SEXUAL ORIENTATION, OCCUPATIONS, AND EARNINGS AMONG MEN

by

Joseph Wade Smith

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

2016

Approved by:

Dr. Scott Fitzgerald

Dr. Stephanie Moller

Dr. Elizabeth Stearns

©2016 Joseph Wade Smith ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

JOSEPH WADE SMITH Sexual orientation, occupations and earnings among men. (Under the direction of Dr. SCOTT FITZGERALD)

Despite an apparent sea change in public attitudes regarding sexual orientation, contemporary qualitative research demonstrates stereotypes persist towards gay men, in turn affecting their labor market outcomes and earnings. This research tests the effects of stereotypical gendered attributes ascribed to gay men in regards to employment and wages. Using data from the American Community Survey's 2010-2014 5-year sample, and occupational sex ratios from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, I model gay men's occupational outcomes against heterosexual men in three constructed occupational categories: female-dominated, male-dominated, or gender-neutral. I also model earnings in a regression with sexuality as the variable of interest. I then look at the intersection of race and sexual orientation to test interaction effects between sexual orientation and race on employment outcomes and earnings. The findings validate that the persistence of stereotypes affects marginalized identities in employment and earnings, but in more complex ways than previously conceived.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee for their support of this research. My thesis advisor, Dr. Scott Fitzgerald, was instrumental to this project and unwavering in mentoring a disciplined approach to the practice of sociology. The other committee members, Dr. Stephanie Moller and Dr. Elizabeth Stearns, both aided in immeasurable ways.

My cohort and other students allowed the graduate student office to become a research incubator. Special thanks to Savannah Larrimore, Eve Bjerre, Jordan Sannito, Curt Kularski, Beth Mason, Candace Miller, Lauren Valentino, and Jessica Dilday for the privilege of sharing ideas and offering critique. Susan Jayson, Dave Frantzreb, and Geri Handon deserve thanks for their daily support of the Department of Sociology at The University of North Carolina Charlotte.

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
|--|----|
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 4 |
| HYPOTHESES | 13 |
| DATA AND METHODS | 16 |
| FINDINGS | 24 |
| DISCUSSION | 35 |
| LIMITATIONS | 37 |
| CONCLUSION | 39 |
| FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH | 40 |
| APPENDIX A: FEMALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS | 46 |
| APPENDIX B: MALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS | 49 |
| APPENDIX C: GENDER-NEUTRAL OCCUPATIONS | 54 |
| APPENDIX D: OCCUPATIONS WITH UNKOWN GENDER RATIO | 59 |

INTRODUCTION

Despite a historically rich and extant theoretical research agenda examining the consequences of occupational segregation for women and racial minorities, a dearth of similar scholarship exists regarding lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) people. The promising rise of corporate anti-discriminatory policies aimed at both protecting LGBT people in the workplace and encouraging application recruitment belies the contentious and costly examples of occupational segregation persisting in the labor market. This research addresses the lack of scholarship regarding differences in occupational outcomes and wages between gay and heterosexual men. Reskin's (1993) research paradigm of occupation sex segregation theoretically and methodologically underpins this study.

Segregation is not just about delimiting a physical space, it "is a fundamental process in social inequality...Indeed, segregation facilitates unequal treatment by subjecting groups to different reward systems" (Reskin 1993:241). The negative consequences for employment in female-dominated occupations create cascading hindrances for social mobility. These penalties include: lower wages, less occupational prestige, reduced benefits (i.e. health insurance and pension plans), less on-the-job training, and fewer promotional opportunities (Reskin 1993). Other researchers investigating racialized occupational segregation find similar consequences that confront men of color (England, Farkas, Kilbourne et al. 1988, England 2010, Reskin 1993, Williams 2013).

The lacuna of quantitative empirical research concerning sexualized occupational segregation emphasizes the need for such scholarship, particularly considering the historic and current practices regarding LGBT legislation. This research addresses that

lack of empirical testing and contributes to the sub-discipline of social stratification and mobility. This study also fills the problematic absence of stratification scholarship mentioned by Shen-Miller and Smiler (2015) examining men within a wide range of female-dominated occupations, as opposed to the current breadth of work that focuses on men employed in a select few female-dominated occupations.

I apply a sex atypical research framework involving *all* occupations to empirically test whether gay men are employed in female-dominated occupations at higher rates than their heterosexual male cohorts. While some scholars recognize a theoretical distinction between occupational sex segregation and sex atypical work research, Reskin's (1993) seminal review on sex segregation in the workplace places sex atypical work firmly under the larger theoretical umbrella of occupational segregation.

While occupational segregation theory is decades old, researchers reliably revisit the concept and respond with both innovative work and reflexive criticism that warrants even more research. The implications of this research extend both feminist theory and gender stratification research on the social and cultural devaluation of "women's work" by demonstrating that other marginalized groups are overrepresented in such employment. I focus on the occupational outcomes and earnings of gay and heterosexual men, and how the processes of socialization create and recreate inequalities in the labor market. These inequalities lead me to three broad research questions:

- 1. Are there differences in occupational outcomes for gay and heterosexual men?
- 2. Are there differences in wages between gay and heterosexual men?
- 3. Are there explanations for these possible differences?

