere to traditional gender beliefs and schema's involving women's employment in the public sphere. Despite these examples, we can expect people's behaviors will

generally reflect the gender beliefs and schemas they've adopted through the socialization process (Okamoto and England 1999).

At the center of gender inequality is the belief that men are superior to women. Male primacy, "represents men as more status worthy than women and accordingly more appropriate for positions of authority and domination" (Charles and Grusky 2004:15). Conversely, the gender essentialist belief that women are "more competent than men in service, nurturance and social interaction" represents women as less status worthy than men (Charles and Grusky 2004:15). These gender beliefs create a status inequality, "inequality between culturally defined types of people," that is pervasive throughout society influencing behaviors at work, home and beyond (Ridgeway 2011, Correll 2004). The cultural pervasiveness of these beliefs yields a hegemonic gender structure that is difficult to change. Breaking the foundation of this structure to erase sex segregation at work requires, in part, changes in individual gender beliefs.

Personal beliefs regarding gender roles have turned slightly toward conservatism since the 1990s (Friedman 2015). Conservative gender role beliefs include female dominance of the private sphere which involves "childrearing, domestic labor, and intense nurturing roles in the family" and male dominance of the public sphere which largely involves intense pursuit of jobs, careers and politics (Friedman 2015:144; Padavic and Reskin 2002). Sarah Friedman (2015) reminds us, however, that despite this recent conservative turn regarding gender role beliefs, the overall trajectory since the 1960s has turned toward liberalism. This has resulted in general support in society for women becoming highly involved in both the private and public spheres and women's movement into male-dominated jobs. Comparatively, the result has not been the same for men; men

continue to be more involved in the public sphere than in the private sphere and men's rates of movement into female-dominated jobs has been low.

Personal gender beliefs not only influence whether people perceive their gender roles as being either in the public sphere or private sphere, these beliefs also influence their assessments of their own intellectual abilities and skills and therefore, the choices they make when pursuing education and training for careers and jobs (Ridgeway, 2011; Charles and Bradley 2009; Correll 2004). *Gender status beliefs* describe the evaluations people make of themselves and others before acting in given situations comparing abilities and competencies with societal expectations of themselves and others based on gender (Ridgeway 2011). Gender status beliefs/gender biased self-assessments account for the "persistence in the sex segregation of college majors" (Ridgeway 2011:107). A good example is the false notion that females lack the aptitude to excel in math and math-related jobs. Consequently, girls and women may doubt their talents in math leading them to underperform in the classroom and avoid pursuing jobs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (Ridgeway 2011, Correll 2004). Conversely, boys and men's gender biased self-assessments of their math abilities boost self-confidence. Importantly, traditional gender beliefs also incite "typical worker" ideals which influence individuals' perceptions of their appropriateness or "fit" for certain jobs given their gender (Ridgeway 2011:108). For example, societal gender beliefs regarding female aptitudes for raising children may lead female physicians possessing excellent qualifications and abilities to choose to specialize in general pediatrics rather than in adult cardiology, a higher paying specialty than pediatrics dominated by men, because they, along with their peers and patients, believe that caring for children is more

appropriate for their gender. Charles and Grusky (2004:19) call this phenomenon "horizontal segregation" whereby individuals self-assess and self-select into jobs considered culturally appropriate for their genders. Conversely, Charles and Grusky (2004: 21) call the phenomenon whereby men more than women possess jobs with the highest status regardless of whether the jobs are appropriate for their gender "vertical segregation." Horizontal segregation stems from gender essentialism and vertical segregation stems from male primacy (Charles and Grusky 2004). Charles and Grusky (2004) argue that sex integration of jobs stalled in the mid-1990s because formal egalitarian forces had more effectively mitigated vertical segregation stemming from gender beliefs of male primacy than they had mitigated horizontal segregation stemming from gender essentialist beliefs. Thus, developing mechanisms to mitigate the influence of gender essentialist beliefs should be the next step toward achieving sex integration of jobs.

# CHAPTER 3: HYPOTHESES

For the current project, I test the following hypotheses related to the different theories and explanations described above. Specifically, the gender role beliefs that men are best suited for dominating the public sphere and for pursuing occupations, careers, and politics led me posit hypotheses H1a and H3a and the gender role beliefs that women are best suited for dominating the private sphere and for performing childrearing, domestic labor, and nurturing roles led me posit hypotheses H1b and H3b. Specifically, regarding hypotheses H2a and H2b, the key aspects of Hegemonic Masculinity Theory involving strict adherence to the hegemonically masculine ideal of being heterosexual and the breadwinner of the household led me to posit hypotheses H2a and H2b. It is important to note that the different concepts founding each of my hypotheses have in common higher-level themes including patriarchy, gender essentialism, and male primacy that involve more than one of the theories and explanations from the problem definition section of this paper. For example, being a breadwinner is a key concept of Hegemonic Masculinity Theory and is a concept that serves to perpetuate patriarchy. Similarly, women's unsuitableness for politics is a key gender role belief that also serves to perpetuate patriarchy.

I analyze data from the GSS comparing the sex compositions of respondents' occupations and responses to questions regarding their gender beliefs to derive my hypotheses. In doing this, I use the same questions involving gender beliefs used by Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman (2011) in their analysis plus several other questions. Unlike Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman (2011), however, the current study is not time series.

H1a: Compared to other men, men who have traditional gender beliefs are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations.

H1b: Compared to other women, women who have traditional gender beliefs are more likely to work female-dominated occupations.

H2a: Compared to other men, men who believe that sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations.

H2b: Compared to other women, women who believe that sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is wrong are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations.

H3a: Compared to other men, men who believe that women are not suited for politics are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations.

H3b: Compared to other women, women who believe that women are not suited for politics are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations.

# CHAPTER 4: CHALLENGES

While there continue to be many factors influencing sex-segregation of jobs in the United States, this research attempts to examine only one, the influence of gender beliefs. The different theories and explanations discussed in this literature review specifically implicate gender beliefs as reasons why sex segregation of jobs persists. In this literature review, I have shed light on the mutually constitutive relationships existing between the gender beliefs of agentic actors, economic factors, and structural factors. Because these relationships are mutually constitutive, Charles and Grusky (2004:14) warn that it is extremely difficult to differentiate between the causes of sex segregation of jobs due to "discrimination" and the causes due to "supply-side forces." Similarly, Padavic and Reskin (2002:54) believe that "adult outlook…is not very important for explaining men's and women's concentration in different jobs…" Despite these challenges, this research attempts to heed the calls of Charles and Grusky (2004) to investigate horizontal sex segregation of jobs resulting from gender essentialist beliefs and of Risman (2004) to investigate sex segregation of jobs caused by interactional dimension mechanisms. Thus, the dependent variable for this research is *sex composition of an adult individual's occupation*.

# CHAPTER 5: DATA, MEASUREMENTS, AND METHODS

## *Data*

The General Social Surveys (GSS) are produced by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago. These ongoing national samples are drawn periodically, typically biannually, with 31 different surveys having been drawn over a 44-year period since 1972. Initially, block quota sampling was used to locate respondents (one respondent per household) for the survey. In 1977, however, probability sampling began being used. It is important to note that in 1975 and 1976, one half of the surveys were conducted using block quota while the other half were conducted using probability. From 1972 through 2004, only English speaking non-institutionalized individuals 18 years and older were surveyed. Since 2006, however, Spanish speaking non-institutionalized individuals 18 years and older have also been surveyed. All surveys are combined into one dataset.

The survey interviews follow a standard questionnaire comprised of questions that are categorized in the following ways: questions that are included on every survey; questions that are included on two-thirds of surveys; and questions that occur only on one survey. Some of the questions are the same questions used on other national surveys dating back to 1937 and thus, makes it possible to perform analyses of social trends. Beginning in 2002, the survey interview was changed from being administered using paper to being administered using computers. The survey questions involve variables that reflect the social characteristics and attitudes of respondents from households throughout the United States. The questions and variables involve a wide array of topics ranging from civil liberties to social mobility (Smith et al. 2019).