This thesis employs quantitative methodology to analyze data from the United States Census Bureau's 2014 5-year American Community Survey (ACS). Using another data source, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Current Population Survey (CPS) table of occupational codes and employment percentages by sex, I construct three gendered categories from all occupations (2010). I then place employed, working age heterosexual and gay men (gleaned from the ACS data) into these three constructed occupational categories. Using a multinomial logistic regression model, I examine the odds ratios of gay and heterosexual men belonging to one of these three occupational outcomes. An ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model tests whether sexuality has any effect on wages. I also test the interaction effects of race and sexual orientation on these occupational outcomes and earnings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Occupational segregation is the "systematic distribution of people across occupations based on demographic characteristics" (Tilcsik, Anteby and Knight 2015:1). This system places heterosexual white males as the dominant group whose occupations offer more prestige, more opportunities for advancement, and higher wages while other groups occupy employment in jobs that offer less prestige, less career advancement, and lower wages (Reskin 1993). Despite the removal of formal barriers that once enforced segregated employment, many occupations in the United States are still highly gendered and racialized.

According to McCall (England et al. 1988, England 1992, Reskin 1993, Tilcsik et al. 2015, Williams 1989, Williams 2013), an important clarification must be made with the study of occupational segregation: the presence of occupational segregation does not necessarily lead to earnings inequality. McColl references several international studies that show countries can have high levels of gendered occupational segregation but relatively low wage gaps (e.g., Sweden) and countries with low levels of gendered occupational segregation can experience large wage gaps (e.g., the former German Democratic Republic). Ample research exists that demonstrate wages are not the only possible penalty of occupational segregation (2001).

Feminist-inspired sociological scholarship posits that gendered occupational segregation is a social process of systems of patriarchal domination and hegemonic masculinity that keep women oppressed so men retain social dominance (England 1992, Reskin 1993, Yavorsky, Cohen and Qian 2016). For years, researchers have noted the persistent resilience of occupational sex segregation (England 1982, England et al. 1988, England 2010, McCall 2001, Reskin 1993, Williams 2013). By reproducing the gendered practice of occupational segregation, the dominant culture holds its place in the social hierarchy. Theoretic scholarship points to the conclusion that "women's work" is essentially de-valued by society, resulting in lower wages and other penalties (England 2010, Gross 1968, Reskin 1993). This theory relies on the social attributes and stereotypes placed on gender, and England (2010) stresses the role that gendered socialization plays on occupational segregation.

This socialization process is so strong that even women devalue women's work. As England notes in the employment decisions between men and women, the same could be said for gay men and heterosexual men: "[T]hus, if the job choices of men and women differ, I believe these differences are sustained by lifelong socialization that leads men and women to find different jobs interesting, respectable, of value, or consistent with their gendered identities" (England 1992:18). Reskin (1993) notes that even if improvements are seen over time in the indexed ratio of female workers to male workers in an occupation, gendered oppression and stereotypes create differences in actual jobs within the same occupation. These practices in the labor market imply stronger social forces are at work.

Taking Tilly's (1999) work on social inequality and extending it to occupational segregation suggests these social forces are the hegemonic practices of a dominant group. The dominant group's actions "control access to value-producing resources solve pressing organizational problems by means of categorical distinctions. Inadvertently or otherwise, those people set up systems of social closure, exclusion and control" (Tilly 1999:8). Bourdieu also theorizes that hegemonic masculinity is so entrenched in culture

and permeates all fields that it rarely is questioned by individuals as a social construction; it is taken as natural (1999).

Hegemonic masculinities, however, even benefit those men in sex atypical work. Williams' (1992) research investigating the privileges men receive in the nursing, library, elementary education, and social work occupations analogizes their experiences to a "glass escalator" in an apt foil to female's experiences in the labor force and the ubiquitous "glass ceiling." Conceptually, Williams later recognized the limitations of her initial research. Specifically, she mentions the lack of examining intersecting identities (including sexual orientation among other marginalized groups) when it comes to the privileges and penalties of the theoretic glass escalator (Williams 2013).

Intersectional theory comes from black feminist thought, as the push for equal rights neglected to encompass the issues of black women. Intersectionality theory later became defined as the study of "the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age operate not as unitary, mutually exclusive entities, but rather as reciprocally constructing phenomena" (Collins 2015:150). The intersections of multiple identities are non-additive: the main effects of status characteristics and their interaction with each other must be modeled. Other theories regarding gendered identity are also at play.

In the relatively recent sub-discipline of masculinity studies, the "precarious manhood" theory posits that as opposed to womanhood, which is perceived as a natural biological transition, manhood is a constantly contested state subject to public inspection for verification (Vandello and Bosson 2013:102). One of the tenets of this theory emphasizes the avoidance of femininity. In a cleverly designed experiment testing this

facet of precarious manhood, two groups of men were tasked with braiding. The experimental group braided a female mannequin's hair and placed a pink bow in the hair. The control group's task was to braid rope, framed as a "rope-strengthening" activity (both tasks were mechanically similar). When finished with the task, the men were given the choice of a gender-neutral puzzle activity or a punching-bag activity. The men in the experimental group chose the punching bag activity two-thirds of the time. The "men who performed an intrinsically engaging, novel hair-braiding activity benefited psychologically from the experience, but only if their concerns about their manhood status were assuaged by allowing them to proclaim their heterosexuality to their ostensible audience" (Vandello and Bosson 2013). These aggressive displays to mitigate a gendered threat to the public and self-identity of manhood also appear in the workplace.

While these researchers were quick to note that physically aggressive responses to perceived gender threats questioning manhood are not socially acceptable in certain social contexts (professional, educated subcultures), other hyper-aggressive tasks and actions were available. They suggest that the high risk-taking and extremely competitive nature of the finance industry is in part due to a culture of masculinity. Research even shows that after gendered threats to masculinity, men make riskier financial decisions. While this line of social psychology and masculine employment can be criticized for its seemingly antiquated essentialist qualities, recent research shows just how culturally entrenched perceived gendered attributes and (manhood) identity management are to occupational outcomes.

Lumping all men into a homogenous group that must manage aggression and avoid appearing feminine highlights the issues with essentialism. Blashill and Powlishta (2009) empirically test the hypothesis that the gendered attributes associated with gays and lesbians persist: are gays still considered feminine and lesbians masculine? Their survey study of college students found gay men were still perceived to be equally less masculine as compared to heterosexual women but not as feminine. In another study of college students, researchers tested what employment attributes they most valued, and both the men and women equally valued job flexibility and work-home balance, second only to financial compensation (Vandello and Bosson 2013). However, when asked if they would seek these attributes in the job market, men responded with a substantially lower rate than women. The follow-up to this study found that men thought the perception of such an employment demand would appear to be either weak or feminine. In a related study, they asked men and women to evaluate job applications, and those applications seeking employment flexibility were evaluated lower. Importantly, men seeking this type of employment were judged to be more feminine (Blashill and Powlishta 2009).

Sexual orientation is another status characteristic that experiences occupational segregation, but previous empirical research focuses on a narrow scope of detailed occupations (Vandello and Bosson 2013). Heteronormativity, homophobia, and hegemonic masculinities readily enforce a matrix of problems for LGBT people in multiple social institutions: familial rejection and banishment leading to high runaway rates and LGBT homelessness; school bullying leading to excessive absenteeism, lower grade, and dropouts; religious intolerance and excommunication; legal incarceration; and medical institutionalization (Bailey and Oberschneider 1997, Castells 1983, Tilcsik et al. 2015). These conditions, however, can foment other occupational outcomes through alternative network ties operating similarly to Portes and Zhou's (Adelman and Woods

2006, Almeida, Johnson, Corliss et al. 2009, Auerswald and Eyre 2002, Kosciw, Greytak, Bartkiewicz et al. 2012, Yep 2003) notion of ethnic enclaves (1993).

Their work in social capital and immigrant group membership demonstrates how membership may benefit or hinder group member(s) through the development of ethnic enclaves. Ethnic enclaves allow established immigrants to "employ a significant proportion of their co-ethnic labor force and develop a distinctive physical presence in urban space" (Castells 1983, Castells 2011, Lauria and Knopp 1985). Castells (Portes 2000:13) noted similar network behavior in the LGBT community in the Castro and Polk areas of San Francisco. Weston (1983) observed that these areas created economies conceptually similar to ethnic enclaves.

Castell offers a convincing explanation of the economic success of these neighborhoods. The push/pull dynamic of waves of LGBT people relocating from more rural areas towards urban city centers created concentrated pockets of LGBT-friendly neighborhoods (1995). This rising population created economic growth (although initially in lower-paying service industry occupations) and planted the seeds of political organization to remedy systematic and institutional LGBT oppression.

Once these urban areas began to form a nascent gay identity, community members were implored to "buy gay." That strategy led to gay-owned businesses and growing occupational opportunities for a rapidly increasing gay population, mimicking the ethnic business niches posited by Portes and Zhou (Weston 1995:255). These institutions and their practices helped to conflate heteronormativity in an increasingly gentrified area and normalize gay and lesbian life in the greater culture (1992). Unlike ethnic immigrants with language and cultural barriers, urban gays and lesbians quickly assimilated into the labor markets of these large urban areas.

Despite national political mobilization, heteronormative assimilation and hegemonic masculinities still oppress the LGBT community. The current partisan political and ideological climate has led to employment outcomes that oscillate wildly for LGBT people. Recently at the state level, the North Carolina General Assembly and Governor, in a rushed, special one-day session, passed and signed House Bill 2 in early 2016. This bill not only prevents transgendered people from using a bathroom associated with their gender identity, it supersedes and prohibits *any* local anti-discriminatory LGBT employment laws in place. An employer has the right to not hire, not promote, and fire an employee based on their sexual minority status. Unlike women and racial minorities, sexual minorities are not afforded the protections of 1964's Civil Rights Act and similar federal employment protections such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In fact, local, state, and federal laws once *readily enforced* occupational segregation.

History reveals many concrete and unsettling examples of *de jure* occupational segregation for lesbian and gay people: President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450, just ten years before the Civil Rights Act, effectively banned gays and lesbians ("sexual perversions" was the official term) from all federal employment (Fetner 2001, Martin 2009). This policing motivated formal organizations to mobilize in order to expel gays and lesbians from education occupations at all levels. Framing the issue of gays and lesbians in these professions with child safety, this scare tactic equated gay men to pedophiles and successfully led to many more local and statewide laws prohibiting gay

men and lesbians from educational occupational settings (Johnson 2009). Gays and lesbians were also officially banned from the U.S. Armed Forces until President Clinton signed "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" into law in 1994 (forcing gays and lesbians to remain "in the closet") (Fetner 2001).