Households are randomly and systematically selected for participation in the survey using listings produced by each decennial United States (US) Census and listings of addresses from the United States Postal Service (USPS). The sampling design used in 2004 and going forward is considered a multi-stage design and systematically ensures all populations and geographic areas from all 50 US states are represented. Following is a general description of the multi-stage design for selection of households. First, Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) containing metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas are selected from a listing. Second, within each PSU, segments containing one or more blocks comprised of 50 or more housing units are selected. Third, because some PSUs are small in area, some segments could possibly be selected twice. Moreover, these segments could contain many households. When this occurs, using probability procedures, the segments are divided into sections and are "sub-sampled." In addition to stratifying samples based on geographic region and type of population (urban, suburban, and rural), stratification procedures are also followed to ensure proportional representation of households based on age, race, and income.

For the current project, I am only using data from years 2006 through 2016 rather than data from 1972 through 2016. Therefore, only the sampling designs used after the 2000 and 2010 US Censuses impact this project. After pulling the variables needed to conduct the current study from the larger dataset, sample size following automatic listwise deletion in Stata is 4,220 observations for the dataset of male respondents and 4,253 observations for the dataset of female respondents.

At the household level, the GSS is considered a "full-probability," "self-weighting" sample because its design ensures that: (1) all households have equal

opportunity for being sampled and (2) all members of a household 18 years and older have equal opportunity for being sampled (Smith et al. 2019: 3124). Moreover, each household and each respondent are sampled only once. For various reasons, obtaining survey interviews from some pre-selected households can be difficult requiring significant use of limited resources. Therefore, a special design (non-respondent sub-sampling) may be used to gather data from these households while also containing costs. Beginning in 2004, the NORC began using this design for the GSS. To make the sample representative, however, it is recommended that a weight coded "wtssnr" be applied for all data gathered beginning in 2004 to the present. For my current project, I am analyzing data from years 2006 through 2016 and thus, the weight variable "wtssnr" is included in all regression models.

Descriptive and inferential statistics are estimated after cases with missing data have been removed. Stata statistical software automatically discards missing data using listwise deletion from the cases.

*Measurement*

Following are descriptions of the variables included in the current project. There is a variable in this dataset "year" which I've included only for demonstrating the extracted parameters of the dataset for this analysis. Otherwise, I will not comment on this variable.

A common concern in survey research is potential bias in samples. Thus, I applied the weight variable "wtsnnr" to the statistical programs I ran for this analysis.

The GSS variable "occ10" denotes respondents' occupations for years 1972 through 2016. However, the GSS dataset lacks the numbers of cases for correctly calculating the sex compositions of all occupations listed in "occ10." Therefore, I created the dependent variable for this analysis following a multi-staged process using: (1) "occ10" from the GSS dataset; "occ1990" from the American Community Survey (ACS), a larger dataset than GSS; occupations coding crosswalks, and merged data involving two variables, one form each dataset (Smith et al., 2019; Ruggles et al., 2019). As I explained earlier, from "occ10" I only included years 2006 through 2016. From "occ1990," I used data from the year 2011 because its occupation codes most closely matched the "occ10" codes.

Following are the steps from this multi-staged process. First, I ran cross-tabulations on the variables "occ1990" and "sex" from the ACS 2011 data to calculate the sex compositions of the occupations. Next, because: (1) GSS and ACS use different occupation names and coding schemes; (2) the ACS year-to-year crosswalk actually lists US Census Bureau occupation codes rather than ACS codes; and (3) I received errors when I attempted to drop the value labels from the ACS "occ1990" variable to uncover the underlying codes, it became necessary to merge an ACS "occ" variable (different from the ACS "occ10" variable) with the GSS "occ10" variable and drop the value labels for ACS "occ" to view and compare the underlying codes side by side. By doing this, for example, I saw that GSS "occ" occupation code 3920 was the equivalent of the ACS "occ1990" occupation code 426 which denote the occupation "security guard and gaming surveillance officers." Next, I used occupation coding crosswalks to observe how some of the codes had been merged over time. By doing this, for example, I saw that GSS

occupation code 5830 (desktop publishers) had been merged over time with GSS occupation code 5940 (office and administrative support workers, all others) to form the GSS occupation code 5940 (miscellaneous office and administrative support workers, including desktop publishers), which was the equivalent of ACS occupation code 0389 (administrative support jobs n.e.c.). Next, I attached the sex-composition values I had derived earlier to the GSS "occ10" occupation codes and arranged the occupations in descending order based on percent male-dominated (see Table 1). Lastly, following standard protocol for calculating sex composition of occupations, I created a binomial dependent variable female dominated occupation whereby occupations 30% or less male are designated female-dominated and 30.01% or more male are designated other (Yavorsky, Cohen, and Qian 2016; Kmec 2005).

**Table 1.** Ranking by Sex Composition of Occupations

| OCCUPATIONS | Codes | Percent Male Sex Composition (Lower Percentages Denote Female-Dominated & Higher Percentages Denote Male Dominated) |
|---|---|---|
| Top 10 Female-Dominated Occupations | | |
| kindergarten and earlier school teachers | 0155 | 2.56 |
| dental hygienists | 0204 | 2.66 |
| dental assistants | 0445 | 3.96 |
| secretaries | 0313 | 3.98 |
| speech therapists | 0104 | 5.57 |
| childcare workers | 0468 | 5.69 |
| licensed practical nurses | 0207 | 7.37 |
| hairdressers and cosmetologists | 0458 | 8.37 |
| occupational therapists | 0099 | 8.74 |
| receptionists | 0319 | 8.74 |
| Top 10 Male-Dominated Occupations | | |
| drillers of oil wells | 0614 | 99.39 |
| concrete and cement workers | 0588 | 99.23 |
| plasterers | 0584 | 99.01 |
| excavating and loading machine operators | 0853 | 98.85 |
| drillers of earth | 0598 | 98.85 |
| small engine repairs | 0509 | 98.64 |
| roofers and slaters | 0595 | 98.55 |
| heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration mechanics | 0534 | 98.47 |
| bus, truck, and stationary engine mechanics | 0507 | 98.37 |
| elevator installers and repairers | 0543 | 98.25 |

After transforming the dependent variable into two separate binary variables (male-dominated occupation and female-dominated occupation), the frequency counts for the sex compositions of the occupations showed men in male-dominated equaling 1,995 and other 2,258 and women in female-dominated equaling 2,096 and other 2,124.

Following are the main independent variables for the current study: (1) "bad for women to work;" (2) "women are not suited for politics;" and (3) "homosexual relations are wrong." The variable "bad for women to work" is an index created from the original variables: (1) "working mother doesn't hurt children;" "preschool kids suffer if mother works;" and "better for man to work, woman tend home." Due to the moderate correlation among these three variables, I created an index combining them. Before creating the index, I produced a correlation matrix (see Table 2) which showed the following Pearson correlation statistics: "preschool kids suffer if mother works" and "mother working doesn't hurt children" = -0.49*; "preschool kids suffer if mother works" and "better for man to work, woman tend home" = 0.46*; and "better for man to work, woman tend home" and "mother working doesn't hurt children" = -0.37*.

The index "bad for women to work" is ordered such that the highest value denotes strong agreement with the traditional gender belief that women working outside the home is harmful to families. Obtaining this order required reordering the category responses for "preschool kids suffer if mother works" and "better for men to work, woman tend home" to align them with the category responses for "mother working doesn't hurt children." The variable "women are not suited for politics" originally had two response categories agree and disagree. I recoded this variable as a dummy variable applying the codes 1 and 0 for agree and disagree respectively. The variable involving homosexual