Homosexual acts were outlawed in many states until the *Lawrence V. Texas* Supreme Court decision in 2003 decriminalized such acts nationally. This judicial opinion's importance for gays and lesbians cannot be overstated because an arrest for "sodomy" could mean a lifetime identified as a sex offender. This taboo social status could lead to employment termination and negatively affect re-entry into the labor force. LGBT people must therefore confront the harsh realities of a labor market shaped in part by institutional processes that reproduce and enforce heteronormativity and homophobia. Link these processes, the possible negative outcomes, and the absence of federal protections in matters of employment for lesbians and gays, and the theoretical question asking whether sexuality moderates occupational choice becomes salient in both the public and academic spheres.

Contemporary research shows gay and lesbian stereotypes persist. These stereotypes revolve around the socialized (re)enforcement of sex roles and gender norms. "Gay individuals are believed to have atypical gender-role characteristics, in terms of their occupational aspirations, activity interests, and personality traits. Specifically, gay men are believed to be more feminine and less masculine and lesbians to be more masculine and less feminine than their heterosexual counterparts" (Hirshman 2012).

The paucity of social science scholarship regarding gay and lesbian employment issues exists primarily due to the difficulty and accuracy of collecting data of such a stigmatized group (Blashill and Powlishta 2009:792). Badgett's (Badgett 1995, Badgett 2003, Carpenter 2005) empirical research employing the General Social Survey to measure wage differences between gays, lesbians, and heterosexuals found that gay men earned 11 to 27 percent less than their heterosexual counterparts, while lesbians and heterosexual women had no significant differences. This study suffers from a disappointingly low number of subjects to be convincing (47 gay men and 34 lesbians). Carpenter (1995) revisited this study, but with a much larger sample population (578 gay men and 335 lesbians). His findings suggest a negative wage gap between gay men and married heterosexual men, but a positive gap when compared with unmarried heterosexual men. The findings also show a positive wage gap between lesbians and both married and unmarried heterosexual women. The sample comes from only one state, California, creating issues with generalizability due to regional bias.

HYPOTHESES

Occupational segregation is a systematic process of discrimination against marginalized groups; theoretically, scholars utilize occupational segregation as a paradigm to focus on mechanisms that explain the practices and consequences of such inequality. As stated earlier in the research of Berg and Lien (2005), sexual orientation cues stereotypical gendered attributes regarding gay men and their occupational aspirations. Antecol et al. posit that perceived occupational aspirations may influence gay men's decisions to self-sort to female-dominated occupations (2002). Occupational segregation scholars successfully criticized the suggestions posited by human capital theorists that differences in occupational outcomes between men and women can be explained by planning life-course decisions, including occupations, on antiquated gender roles between men and women. Particularly, human capital theorists posited that women choose employment that allows for intermittency (anticipating the time needed for childbirth) and little capital reward for skill accumulation through tenure. England's (2008) research showed that many women whose work record showed no intermittent time away from employment were still employed at high rates in female-dominant occupations.

While gay men wrestle with stigma and other psychological stressors related to sexual orientation and gender role conflict, partnered gay men may be more free of the stressors of identity management. Scant empirical evidence exists positing gay men experience occupational segregation when compared to heterosexual men in regards to female- and male-dominated occupations. Reskin's (2008) theoretical work regarding occupational outcomes warns of the "Balkanization" of stratification theory in the search of her recommendations is the systematic study of societal mechanisms. This recommendation drives my first two hypotheses. While the model does rely on sexual orientation as an independent variable, this research focuses on the larger processes of socialization rather than specific causal mechanisms.

Socialization, and more specifically, the social-relational practices that (re)produce both entrenched social patterns and divergent intersectional identities, underpins my hypotheses. The previously mentioned social psychology literature demonstrating stereotyped gendered norms regarding gay men, femininity, and occupational aspirations suggest gay men are influenced to self-sort towards female-dominated occupations. Also, feminist scholarship highlighting hegemonic masculinities and masculinity studies positing the "precarious manhood" theory suggest heterosexual men are influenced to self-sort towards male-dominated occupations. Thus, I hypothesize:

H₁: Gay men are more likely to be in female-dominated occupations than heterosexual men.

H₂: Gay men are less likely to be in male-dominated occupations than heterosexual men.

Due to both the formal historical practices of segregation and empirical studies that demonstrate wage differences between gay and heterosexual men (though lacking in the ability to generalize such results), I also hypothesize:

- H_{3a}: Heterosexual men experience a wage premium in female-dominated occupations relative to gay men.
- H_{3b}: Heterosexual men experience a wage premium in male-dominated occupations relative to gay men.

H_{3c}: Heterosexual men experience a wage premium in gender-neutral occupations relative to gay men.

Other theoretical claims discuss gay men's relocation to city centers, where, unlike immigrants with language and cultural deficiencies, gay men can carve employment niches rewarding their migration. This hypothesis expands the scope of the previous hypothesis by adding the intersection of a spatial context with sexual orientation.

H₄: Gay men experience a wage premium in central city metropolitan

areas relative to their heterosexual counterparts.

Finally, intersectionality as an analytical tool is tested by examining Pedulla's (2014) theory that there may benefits to stereotypes. His research shows gay black men received a benefit in the job application process from their gay identity that overpowered the stereotype surrounding the "aggressive" black male that white gay males did not experience. The logical extension of this theory would suggest that this benefit at the beginning of the employment process would lead to increases in wages relative to heterosexual black men.

H_{5a}: Black gay men receive a wage premium relative to black heterosexual men.

H_{5b}: White gay men receive a wage penalty relative to white heterosexual men.