**Table 2.** Correlations among variables

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Sex composition of occupations | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mother working doesn't hurt children | -0.09* | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Peschool kids suffer if mother works | 0..09* | -0.49* | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Women not suited for politics | 0.05* | -0.15* | 0.18* | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Better for man to work, woman tend home | 0.10* | -0.37* | 0.46* | 0.29* | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Homosexual sex relations | 0.13* | -0.20* | 0.25* | 0.23* | 0.38* | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Respondent considers self a religious person | 0.00 | -0.09* | 0.12* | 0.10* | 0.22* | 0.40* | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Think of self as liberal or conservative | -0.05* | 0.15* | -0.17* | -0.16* | -0.23* | -0.34* | -0.26* | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Race of respondent | -0.03* | 0.03* | -0.06* | -0.04* | -0.07* | -0.09* | -0.06* | -0.08* | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 10 | Labor force status | -0.01 | 0.08* | -0.09* | -0.06* | -0.15* | -0.10* | -0.11* | 0.03* | -0.46 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 11 | Respondents sex | 0.24* | -0.16* | 0.16* | 0.02 | 0.08* | 0.06* | -0.13* | -0.04* | 0.01 | 0.18* | 1.00 | | | | |
| 12 | Age of Respondent | -0.00 | 0.10* | -0.14* | -.0.03* | -0.17* | -0.20* | -0.20* | 0.11* | -0.18* | 0.28* | 0.03* | 1.00 | | | |
| 13 | Highest year of school completed | 0.18* | -0.15* | 0.18* | 0.13* | 0.26* | 0.26* | 0.10* | -0.09* | -0.15* | -0.19* | -0.00 | -0.04* | 1.00 | | |
| 14 | Family income in constant dollars | 0.10* | -0.07* | 0.08* | 0.07* | 0.15* | 0.14* | 0.07* | 0.04* | -0.12* | -0.19* | -0.09* | 0.01 | 0.37* | 1.00 | |
| 15 | Marital status | 0.00 | -0.05* | 0.07* | 0.01 | 0.09* | 0.16* | 0.17* | -0.16* | 0.14* | -0.03* | -0.02* | -0.37* | -0.05* | -0.29* | 1.00 |

relations originally had four response categories (always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, and not wrong at all). I recoded this variable as a dummy variable applying the code 1 and 0 for wrong and not wrong respectively.

I control for personal characteristics and attitudes that might contribute to job selection and indirectly individual reflect gender beliefs. Control variables include income, education, and age which are continuous variables which I did not recode. However, for the "age" variable I used the "keep" command in Stata to limit the range to include only working age adults 23 to 65. Other control variables include marital status, work status, race, sex, political views, and religiosity. I recoded these categorical

variables as either straight-forward dummy variables, i.e., marital status as married=1 and not married=2, or I recoded the variables' response categories as dummy variables, i.e., political views as liberal=1 and other=0, moderate=1 and other=0, and conservative=1 and other=0.

*Methods*

For the current analysis, I am analyzing cross-sectional data, my dependent variable is a dichotomous categorical variable with only two values 0 and 1, and I am predicting the dependent variable based on many independent variables both nominal and continuous. Therefore, carrying out binary logistic regressions are appropriate for analyzing the data (Woolridge 2016). Also, since I am most interested in the impact of having traditional gender beliefs on the sex-composition of occupations, my hypotheses are directional.

I run six different models using binomial logistic regression for this analysis. In the first three models (model 1, model 2, and model 3), I include male respondents and exclude female respondents and recode the variable "sex composition" creating a dichotomous dependent variable labeled "male-dominated occupation" whereby 1 denotes male-dominated occupations and 0 denotes all other occupations. For the next three models (model 4, model 5, and model 6), I include female respondents and exclude male respondents and recode the variable "sex composition" creating a dichotomous dependent variable labeled "female-dominated occupation" whereby 1 denotes female-dominated occupations and 0 denotes all other occupations. Consequently, I am running binomial logistic regressions on two different dependent variables from two different

datasets which are subsets of the original GSS dataset and in the discussion section of this thesis, will compare the results.

Regarding the independent variables, for the first and fourth models I include only the three main independent variables that are directly associated with testing my hypotheses. The main independent variables involve the following gender beliefs: (1) it is "bad for women to work," which is an index measuring levels of agreement and disagreement with the survey statements "mother working doesn't hurt children," "preschool kids suffer if mother works," and "better for man to work, woman to tend home;" (2) "women are not suited for politics;" and (3) "homosexual relations are wrong." For the second and fourth models, I include the three independent variables described previously plus two additional independent variables: (1) a variable measuring a respondent's level of religiosity and (2) a variable measuring a respondent's political views. Rather than recoding the variable measuring religiosity into a dummy variable coded religious and not religious, I recoded the variable's response categories into dummy variables because I expected there may be significant differences in gender beliefs among respondents who answered very religious, moderately religious, and slightly religious and I wanted to discuss these potential differences in my analysis. The variable involving respondents' political views originally had seven response categories and I collapsed these categories into three categories: liberal, moderate, and conservative. Like the variable measuring religiosity, I recoded these response categories into dummy variables. For the third and fifth models, I include all independent variables. After running all six binomial logistic regression models, I analyzed, compared, and interpreted the resulting statistics.

# CHAPTER 6: RESULTS

*Summary and Descriptive Statistics*

I begin by considering summary and descriptive statistics involving the dependent variable and main independent variables, which are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Given the concern of the current study regarding gender traditionalism, I describe and analyze these statistics emphasizing response categories and characteristics fitting of traditional gender beliefs. I begin by describing the sample populations

Regarding demographics, respondents are 50.19 percent male and 49.81 percent female. Forty-seven percent of male respondents work in male-dominated occupations and 50 percent of female respondents work in female-dominated occupations. Respondents' average ages are approximately 44 years for males and 43 years for females; it is important to keep in mind that the ages of respondents included in this analysis is restricted ranging from 23 to 65 years, the typical working age for adults. Ninety percent of male respondents work fulltime and 80 percent of female respondent work fulltime. Note, only respondents working full or part-time are included in this sample. The average family income for male respondents is $41,770.34 and for female respondents is 36,156.33. Fifty-four percent of male respondents are married, whereas 48 percent of female respondents are married. Respondent's educational attainment is measured in years of education with the average educational attainment for both sexes being approximately 14 years. Racially, 75 percent of male respondents and 72 percent of female respondents are white. All other respondents are listed as non-white.

Regarding the gender beliefs and personal characteristics of these respondents, 20 percent of male respondents and 18 percent of female respondents believe that women

**Table 3:** Descriptive statistics dataset

| Variables | Obs # | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male-Dominated Occupation | 4,253 | 0.47 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| *Traditional Gender Beliefs* | | | | | |
| Its Bad for Women to Work | 2,560 | 2.22 | 0.61 | 1 | 4 |
| Women Are Not Suited for Politics | 2,393 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 |
| Homosexual Relations Are Wrong | 2,426 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| *Other* | | | | | |
| Considers Self a Religious Person | | | | | |
| Very Religious | 3,797 | 0.13 | 0.36 | 0 | 1 |
| Moderately Religious | 3,797 | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Slightly Religious | 3,797 | 0.26 | 0.44 | 0 | 1 |
| Not Religious | 3,797 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 |
| Thinks of Self as Liberal or Conservative | | | | | |
| Liberal | 4,149 | 0.28 | 0.45 | 0 | 1 |
| Moderate | 4,149 | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Conservative | 4,149 | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Employed Fulltime | 4,279 | 0.90 | 0.30 | 0 | 1 |
| Married | 4,277 | 0.54 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Male | 4,279 | 1 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 |
| White | 4,279 | 0.75 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 |
| Age | 4,279 | 43.64 | 11.44 | 23 | 65 |
| Family Income in Constant Dollars | 3,977 | 41,770 | 36,808 | 234 | 155,140 |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 4,273 | 13.82 | 3.16 | 0 | 20 |

**Table 4:** Descriptive statistics dataset

| Variables | Obs # | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female-Dominated Occupation | 4,220 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| *Traditional Gender Beliefs* | | | | | |
| Its Bad for Women to Work | 2,522 | 1.95 | 0.66 | 1 | 4 |
| Women Are Not Suited for Politics | 2,448 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0 | 1 |
| Homosexual Relations Are Wrong | 2,441 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| *Other* | | | | | |
| Considers Self a Religious Person | | | | | |
| Very religious) | 3,804 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0 | 1 |
| Moderately religious) | 3,804 | 0.42 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Slightly religious) | 3,804 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0 | 1 |
| Not religious) | 3,804 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0 | 1 |
| Thinks of Self as Liberal or Conservative | | | | | |
| Liberal) | 4,112 | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
| Moderate) | 4,112 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 |
| Conservative) | 4,112 | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
| Employed Fulltime | 4,248 | 0.80 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 |
| Married | 4,248 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Female | 4,248 | 2 | 0.00 | 2 | 2 |
| White | 4,248 | 0.72 | 0.45 | 0 | 1 |
| Age | 4,248 | 42.88 | 11.44 | 23 | 65 |
| Family Income in Constant Dollars | 3,864 | 36,156 | 33,020 | 234 | 155,140 |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 4,241 | 14.14 | 2.90 | 0 | 20 |

are not suited for politics. On a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating strong agreement with the index concept that it is "bad for women to work outside the home," the average score for males is 2.22 and females is 1.95. Asked if homosexual relations are wrong, 57 percent of male respondents expressed agreement and 48 percent of female respondents expressed agreement. Regarding religiosity, 75 percent of male respondents and 83 percent of female respondents describe themselves as religious. As for political persuasion, males identified as 28 percent liberal, 36 percent moderate, and 36 percent conservative and females identified as 30 percent liberal, 40 percent moderate, and 30 percent conservative.