DATA AND METHODS

The primary data set for this research comes from the ACS 2010-2014 5-year survey of a random sample of the United States population. This is a weighted sample of N=15,552,144 people. Utilizing the University of Minnesota's Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 6.0 [machine-readable database] and statistical software, I construct a data set to identify all working age black and white males (24-65 years old) with cohabitating or married partners, either in same-sex or heterosexual relationships (the specific methods to identify gay men are below). Unfortunately, there is no way to capture single heterosexual or gay males from the ACS data, so this study is limited to married or cohabitating heterosexual or gay partners.

This study contains two models with two different dependent variables. The first model's dependent variable is a multinomial categorical variable consisting of the three categories of detailed occupations (female-dominated, male-dominated, and gender-neutral) with the "gender-neutral" category being the reference category. Using Reskin's (1993) review on occupational segregation as a template, I categorize female-dominated occupations as having 70 percent or more women. Male-dominated occupations are 70 percent or more men. Those occupations falling between these two categories are considered gender-neutral occupations. The CPS table data does not report an occupation's gender ratio if the occupation contains less than 50,000 people, therefore these occupations are not included with the study (approximately 2.4 percent of total workers). Detailed tables of these constructed categories are listed in the appendix (tables B1-B4).

I add five occupations falling in the middle range to the list of female-dominated occupations due to their historical persistence as feminized occupations: physical therapists, physician's assistants, hotel or motel desk clerks, human resources, and office administrative managers.

The second dependent variable is earnings (logged) as annual wages in 2014 dollars. A regression analysis models earnings as dependent on an array of independent variables, with sexuality being the independent variable of interest.

The unit of analysis for this research is at the individual level; however, the variable for sexuality must be constructed using household level data from the American Community Survey. The first question on the ACS asks to identify the head of household. If there is a person two in the household, the questionnaire then asks how this person is related to person one. Of the many possible answers, the two pertinent responses to this study are "spouse" and "unmarried partner." IPUMS-USA provides a unique serial number as an identifier to each household in the ACS. Each household member has a coded variable (relate) to identify the head of household (relate=101), the married spouse to the head of household (relate=201), or the unmarried cohabitating partner to the head of household (relate=1104). IPUMS allows researchers to remove all other individuals from the same household from the data set. This action allows only three possible individual lines from each household: the head of household (relate=1), the married partner (relate=2) or the unmarried cohabitating partner (relate=19). The construction of the variable for sexuality (gay=1) relies on the answers to the first two questions regarding household interrelationships on the American Community Survey questionnaire.

Gay and heterosexual married couples and gay and heterosexual cohabitating partners are the household interrelationships of interest. IPUMS-USA allows the researcher to select an option that creates a coded variable for the sex of the married partner in the same household. If the sex of the head of household is male and the sex of the spouse is male for both married partners, it follows this is a male same-sex married household and sexuality (gay=1) can be coded for both individuals accordingly. If the sex of the spouse is different from the head of household, then this is a heterosexual marriage and sexuality (gay=0) can be coded accordingly. Coding the sexuality of cohabitating partners requires manipulating variables within data sets via analytic software. The survey distinguishes an unmarried partner from a housemate or roommate by clearly stating a "housemate or roommate" is someone sharing the house/apartment (but who is not romantically involved) with person 1. An 'unmarried partner,' also known as a domestic partner, is a person who shares a close personal relationship with Person 1." Since IPUMS constructs a variable labeling the sex of the partners of heterosexual or gay married men, a new data set can be constructed with just these individuals. If the sex of the male married partner is female, then gay equals zero (heterosexual). If the sex of the male married partner is male, then both partners' sexuality is coded as gay.

Coding for unmarried cohabitating men, both heterosexual and gay, consists of creating a household level data file. Coding culls just head of households (relate=1) or the cohabitating partner (relate=19). Next, a temporary data set allows for the creation of a variable cohab (cohab=0). Then, coding steps create cohab=1 if one of the individuals in the household is a cohabitating unmarried partner (relate=19). A new data set and coding to keep cohab=1 will eliminate any single head of households. Then a new data

set can create a variable that is the sum of the variable sex in each cohabitating household (sexcount). If the household sexcount equals zero, then this is a female same-sex cohabitating partnered household and is eliminated from the data set. If sexcount equals one, then this is an opposite-sex cohabitating household and sexuality is coded zero for heterosexual. If sexcount equals two, then this is a male same-sex cohabitating household and sexuality is coded one. Then only men are included in an output data set. This male cohabitating data set is merged with the married men data set to capture all men in a household relationship.

As with most regression models measuring wage inequality, I include age as a continuous variable and educational attainment as a series of dummy variables (see Table 1 for the description of the five categories of educational attainment). Both variables reflect measures of human capital, as age generally correlates with experience and higher levels of education demonstrate increased accumulation of human capital via knowledge and skills.

Research shows that the presence of children in married heterosexual couples consistently leads to a "fatherhood premium" on earnings (2002). Research also shows that the percentage of gay parents with their own children is considerably less that their heterosexual married counterparts (Correll, Benard and Paik 2007). These findings strongly suggest that the presence of children makes a significant difference in wage earnings for married heterosexual men. This research therefore includes the number of children related to the head of household (biological, adopted, or stepchild) in the household as a nominal independent variable. Geographic control variables representing a subject's regional status are included, with the South being the reference category. Also included is a dummy variable representing residence in a primary city in a ACS defined metropolitan statistical area (MSA), where 1 = yes and 0 = no.

| Table 1: | Descriptive statistics |
|----------------------|--|
| | |
| Variables | Frequency (percentages in parentheses) |
| | Relationship to household partner; $(1 = \text{same-sex}, 0 =$ |
| Sexual Orientation | heterosexual) |
| Gay | 19,983 (1.18%) |
| Heterosexual | 1,677,234 (98.82%) |
| | |
| Race | Race of respondent; $(1 = black, 0 = white)$ |
| Black | 119,189 (7.02%) |
| White | 1,578,028 (92.98%) |
| City Center | Respondent resides in a primary city center; $(1 = \text{yes}, 0 = \text{no})$ |
| ves | 139,297 (8.21%) |
| no | 1,557,920 (91.80%) |
| | |
| Year of survey | Year of survey; $(1 = yes, 0 = no)$ |
| 2010 | 342,087 (20.16%) |
| 2011 | 331,578 (19.54%) |
| 2012 | 337,864 (19.91%) |
| 2013 | 344,125 (20.28%) |
| 2014 | 341,563 (20.12%) |
| | |
| | Respondent resides in the geographic region; $(1 = yes, 0 =$ |
| Geographic region | no) |
| New England | 89,343 (5.26%) |
| Mid-Atlantic | 226,693 (13.36%) |
| Midwest | 418,209 (24.64%) |
| West | 335,880 (19.79%) |
| South | 627,092 (36.95%) |
| | |
| Level of education | Respondent's level of education: $1 = ves$, $0 = no$ |
| No high school | |
| diploma | 120,498 (7.10%) |
| High school graduate | 367,782 (21.67%) |
| Some college | 508,609 (29.97%) |
| Bachelor's degree | 391,179 (23.05%) |
| Graduate degree | 250,015 (14.73%) |
| 0 | |

Table 1: Continued

| Industry | Respondent's occupational industry; $1 = yes$, $0 = no$ |
|--------------------------|--|
| Agriculture | 35,007 (2.06%) |
| Manufacturing | 463,909 (27.33%) |
| Transportation | 136,554 (8.05%) |
| Information | 43,845 (2.59%) |
| Finance, Insurance, Real | |
| Estate | 107,761 (6.35%) |
| Professional services | 665,788 (39.23%) |
| Sales | 175,472 (10.39%) |
| Part-time work | Respondent works less than 35 hours a week; $(1 = yes, 0 = no)$ |
| Part-time work | 112.564 (6.63%) |
| Full-time work | 1,584,653 (93.37%) |
| Age | Respondent's age at time of survey |
| C | 45.96 (mean) |
| Earnings | Respondent's annual earnings, logged, in 2014 dollars 10.85 (mean) |
| Children | Number of respondent's own children in household 1.13 (mean) |
| Hours | Average hours of work per week |
| | 44.28 (mean) |
| N = 1,697,217 | |

Two models serve this analysis. The first equation is a multinomial logit regression where the dependent variable is one of the three types of occupation (masculinized, feminized, or neither). This model will use both individual and city-level characteristics to understand if sexuality affects occupational outcomes. Obviously, males dominate the outcomes for masculinized occupations. The interesting results will be in the comparison of probabilities between gay males and their heterosexual cohorts for all three of the mutually exclusive, exhaustive outcomes.

In the first equation:

 P_{i1} = the probability that Femocc=1 for person *i*

 P_{i2} = the probability that Mascocc=1 for person *i*

 P_{i3} = the probability that Middle=1 for person *i*

From the previous three equations, the following models probabilities for person *i* with x_i =the row vector of explanatory variables and β =the column coefficients:

$$x_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \ x_{i1} \ x_{i2} \ \dots \ x_{i18} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$P_{i1} = \frac{e^{\beta_{1}x_{i}}}{1 + e^{\beta_{1}x_{i}} + e^{\beta_{2}x_{i}}}$$
$$P_{i2} = \frac{e^{\beta_{2}x_{i}}}{1 + e^{\beta_{1}x_{i}} + e^{\beta_{2}x_{i}}}$$
$$P_{i3} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta_{1}x_{i}} + e^{\beta_{2}x_{i}}}$$

The second equation is an ordinary least squares regression that models annual wages (logged, in 2014 dollars) as the dependent variable. I also utilize another type of regression analysis to test hypotheses 3 and 4. Building off the OLS regression, the methodology illustrated by Jaccard and Turrisi (2003) centers control variables around the mean (effectively making all control coefficients zero), thus creating a way to isolate the variables of interest's main effects and their interaction effects.

The OLS regression equation is as follows:

 β_0 = the intercept of the model

 β_{li} = the parameter estimate of the first independent variable X_{li}

$$Wage_i = \beta_0 + \beta_{1i}X_{1i} + \ldots + \beta_{18i}X_{18i} + \varepsilon_i$$

FINDINGS

Table 2 shows the results of the multiple logistic regression odds ratio estimates of using female-dominated occupations, male-dominated occupations, and gender-neutral occupations as the three categorical dependent variables. For goodness-of-fit tests, I performed two multinomial logistic regressions, nesting a smaller model without the binary variable for gay or heterosexual to compare the -2 log likelihood statistics to the full model. Subtracting these -2 log likelihoods from the global null hypothesis lead to a total of 393852 for the nested model and 409936 for the full model. The difference is greater in the full model, meaning the maximum likelihood of fit is greater, supporting the use of the full model. The associated *p*-values from the maximum of the multiple logistic regression are important because they provide significance testing results of the corresponding related effects of the odds ratio estimates.