Comparing the two samples: male respondents with male-dominated occupations and female respondents with female-dominated occupations, I observe some interesting results. Regarding average family income, compared to male respondents in male-dominated occupations, females in female-dominated occupations earn $5,614.01 less annually. The male respondents who agree that homosexual relations are wrong work in male-dominated occupations (57 percent), whereas females who agree that homosexual relations are wrong work in mixed-sex or male-dominated occupations (48 percent).

*Binomial Logit Regression (Men's Gender Beliefs)*

Tables 5 and 6 show the resulting statistics of the binomial logit regression models carried out for this study. I begin by interpreting the results shown in Table 5 involving the binomial logistic regressions carried out for analyzing the impact of men's gender beliefs on self-selection into male-dominated occupations. Next, I interpret the results shown in Table 6 involving the binomial logistic regressions carried out for

analyzing the impact of women's gender beliefs on self-selection into female-dominated occupations.

Following are results from running binomial logit regression model 1, which includes only male respondents, the dependent variable "male-dominated occupation," the following independent variables: "bad for women to work," "women are not suited for politics," and "homosexual relations are wrong," and the "weight variable." There are 1,142 observations after missing data are automatically removed by Stata using listwise deletion. Diagnostics conducted to diagnose multicollinearity show variance inflation factor (VIF) values no greater than 1.15 and tolerance values no less than 0.87, which provide some evidence of no high multicollinearity existing among the independent variables because no values are greater than 10 (Woolridge 2016). To adjust for heteroskedasticity, heteroskedastic-robust standard errors are applied (Woolridge 2016). Adding the "vce robust" option to the command for running the binomial logistic regression accomplishes this task in Stata. To judge how well the independent variables in the model together explain the variance in the dependent variable, I observed results from the Wald chi2 and associated p-value, pseudo R2, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow test and associated p-value: the Wald chi2 is 50.93 (p-value <0.001***), pseudo r2 is 0.0333, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow value is 6.47 (p-value = 0.5944). The null hypothesis for the Wald chi2 test is that a model containing only the constant would be a better fit. Given that the p-value for Wald chi2 is significant, I can reject the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis for the Hosmer-Lemeshow test is that the model is a good fit and since the test is not statistically significant, I accept the null that the model is a good fit. These results lead me to conclude that model 1 is a good fit.

**Table 5.** Binomial Logit Regression of Men With Traditional Gender Beliefs and Other Characteristics on Male-Dominated Occupations

| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| VARIABLES | Male-dominated Coefficients | Male-dominated Coefficients | Male-dominated Coeficients |
| Bad for women to work | 0.224** | 0.195* | 0.0474 |
| | (-0.107) | (-0.110) | (-0.117) |
| Women not suited for politics | 0.163 | 0.169 | 0.124 |
| | (-0.156) | (-0.161) | (-0.172) |
| Homosexual relations are wrong | 0.684*** | 0.690*** | 0.457*** |
| | (-0.132) | (-0.145) | (-0.153) |
| Very religious | | -0.277 | -0.175 |
| | | (-0.232) | (-0.258) |
| Moderately religious | | -0.0492 | -0.0648 |
| | | (-0.173) | (-0.185) |
| Slightly religious | | 0.176 | 0.127 |
| | | (-0.180) | (-0.190) |
| Not religious (omitted) | | | |
| Liberal | | -0.116 | -0.231 |
| | | (-0.169) | (-0.183) |
| Moderate | | 0.226 | 0.030 |
| | | (-0.151) | (-0.163) |
| Conservative (omitted) | | | |
| Employed fulltime | | | 0.086 |
| | | | (-0.225) |
| White | | | -0.080 |
| | | | (-0.161) |
| Married | | | (-0.089) |
| | | | -0.152 |
| Age | | | -0.004 |
| | | | (-0.006) |
| Highest year of school completed | | | -0.200*** |
| | | | (-0.028) |
| Family income | | | 1.34E-06 |
| | | | -2.15E-06 |
| Weight variable | 0.153 | 0.139 | 0.167 |
| | (-0.101) | (-0.105) | (-0.113) |
| Constant | -1.281*** | -1.263*** | 1.772*** |
| | (-0.247) | (-0.304) | (-0.631) |
| Observations | 1,142 | 1,106 | 1,040 |

*Note:* *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Robust standard errors in parentheses

In model 1, the coefficients for the variables "bad for women to work" and "homosexual relations are wrong" are positive at 0.22 and 0.68 respectively. These

results are statistically significant at the 95 (0.037) and 99 (<0.001) percent confidence levels respectively, indicating that positive relationships exist between these independent variables and the dependent variable. The null hypotheses are that these coefficients are equal to zero and that there are no associations between these independent variables and the dependent variable. Thus, we can reject these null hypotheses and support the alternative hypotheses that the coefficients are not zero and that associations exist.

We can state the following based on the binomial logit regression results for model 1. The coefficient for "bad for women to work" is 0.22. This means that we expect an increase of 0.22 in the log-odds of "male-dominated occupation" with every one-unit increase in "bad for women to work." The coefficient for "homosexual relations are wrong" is 0.68. This means that an increase of 0.68 is expected in the log-odds of "male-dominated occupation" with a one unit increase in "homosexual relations are wrong."

These coefficients translate to odds ratios of 1.25 and 1.98 for "bad for women to work" and "homosexual relations are wrong" respectively. Odds ratios are interpreted differently for continuous and categorical variables. For continuous independent variables, odds ratios greater than 1 mean that for every one-unit increase in the independent variable, the dependent variable increases by the odds ratio. For categorical independent variables, however, odds ratios greater than one mean that the category of the dependent variable with the value 1 is more likely to occur. In the case of model 1, the odds ratios for "bad for women to work" (continuous variable) and "homosexual relations are wrong" (categorical variable) are greater than 1 indicating that positive relationships exist between these independent variables and the dependent variable. We

can state that for every one-unit increase in "bad for women to work," the likelihood of "male-dominated occupation" occurring increases 1.25 times. In other words, on average, for every one-unit increase in men's belief that it is "bad for women to work," the likelihood of men working in male-dominated occupations increases by 1.25 times. We can also state that compared to other men, on average, men who believe that "homosexual relations are wrong" are 1.98 times more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations.

Now the results of model 2, which includes the same male respondents, dependent variable, independent variables, and weight variable as model 1 plus the following independent "dummy" variables: "very religious" person, "moderately religious" person, "slightly religious" person, "not religious" person, "liberal" political views, "moderate" political views, and "conservative" political views. There are 1,106 observations after missing data are automatically removed by Stata using listwise deletion. Diagnostics conducted to diagnose multicollinearity show variance inflation factor (VIF) values no greater than 2.67 and tolerance values no less than 0.37, providing some evidence of no high multicollinearity. To adjust for heteroskedasticity, heteroskedastic-robust standard errors are applied using the "vce robust" option. The Wald chi2 is 51.24 (p-value <0.001***), pseudo r2 is 0.0361, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow value is 9.32 (p-value = 0.3163). These results lead me to conclude that model 2 is a good fit compared to the constant.

In model 2, the coefficients for the variables "bad for women to work" and "homosexual relations are wrong" are positive at 0.20 and 0.69 respectively. These results are statistically significant at the 90 (0.076) (down from 95 percent in model 1),

and 99 (<0.001) percent confidence levels respectively indicating positive relationships existing between these independent variables and the dependent variable. Thus, we reject the null hypotheses and support the alternative hypotheses.

We can state the following based on the logit results for model 2. The coefficient for "bad for women to work" is 0.20. This means that we expect an increase of 0.20 in the log-odds of "male-dominated occupation" with every one-unit increase in "bad for women to work." The coefficient for "homosexual relations are wrong" is 0.69. This means that an increase of 0.69 is expected in the log-odds of male-dominated-occupation with a one unit increase in "homosexual relations are wrong." The coefficients translate to odds ratios of 1.22 and 1.99 for "bad for women to work" and "homosexual relations are wrong" respectively. In the case of model 2, the odds ratios for "bad for women to work" (continuous variable) and "homosexual relations are wrong" (categorical variable) are greater than 1 indicating that positive relationships exist between these independent variables and the dependent variable. We can also state that for every one-unit increase in "bad for women to work," the likelihood of "male-dominated occupation" occurring increases 1.21 times. In other words, on average, for every one-unit increase in men's belief that it is bad for women to work, the likelihood of men working in male-dominated occupations increases by 1.21 times. We can also state that compared to other men, on average, men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are 1.99 times more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations.

Regarding the results for model 3, which includes the same male respondents, dependent variable, independent variables, and weight variable as model 2 plus the

following “dummy” independent variables: “employed full-time,” “white,” and “married” and the following continuous independent variables: “age,” “highest year of school completed,” and “family income.” There are 1,040 observations after missing data are automatically removed by Stata using listwise deletion. Diagnostics conducted to diagnose multicollinearity show variance inflation factor (VIF) values no greater than 1.81 and tolerance values no less than 0.55, providing some evidence of no high multicollinearity. To adjust for heteroskedasticity, heteroskedastic-robust standard errors are applied using the “vce robust” option. The Wald chi2 is 88.97 (p-value <0.001***), pseudo r2 is 0.0762, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow value is 13.30 (p-value = 0.1019). These results lead me to conclude that model 3 is a good fit compared to the constant.

In model 3, the p-values for the coefficients of the variables “homosexual relations are wrong” and “”highest year of school completed” are statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level: 0.0.003 and <0.001 respectively. Thus, we reject the null hypotheses and support the alternative hypotheses. The coefficient for “homosexual relations are wrong” is positive at 0.46 indicating a positive relationship existing between this independent variable and the dependent variable. The coefficient for “highest year of school completed,” however, is negative at -0.200 indicating a negative relationship existing between this independent variable and the dependent variable.

We can state the following based on the logit results for model 3. The coefficient for “homosexual relations are wrong” is 0.46. This means that we expect an increase of 0.46 in the log-odds of “male-dominated occupation” with every one-unit increase in “homosexual relations are wrong.” The coefficient for “highest year of school completed” is -0.20. This means a decrease of 0.20 is expected in the log-odds of “male-

dominated occupation" with every one-unit increase in "highest year of school completed." In other words, as males' "highest year of school completed" increases, the likelihood of males working in male-dominated occupations decreases. These coefficients translate into odds ratios of 1.58 and 0.82 for "homosexual relations are wrong" and "highest year of school completed" respectively. In the case of model 3, the odds ratios for "homosexual relations are wrong" (categorical variable) is greater than 1 indicating that a positive relationship exists between this independent variable and the dependent variable. However, the odds ratio for "highest year of school completed" (continuous variable) is less than 1 indicating that a negative relationship exists between this independent variable and the dependent variable. We can also state that compared to other men, on average, men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are 1.58 times more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. We can also state that for every one-unit increase in "highest year of school completed," the likelihood of "male-dominated occupation" occurring decreases 0.82 times. In other words, on average, for every one-unit increase in men's highest year of school completed, the likelihood of men working in male-dominated occupations decreases by 1.21 times.

*Binomial Logit Regression (Women's Gender Beliefs)*

Next, I interpret the results of Table 6 which involve the binomial logistic regressions performed to analyze the potential impact of women's traditional gender beliefs on female-dominated occupations.

Following are results from running binomial logit regression model 4, which includes only female respondents, the dependent variable "female-dominated occupation," the following independent variables: "bad for women to work," "women are not suited for politics," and "homosexual relations are wrong," and the "weight variable." There are 1,159 observations after missing data are automatically removed by Stata using listwise deletion. Diagnostics conducted to diagnose multicollinearity show variance inflation factor (VIF) values no greater than 1.13 and tolerance values no less than 0.89, which provides some evidence of no high multicollinearity existing among the independent variables because no values are greater than 10 (Woolridge 2016). To adjust for heteroskedasticity, heteroskedastic-robust standard errors are applied (Woolridge 2016). Adding the "vce robust" option to the command for running the binomial logistic regression accomplishes this task in Stata. To judge how well the independent variables in the model together explain the variance in the dependent variable, I observed results from the Wald chi2 and associated p-value, pseudo R2, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow test and associated p-value: the Wald chi2 is 4.22 (p-value = 0.3768), pseudo r2 is 0.0026, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow value is 8.92 (p-value = 0.3493). The null hypothesis for the Wald chi2 test is that a model containing only the constant would be a better fit. Given that the p-value for Wald chi2 is not significant, I cannot reject the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis for the Hosmer-Lemeshow test is that the model is a good fit and since the test is not statistically significant, I accept the null that the model is a good fit. These statistics provide conflicting results. This leads me to conclude that model 4 is not a good fit.

**Table 6.** Binomial Logit Regression of Women With Traditional Gender Beliefs and Other Characteristics on Female-Dominated Occupations

| VARIABLES | Model 4<br>Female-dominated Coefficents | Model 5<br>Female dominated Coefficients | Model 6<br>Female-dominated Occupations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bad for women to work | -0.100 | -0.088 | -0.057 |
| | (-0.095) | (-0.097) | (-0.103) |
| Women not suited for politics | 0.179 | 0.238 | 0.235 |
| | (-0.157) | (-0.163) | (-0.174) |
| Homosexual relations are wrong | 0.064 | 0.094 | -0.001 |
| | (-0.124) | (-0.140) | (-0.152) |
| Very religious | | -0.125 | -0.229 |
| | | (-0.226) | (-0.243) |
| Moderately religious | | -0.070 | 0.042 |
| | | (-0.179) | (-0.190) |
| Slightly religious | | 0.070 | 0.061 |
| | | (-0.190) | (-0.201) |
| Not religious (omitted) | | | |
| Liberal | | -0.049 | -0.113 |
| | | (-0.169) | (-0.179) |
| Moderate | | 0.153 | 0.064 |
| | | (-0.151) | (-0.162) |
| Conservative (omitted) | | | |
| Employed fulltime | | | -0.309* |
| | | | (-0.162) |
| White | | | 0.049 |
| | | | (-0.150) |
| Married | | | -0.130 |
| | | | (-0.150) |
| Age | | | -0.004 |
| | | | (-0.006) |
| Highest year of school completed | | | 0.042 |
| | | | (-0.026) |
| Family income | | | -1.14e-05*** |
| | | | -2.55E-06 |
| Weight variable | 0.125 | 0.129 | 0.217* |
| | (-0.098) | (-0.100) | (-0.113) |
| Constant | -0.007 | -0.113 | 0.013 |
| | (-0.211) | (-0.281) | (-0.568) |
| Observations | 1,159 | 1,126 | 1,055 |

*Notes:* *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Robust standard errors in parentheses

In model 4, the coefficients for the variables are not statistically significant at the 90 percent and higher confidence levels. The null hypotheses are that each of these

coefficients are equal to zero and that there are no associations between these independent variables and the dependent variable. Thus, I cannot reject these null hypotheses and support the alternative hypotheses that the coefficients are not zero and that associations exist. Moreover, I cannot make inferences about the population regarding the meanings of the coefficients.

Now the results for model 5, which includes the same female respondents, dependent variable, independent variables, and weight variable as model 4 plus the following independent "dummy" variables: "very religious" person, "moderately religious" person, "slightly religious" person, "not religious" person, "liberal" political views, "moderate" political views, and "conservative" political views. There are 1,126 observations after missing data are automatically removed by Stata using listwise deletion. Diagnostics conducted to diagnose multicollinearity show variance inflation factor (VIF) values no greater than 2.18 and tolerance values no less than 0.46, providing some evidence of no high multicollinearity. To adjust for heteroskedasticity, heteroskedastic-robust standard errors were applied using the "vce robust" option. The Wald chi2 is 9.07 (p-value = 0.4310), pseudo r2 is 0.0058, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow value is 8.98 (p-value = 0.3436). These results lead me to conclude that model 5 is not a good fit compared to the constant.

In model 4, the coefficients for the variables are not statistically significant at the 90 percent or higher confidence levels. The null hypotheses are that each of the coefficients are equal to zero and that there are no associations between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Thus, I cannot reject these null hypotheses and support the alternative hypotheses that the coefficients are not zero and that associations

exist. Moreover, I cannot make inferences about the population regarding the meanings of the coefficients.