While a multinomial logistic regression better fits the purpose of categorical data, interpreting the results of a multinomial logistic regression is daunting. Allison's (2012) novel three column chart method possesses an intuitive approach to handle the complexities of such a model. In Table 2, the three columns correspond to the odds ratio that a respondent will be in a female-dominated occupation over a gender-neutral occupation, a male-dominated occupation over a gender-neutral occupation, and a female-dominated occupation over a male-dominated occupation, respectively.

| | and inclusion and inclusion | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | Female-dominated Occupations | Male-dominated Occupations | Female-dominated Occupations |
| | | vs. | vs. | vs. |
| | | Gender-neutral Occupations | Gender-neutral Occupations | Male-dominated Occupations |
| N=1,697,217 |] | | | |
| | Effect | Point Estimate | Point Estimate | Point Estimate |
| Variable of Interest: | Sexual orientation (1=gay, 0=heterosexual) | 1.935** | 0.536** | 3.611** |
| Controls: | | | | |
| Year of Survey | 2011 | 1.015^{**} | 0.999 | 1.016^{*} |
| | 2012 | 1.025^{**} | 1.004^{*} | 1.021^{**} |
| | 2013 | 1.015^{**} | 1.001 | 1.041^{**} |
| | 2014 | 0.988* | 0.980^{**} | 1.008* |
| Geographic Region | New England | 1.081^{**} | 0.937^{**} | 1.153 ** |
| | Mid-Atlantic | 1.182^{**} | 0.965^{**} | 1.226^{**} |
| | Midwest | 1.092^{**} | 0.958^{**} | 1.140^{**} |
| | West | 1.090^{**} | 0.966^{**} | 1.129^{**} |
| | Primary city | 0.977 ** | 0.911^{**} | 1.073 ** |

Multiple logistic regression odds ratio estimates of gendered occupational outcomes based on employed gay and heterosexual men.

Table 2:

| oma 0.830** 1.039** 0.799* | llege 1.494** 0.854** 1.749** | gree 1.666** 0.593** 2.811** | gree 1.821** 0.623** 2.921** | lture 0.389** 0.933** 0.417** | rring 0.439** 1.921** 0.229** | tion 0.545** 2.070** 0.263** | tion 0.795** 1.347** 0.590** | Real | state 1.091^{**} 0.670^{**} 1.628^{**} | vices 5.107** 1.365** 3.741** | | hite) 1.498^{**} 0.842^{**} 1.780^{**} | Age 0.992* 1.000 0.992* | dren 1.000 1.028^{**} 0.973^{**} | veek 0.975** 1.011* 0.965** | vork 0.880** 0.871** 1.010 |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 0.830** | 1.494^{**} | 1.666^{**} | 1.821^{**} | 0.389^{**} | 0.439** | 0.545^{**} | 0.795^{**} | | 1.091^{**} | 5.107^{**} | | 1.498^{**} | 0.992^{*} | 1.000 | 0.975** | 0.880^{**} |
| No high school diploma | Some college | Bachelor's degree | Graduate degree | Agriculture | Manufacturing | Transportation | Information | Finance, Insurance, Real | Estate | Professional Services | | Race (1=Black, 0=White) | Age | Number of children | Hours worked per week | Part-time work |
| Level of Education | | | | Industry | | | | | | | Other Controls: | | | | | |

p-value corresponding to the maximum likelihood estimate is p<.05. **p<.001.

Note: The data source is the ACS 2010-2014 five-year sample. An occupation with ≥ 70 % women is considered female-dominated and an occupation that is $\geq 70\%$ men is considered male-dominated. Gender-neutral occupations is the reference category for occupations, where an occupation is neither female- nor male-dominant. The regression was weighted at the individual level. 2010 is the year of reference. The South is the region of reference. A high school diploma is the education level of reference. Part-time is defined as employed less than 35 hours a week. Sales is the reference category for industry. Column one will serve as the example for interpretation. This column is the odds ratio of a respondent's occupational outcome being in a female-dominated occupation over being in a gender-neutral occupation. The greater the point estimate value, the more likely this outcome occurs. The lower the point estimate is below 1.0, the more likely the opposite outcome occurs. For results below 1.0, the reciprocal of that number becomes the odds ratio for the outcome that the subject is in a gender-neutral occupation over a female-dominated occupation (the inverse of event one).

The findings from this model provide statistical evidence in support of the first two hypotheses. First, from the multinomial logistic regression Table 2 (column three), gay men are 3.611 times more likely to work in a female-dominated occupation than a male-dominated occupation. Gay men also demonstrate outcomes that they are 1.935 times more likely to work in female-dominated occupations over gender-neutral occupations. In the second column, because the odds ratio is lower than 1.0, the result needs to be transformed using the reciprocal of the result for interpretation. The reciprocal is then used to show how the inverse event is more likely to happen. In this instance, the result of 0.536 has a reciprocal of 1.866. Thus, gay men are 1.866 times more likely to have a gender-neutral occupation over a male-dominant occupation. From column three, gay men are 3.611 times more likely to work in a female-dominant occupation than a male-dominant occupation. These statistically significant large odds ratios demonstrating that gay men significantly more likely to work in female-dominated occupations (from Table 2 in column 1 and column 3) provides strong support to accept:

H₁: Gay men are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations relative to heterosexual males.

The same results (plus the odds ratio from Table 2 in column 2) also strongly support: H₂: Gay men are less likely to be in male-dominated occupations relative to heterosexual men.