Regarding the results for model 6, which includes the same male respondents, dependent variable, independent variables, and weight variable as model 5 plus the following "dummy" independent variables: "employed full-time," "white," and "married" and the following continuous independent variables: "age," "highest year of school completed," and "family income." There are 1,055 observations after missing data are automatically removed by Stata using listwise deletion. Diagnostics conducted to diagnose multicollinearity show variance inflation factor (VIF) values no greater than 2.18 and tolerance values no less than 0.46, providing some evidence of no high multicollinearity. To adjust for heteroskedasticity, heteroskedastic-robust standard errors were applied using the "vce robust" option. The Wald chi2 is 37.37 (p-value <0.001***), pseudo r2 is 0.0261, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow value is 7.95 (p-value = 0.4385). These results lead me to conclude that model 6 is a good fit compared to the constant.

In model 6, the p-values for the coefficients of the variables "employed fulltime" and ""family income" are statistically significant at the 90 (0.056) and 99 percent (<0.001) confidence intervals respectively. Thus, we can reject the null hypotheses and support the alternative hypotheses. The coefficient for "employed fulltime" is negative at 0.31 indicating a negative relationship existing between this independent variable and the dependent variable. The coefficient for "respondents family income in constant dollars" is also negative at 1.14e-05 indicating a negative relationship existing between this independent variable and the dependent variable.

We can state the following based on the binary logit regression results for model 6. The coefficient for "employed fulltime" is -0.31. This means that we can expect a decrease of 0.31 in the log-odds of "male-dominated occupation" with every one-unit increase in "employed fulltime." The coefficient for "respondent's family income in constant dollars" is -1.14e-05. This means a decrease of 1.14e-05 is expected in the log-odds of "male-dominated occupation" with a one-unit increase in income. These coefficients translate to odds ratios of 0.74 and 0.99 for "employed fulltime" and "respondent's family income in constant dollars" respectively. In the case of model 6, the odds ratios for "employed fulltime" (categorical variable) is less than 1 indicating that a negative relationship exists between this independent variable and the dependent variable. The odds ratio for "respondent's family income in constant dollars" (continuous variable) is less than 1 indicating that a negative relationship exists between this independent variable and the dependent variable. We can also state that compared to other women, on average, women who work part-time are 0.74 times more likely to work in female-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or male-dominated occupations. We can also state that for every one-unit increase in "respondent's family income in constant dollars," the likelihood of "female-dominated occupation" occurring decreases 0.99 times. In other words, on average, for every one-dollar increase in women's income, the likelihood of women working in female-dominated occupations decreases by 0.99 times.

Although still large, the total number of observations for each of the six binary logit regression models executed for this study are significantly less than the number of observations in the dataset I first created. The total number of observations for each variable are reduced following each step in the recoding process (see Appendices A and

B). These reductions are likely the result of the automatic listwise deletion process performed by Stata.

# CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Paula England and Nancy Folbre (2005) stated, "There is a long tradition of survey questions on gender role attitude and occupational aspiration, so we know a good deal about the aspirations that individuals hold. But how much these reflect the broader cultural norms that affect occupational choices is not well understood" (632-633). Helping to fill the gap in understanding noted by England and Folbre, the current research provides evidence increasing our understanding of the impact of individual gender beliefs on actual occupational choices, moving beyond occupational aspirations to occupational selections. The current research considers the impact of gender beliefs on selection of occupations for: (1) men who work in male-dominated occupations compared to men who work in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations, (2) women who work in female-dominated occupations compared to women who work in mixed-sex or male-dominated occupations, and (3) men who work in male-dominated occupations compared to women who work in female-dominated occupations. Following are summaries and discussions of the evidence.

Results show that compared to other men, on average,: (1) men who have traditional gender role beliefs are 1.22 to 1.25 times more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations, (2) men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are 1.58 to 1.99 times more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations, and (3) for each year increase in men's education, the likelihood of men working in male-dominated occupations decreases 1.21 times. The traditional gender role beliefs these men hold are: (1) women working outside the home is harmful to preschool age children,

(2) women who work outside the home cannot develop as strong relationships with their children as women who do not work outside the home, and (3) women are not emotionally suited for politics. Importantly, when the variable highest year of school completed is added to the regression model, the variable involving traditional gender role beliefs loses statistical significance. Therefore, we may conclude that level of education accounts at least partly for the variance in men's traditional gender role-beliefs. Unlike the traditional gender beliefs variable, the significance of the variable "homosexual relations are wrong" does not lose statistical significance when other independent and control variables are added to the regression model. Therefore, we may conclude that the level of association between men's belief that homosexual relations are wrong and men working in male-dominated occupations is strong.

Based on evidence from the current study, compared to men, neither having traditional gender role beliefs nor believing that homosexual relations is wrong account significantly as explanations for why women choose to work in female-dominated occupations rather than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. For women, work status (full or part time) and family income are statistically significant explanations for why women select female-dominated occupations. Compared to other women, women working in part-time occupations are 0.74 times more likely to work in female-dominated occupations rather than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. Regarding family income, for every one-dollar increase in women's annual income, the likelihood of women working in female-dominated occupations decreases 0.99 times on average. For both groups, views regarding women's suitability for politics are not statistically

significant explanations for why men choose to work in male-dominated occupations or women choose to work in female-dominated occupations.

The findings of this research support the following hypotheses: (H1a) Compared to other men, men who have traditional gender beliefs are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations and (H2a) Compared to other men, men who believe that sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations. Conversely, the findings of this research do not support the other hypotheses: (H1b) Compared to other women, women who have traditional gender beliefs are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations; (H2b) Compared to other women, women who believe that sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is wrong are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations; (H3a) Compared to other men, men who believe that women are not suited for politics are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations; and (H3b) Compared to other women, women who believe that women are not suited for politics are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations. Comparing the two hypotheses supported by the findings, the hypothesis involving men's beliefs about homosexuality (H2a) received the highest level of support; the coefficients for the variable associated with this hypothesis are statistically significant at the highest-level confidence (99 percent) across all three statistical models. Interestingly, none of the hypotheses positing the impact of women's gender beliefs on sex composition of occupations are supported by the findings of this research. I now look to evidence from other studies involving gender and occupations to help explain these differences between men and women who work in occupations dominated by members of their own sex.

Other research has found that men are less likely than women to work in sex atypical occupations because salaries for female-dominated occupations are typically lower than salaries for male-dominated occupations (England 2010). In the current study we observe a significant negative relationship existing between income and likelihood of women working in female-dominated occupations. In other words, as women move from female-dominated occupations into mixed-sex or male-dominated occupations, their income levels increase. Conversely, the current study does not provide evidence of a similar phenomenon involving men's movement into sex atypical occupations. Thus, the current study supports pervious research regarding this issue.

Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman (2011) explain that the behaviors of people with higher levels of education compared to people with lower levels of education demonstrate lower adherence to traditional gender role beliefs. In the sample of men in the current study, we observe statistically significant evidence supporting this previous finding. As men's level of education increases, on average, their likelihood of working in male-dominated occupations decreases.

Regarding the impact of work status, working fulltime or part-time, on individuals' likelihood of working in male-dominated or female-dominated occupations, other studies have shown that working part-time is positively associated with working in female-dominated occupations. Joan Williams (2000) and Charles and Grusky (2004) explain that for male-dominated occupations overtime hours are utilized to achieve productivity goals, and, conversely, for female-dominated occupations part-time hours are utilized to achieve productivity goals. Moreover, compared to men, women are more likely to work in part-time occupations at various times during their lifespans depending

upon the waxing and waning of family caretaking responsibilities Joan Williams (2000) and Charles and Grusky (2004). In the current study, we observe evidence supporting these previous findings as women working part-time are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations rather than mixed-sex or male-dominated occupations.

Previous research has shown that gender role beliefs have greater impact on men's occupational aspirations than on women's occupational aspirations (Forsman and Barth 2016). The current research extends this finding demonstrating that men who have traditional gender beliefs and potentially lower levels of education successfully fulfill their aspirations by attaining occupations congruent with their traditional gender role beliefs. For the current study, I hypothesized (H1a) that compared to other men, men who express the traditional gender belief that it is bad for women to work are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations. This hypothesis is derived from a group of gender belief explanations which include the beliefs that childrearing, domestic labor, and nurturing are appropriate roles for women rather than men. The coefficient for variable (bad for women to work) that measures traditional gender role beliefs is statistically significant. Indicating that compared to other men, men who believe that it is bad for women to work because working interferes with women's childrearing, housekeeping, and nurturing roles, are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations rather than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. Therefore, evidence from the current research supports this hypothesis, although weakly when considering the association of the variables bad for women to and highest year of school completed.

Berdahl et al. (2018: 422,426) posit that "work remains the site of masculinity contests among men" and that, "Culturally, masculinity is, at its core, about achieving dominance: over women, but also over other men." Heterosexuality is a key component of hegemonic masculinity and is also a key factor influencing men's ability to dominate women as well as other men (Berdahl et al. 2018). The current research supports this finding demonstrating that men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong fulfill their aspirations by attaining occupations congruent with this belief. For the current study, I hypothesized (H2a) that compared to other men, men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations. This hypothesis is derived from Hegemonic Masculinity Theory and the component that requires men be heterosexual otherwise they "destroy [their] masculinity" and consequently, their ability to dominate others (Berdahl et al. 2018: 426). The coefficient is statistically significant for the variable "homosexual relations are wrong" indicating a positive relationship existing between the independent variable homosexual Thus, we can conclude that compared to other men, on average, men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations, (2) Consequently, evidence from the current research supports hypothesis H2a and does so strongly given that statistical significance of the variable holds across all regression models that were executed involving male respondents.

Compared to women, men pursue sex atypical occupations at a much lower rate, and it is helpful to understand the causes of this phenomenon (England 2010). We know that male-dominated occupations receive greater financial and status rewards over

female-dominated occupations (Berdahl et al. 2018; Ridgeway 2011). Even so, we also know that men often increase their salaries when transiting into female-dominated occupations because of the glass escalator effect whereby men rise quickly to top, higher paying positions in female-dominated fields (Williams 1995). Generally, however, there is little financial incentive for men to pursue sex atypical occupations.

We also know that men working in female-dominated occupations face challenges to their masculinity (Shen-Miller and Smiler 2015). Even so, we also know that men often experience elevations in their statuses when they work in female-dominated occupations due to "having been welcomed and offered enhanced career opportunities, including swift advancement and choice trainings and placements" (Shen-Miller and Smiler 2015: 271). Generally, however, to work in female-dominated occupations, men must expend emotional energy saving their masculine identities which is a disincentive for transitioning from male-dominated to female-dominated occupations (Forsman and Barth 2017).

We also know that men are continuing to pursue physical/manual occupations despite the dwindling availability of these occupations (Dwyer 2013). The decreasing supply of male-dominated occupations should serve as an incentive for men to pursue female-dominated occupations such as nursing, which is currently experiencing a severe shortage of nurses. Although male-dominated occupations are decreasing, men are persistent in their pursuit of male-dominated occupations. For men to begin transitioning from male-dominated occupations to female-dominated occupations, the gender structure must change.

The gender structure envelopes the occupational, familial, and individual domains (Scarborough and Risman 2017). It consists of three "interrelate[ed]" and equal parts: "individuals' personal orientations, interpersonal interactions, and macro-level patterns" (Scarborough and Risman 2017: 2). Each of these parts is constituted by a material aspect and a cultural aspect (Scarborough and Risman 2017). The gender structure is changeable because its parts are "interrelated," reflexive," and "mutually constitutive" (Scarborough and Risman 2017: 2). For example, cultural views regarding homosexuality and masculinity shape and are shaped by workplace norms while at the same time workplace norms shape and are shaped by cultural views regarding homosexuality and masculinity.

The current research shows that men who believe that homosexual relations are wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than in mixed-sex and female-dominated occupations. We can explain this phenomenon using Gender Structure Theory. The currently dominant model of the most successful man, the hegemonically masculine model that is highly valued and rewarded throughout society's institutions including within families and workplaces, requires a man to be "rich, White, heterosexual, tall, athletic, professionally successful, confident, courageous, and stoic" to be considered highly successful (Berdahl et al. 2018: 426). According to Hegemonic Masculinity Theory, only heterosexual men have the potential to achieve the highest level of masculinity because homosexuality is closely associated with femininity (Connell 2005). Moreover, masculinity is more highly valued than femininity and thus, highly masculine men are granted "higher status, more power, and greater privileges than women (or less masculine men)" (Berdahl et al. 2018: 425). Consequently, men need

occupations to help them judge their level of success. Obtaining feedback regarding their level of success in meeting the hegemonically masculine standard is best achieved through interactions occurring in the workplace, or in the case of the current research… in male-dominated occupations (Berdahl et al. 2018). Similarly, to achieve organizational goals, male-dominated workplaces benefit from competitions occurring among men striving to achieve high status, power, and privileges. Given this gender structure, men have little incentive to move from male-dominated occupations to mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations.

A limitation of the current research is that it does not address changes in individuals' gender beliefs and selections of occupations over time. This is important because over the past decade, beliefs about homosexuality have changed significantly. For example, support for same sex marriage and federal laws protecting LGBT people from discrimination have increased 33 percent and 9 percent respectively over the past decade (Lewis et al. 2017). Since the relationship between the variables "male-dominated occupation" and "homosexual relations are wrong" is statistically significant across all models involving male respondents in the current study, it may be useful to observe whether this relationship is changing over time given the rapid cultural shift occurring regarding beliefs about homosexuality. Perhaps analysis of panel or time series data would be useful.

Another limitation of the current study is that the analysis is less nuanced because I created dichotomous dependent variables measuring only the extreme categories: (1) male-dominated occupation versus mixed-sex/female-dominated occupation and (2) female-dominated occupation versus mixed-sex/male-dominated occupation. Instead, it

could be useful to create a polytomous dependent variable with three categories: (1) male-dominated occupation, mixed-sex occupation, and female-dominated occupation. Doing this will allow for analysis and comparison of the extreme groups and the middle group. Given the differences observed in the current study between male and female respondents regarding the impact of their beliefs on homosexuality and selection of occupations, it would have been useful to have information on respondents' beliefs on homosexuality who work in mixed-sex occupations.

The current study is also limited by an inability to directly investigate the mutually constitutive relationships exiting between gender beliefs and sex compositions of occupations. It would be helpful to uncover the causal relationships in gendered workplaces. Do prevailing factors in male-dominated workplaces cause the gender beliefs of men who work there to vary? Do the gender beliefs of women who work in female-dominated workplaces cause prevailing factors in workplaces to vary? Perhaps conducting a qualitative study would uncover the answers to these questions.

In conclusion, this research provides evidence demonstrating the impact of individual gender beliefs on self-selection into jobs and occupational sex segregation. This research shows that compared to other men, on average, men who have traditional gender beliefs regarding the role of females in the private sphere are more likely to have male-dominated occupations than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. However, as men's level of education increases, the statistical significance of this traditional gender belief is annulled and the likelihood of men working in male-dominated occupations decreases. The most significant finding of this research is that compared to other men, on average, men who believe that homosexual relations are

wrong are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than mixed-sex or female-dominated occupations. I explain these phenomena using Hegemonic Masculinity Theory and Gender Structure Theory. In order to be considered highly successful men, men must meet hegemonically masculine standards supported individually, culturally, and organizationally throughout society. The best places for men to judge and achieve success are in male-dominated occupations. Thus, the rate of men's transitions from male-dominated occupations to female-dominated occupations is low and consequently, sex segregation of jobs persists. Because both the hegemonically masculine ideal and the gender structure are reflexive and mutually constitutive, they are changeable (Berdahl et al. 2018; Scarborough and Risman 2017). Going forward, to achieve greater sex integration of occupations there must be challenges to gender hegemony and the gender structure that supports it.

# REFERENCES


Becker, Gary S. 1957. *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berdahl, Jennifer L., Marianne Cooper, Peter Glick, Robert W. Livingston, and Joan C. Williams. 2018. "Work as a Masculinity Contest." *Journal of Social Issues* 74(3): 422-448.

Cech, Erin A. 2013. "The Self-Expressive Edge of Occupational Sex Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 119(3): 747-89.

Charles, Maria and David B. Grusky. 2004. *Occupational Ghettos: The Worldwide Segregation of Women and Men*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Charles, Maria and Karen Bradley. 2009. "Indulging Our Gendered Selves? Sex Segregation by Field of Study in 44 Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(4): 924-76.

Connell, R. W. 2005. 2nd ed. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Correll, Shelly J. 2004. "Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status, and Emerging Career Aspirations." *American Sociological Review* 69(1): 93-113.

Cotter, David, Joan M. Hermsen, and Reeve Vanneman. 2011. "The End of the Gender Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes from 1977 to 2008." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(1): 259-89.

Dwyer, Rachel E. 2013. "The Care Economy? Gender, Economic Restructuring, and Job Polarization in the U.S. Labor Market." *American Sociological Association* 78(3): 390-416.

England, Paula and Nancy Folbre. 2005. "Gender and Economic Sociology." Pp. 627-649 in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, 2nd ed, edited by Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society* 24(2): 149-66.

England, Paula. 2011. "Reassessing the Uneven Gender Revolution and its Slowdown." *Gender & Society* 25(1): 113-23.

Friedman, Sarah. 2015. "Still a 'Stalled Revolution'? Work/Family Experiences, Hegemonic Masculinity, and Moving Toward Gender Equality." *Sociology Compass* 9(2): 140-55.

Forsman, J. Andrew and Joan M. Barth. 2017. "The Effect of Occupational Gender Stereotypes on Men's Interest in Female-Dominated Occupations." *Sex Roles* 76: 460-472.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kennedy, Peter. 2008. 6th. *A Guide to Econometrics.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Kmec, J.A. 2005. "Setting Occupational Sex Segregation in Motion: Demand-side Explanations of Sex Traditional Employment." *Work and Occupations* 32(3): 322-354.

Lewis, Daniel C., Andrew R. Flores, Donald P. Haider-Markel, Patrick R. Miller, Barry L. Tadlock, and Jami K. Taylor. 2017. "Degrees of Acceptance: Variation in Public Attitudes toward Segments of the LGBT Community." *Political Research Quarterly* 70(4): 861.

Okamoto, Dina and Paula England. 1999. "Is There a Supply Side to Occupational Sex Segregation?" *Sociological Perspectives* 42(4): 557-82.

Padavic, Irene. 1992. "White-Collar Work Values and Women's Interest in Blue-Collar Jobs." *Gender and Society* 6(2): 215-30.

Padavic, Irene and Barbara Reskin. 2002. 2nd ed. *Women and Men at Work*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Reskin, Barbara. 1993. "Sex Segregation in the Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 241-70.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Risman, Barbara J. 2004. "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender and Society* 18(4): 429-50.

Ruggles, Steven, Sarah Flood, Ronald Goeken, Josiah Grover, Erin Meyer, Jose Pacas, and Matthew Sobek. *IPUMS USA: Version 9.0* [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2019. https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V9.0

Scarborough, William J. and Barbara J. Risman. 2017. "Changes in the Gender Structure: Inequality at the Individual, Interactional, and Macro Dimensions." *Sociology Compass* 11(10): 1-16.

Sewell, William H. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(1): 1-29.

Shen-Miller, David and Andrew P. Smiler. 2015. "Men in Female-Dominated Vocations: A Rationale for Academic Study and Introduction to the Special Issue." *Sex Roles* 72: 269-276.

Smith, Tom W., Davern, Michael, Freese, Jeremy, and Morgan, Stephen L., General Social Surveys, 1972-2018 [machine-readable data file] /Principal Investigator, Smith, Tom W.; Co-Principal Investigators, Michael Davern, Jeremy Freese and Stephen L. Morgan; Sponsored by National Science Foundation. --NORC ed.-- Chicago: NORC, 2019. 1 data file (64,814 logical records) + 1 codebook (3,758 pp.). -- (National Data Program for the Social Sciences, no. 25).

Stockdale, Margaret S. and Joel T. Nadler. 2013. "Paradigmatic Assumptions of Disciplinary Research on Gender Disparities: The Case of Occupational Sex Segregation." *Sex Roles* 68: 207-15.

Williams, Christine. 1995. *Still a Man's World: Men Who Do Women's Work.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, Joan. 2000. *Unbending Gender*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Woolridge, Jeffrey M. 2016. 6th ed. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Yavorsky, Jill E., Philip N. Cohen, and Yue Qian. 2016. "Man Up, Man Down: Race-ethnicity and the Hierarchy of Men in Female-Dominated Work." *The Sociological Quarterly* 57(4): 733-758.

# APPENDIX A: CHANGES IN OBSERVATIONS THROUGH DATA CLEANING AND RECODING OF THE DATASET WITH MALE RESPONDENTS

**Table 7.** Changes in Observations Through Data Cleaning and Recoding of the Dataset With Male Respondents

| VARIABLES | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *BEGINNING* | *AGE 23-65* | *WORKING ONLY* | *MALE ONLY* | *AFTER RECODING* | *Model 1* | *Model 2* | *Model 3* |
| Year | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Age | 15,901 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Work Status | 15,941 | 12,230 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Sex | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Women Not Suited for Politics | 9,100 | 6,919 | 4,841 | 2,393 | 2,393 | | | |
| Better for Man to Work, Woman Tend Home | 9,506 | 7,221 | 5,040 | 2,537 | index 2,560 | | | |
| Preschool Kids Suffer if Mother Works | 9,509 | 7,224 | 5,043 | 2,426 | index 2,560 | | | |
| Working Mother Doesn't Hurt Children | 9,552 | 7,255 | 5,066 | 2,538 | index 2,560 | | | |
| Homosexual Relations | 9,096 | 6,990 | 4,867 | 2,548 | 2,426 | | | |
| Political Views | 15,318 | 11,775 | 8,261 | 4,149 | 4,149 | | | |
| Weight Variable | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Occupations | 15,211 | 11,824 | 8,473 | 4,253 | fem-dom 4,253 | | | |
| ID | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Race | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,279 | 4,279 | | | |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 15,923 | 12,218 | 8,514 | 4,273 | 4,273 | | | |
| Family Income in Constant Dollars | 14,120 | 11,087 | 7,841 | 3,977 | 3,977 | | | |
| Consider Self a Religious Person | 14,305 | 10,930 | 7,601 | 3,797 | 3,797 | | | |
| Marital Status | 15,939 | 12,231 | 8,525 | 4,277 | 4,277 | | | |
| Binomial Logit Regression | | | | | | 1,142 | 1,106 | 1,040 |

# APPENDIX B: CHANGES IN OBSERVATIONS THROUGH DATA CLEANING AND RECODING OF THE DATASET WITH FEMALE RESPONDENTS

**Table 8.** Changes in Observations Through Data Cleaning and Recoding of the Dataset With Female Respondents

| VARIABLES | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS | OBS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *BEGINNING* | *AGE 23-65* | *WORKING ONLY* | *FEMALE ONLY* | *AFTER RECODING* | *Model 4* | *Model 5* | *Model 6* |
| Year | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Age | 15,901 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Work Status | 15,941 | 12,230 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Sex | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Women Not Suited for Politics | 9,100 | 6,919 | 4,841 | 2,448 | 2,448 | | | |
| Better for Man to Work, Woman Tend Home | 9,506 | 7,221 | 5,040 | 2,503 | index 2522 | | | |
| Preschool Kids Suffer if Mother Works | 9,509 | 7,224 | 5,043 | 2,505 | index 2522 | | | |
| Working Mother Doesn't Hurt Children | 9,552 | 7,255 | 5,066 | 2,518 | index 2522 | | | |
| Homosexual Relations | 9,096 | 6,990 | 4,867 | 2,441 | 2,441 | | | |
| Political Views | 15,318 | 11,775 | 8,261 | 4,112 | 4,112 | | | |
| Weight Variable | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Occupations | 15,211 | 11,824 | 8,473 | 4,220 | fem-dom 4220 | | | |
| ID | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Race | 15,956 | 12,240 | 8,527 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 15,923 | 12,218 | 8,514 | 4,241 | 4,241 | | | |
| Family Income in Constant Dollars | 14,120 | 11,087 | 7,841 | 3,864 | 3,864 | | | |
| Consider Self a Religious Person | 14,305 | 10,930 | 7,601 | 3,804 | 3,804 | | | |
| Marital Status | 15,939 | 12,231 | 8,525 | 4,248 | 4,248 | | | |
| Binomial Logit Regressions | | | | | | 1,159 | 1,126 | 1,055 |