The point estimates of the control variables contribute to a more nuanced understanding of this research. The education effect presents surprising results but a welltested interpretation. Those subjects without a high school diploma or its equivalent show they are 1.205 times more likely to have a gender-neutral occupation than a femaledominated occupation. As the level of education increases, so do the odds ratios of being employed in a female-dominated occupation rather than a gender-neutral occupation. Comparable worth theory from the gender stratification literature posits equally skilled (one measure of skill is education) women and men make unequal wages at jobs where the skill level is the same (England 1992). This result supports the idea that women's work is devalued socially as higher education may lead to women's work for men but this work is known to pay lower wages.

The industry categories follow a predictable pattern, as a male respondent is unsurprisingly more likely to be employed in a gender-neutral occupation over a femaledominant occupation within the agriculture/hunting/mining, manufacturing, transportation, and information industries. A male respondent is 5.125 times more likely to be employed in a female-dominated occupation over a gender-neutral occupation in the professional services industry.

This model illustrates support for racial occupational segregation as well. A black man is 1.498 times more likely to have a female-dominant occupation over a genderneutral occupation. This outcome strengthens the research of Yavorsky, Cohen, and Qian (2016) which examines men at the intersections of race and female-dominant occupations.

In the second column, the odds ratio reflects the respondent's occupational outcome in a male-dominated occupation over a gender-neutral occupation. A black man has a 1.188 times greater odds ratio of a gender-neutral occupation over a male-dominant occupation. From the third column, a black man is 1.780 times more likely to work in a femaledominant occupation than a male-dominant occupation, once again supporting the previously mentioned research on racialized occupational segregation.

To test the other hypotheses, an OLS regression (Table 3) of a respondent's annual earnings (logged) on the variables of interest control and other control variables show parameter estimates in matters of both direction and magnitude. All parameter estimates are significantly highly significant at p < .001 (except for the variable controlling for residing in a primary city). Importantly, gay men receive a wage premium of 0.0348. The gender composition of an occupation has significant effects on income, as femaledominated occupations have a negative impact on earnings (-0.1625) while maledominated occupations add a 0.0823 increase on logged wages. Race also has a negative effect on wages (-0.1954). The levels of education demonstrate human capital premiums to wages: a respondent with no high school diploma faces a penalty effect on wages. Some college provides a large positive jump in earnings, while a bachelor's degree more than doubles the effect. A graduate degree offers a large jump in magnitude from a bachelor's degree for a respondent. The dummy variables for industries offer a positive increase except for professional services, which have a very slight negative effect on earnings. The largest effects come in the information and FIRE industries, both almost

double of any other industry. A respondent's age increases earnings, as age is a close proxy to experience, another form of human capital that leads to higher wages. The number of children a respondent has in the household increases earnings. The hours of work in a week obviously increases wages, while part-time work decreases wages.

| N=1697217 | | Parameter | Standard |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| | Variables | Estimate | Error |
| | Intercept | 9.1756** | (0.0059) |
| Variables of | Sexual orientation (1=gay, | | |
| interest | 0=heterosexual) | 0.0348** | (0.0062) |
| | Race (1=Black, 0=White) | -0.1954** | (0.0027) |
| Year of survey | 2011 | -0.0260** | (0.0021) |
| | 2012 | -0.0282** | (0.0020) |
| | 2013 | -0.0240** | (0.0020) |
| | 2014 | -0.0224** | (0.0020) |
| Geographic region | New England | 0.1145** | (0.0030) |
| | Mid-Atlantic | 0.1123** | (0.0021) |
| | Midwest | -0.0265** | (0.0017) |
| | West | 0.0628** | (0.0019) |
| | City Center (1=yes, 0=no) | -0.0035 | (0.0025) |
| Education | No high school diploma | -0.2991** | (0.0029) |
| | Some college | 0.1944** | (0.0018) |
| | Bachelor's degree | 0.5701** | (0.0020) |
| | Graduate degree | 0.8200** | (0.0024) |
| Industry | Agriculture/Hunting/Mining | 0.0982** | (0.0056) |
| | Manufacturing | 0.1304** | (0.0022) |
| | Transportation | 0.1213** | (0.0030) |
| | Information | 0.2256** | (0.0043) |
| | Finance, Insurance, Real Estate | 0.2607** | (0.0034) |
| | Professional Services | 0.0422** | (0.0022) |
| Other controls | Respondent's age | 0.0113** | (0.0001) |
| | Number of children | 0.0505** | (0.0006) |
| | Hours worked weekly | 0.0171** | (0.0001) |
| | Part-time work | -0.8226** | (0.0043) |
| Gender composition of | Female-dominated occupations | -0.1625** | (0.0027) |
| occupation | Male-dominated occupations | 0.0823** | (0.0014) |

Table 3.OLS coefficients from the regression of annual wages (logged) of
working-age 24-65 years old), gay and heterosexual employed men.

*p < .05 **p < .0001 Adjusted R²=0.3655

Note: Data source is the ACS 2010-2014 five-year sample. The regression is weighted at the individual level and all p-values are reported utilizing a Huber-White correction to adjust the sample for clustering effects. 2010 is the year reference. The South is the region of reference. A high school diploma is the education level of reference. Part-time is defined as employed for 35 or more hours a week. Gender-neutral occupations are the reference category for occupations, where 70 percent or more of one gender defines the occupation as dominated. Sales is the reference category of industry.



Table 4 shows the results from the regression designed to illustrate main effects and interaction effects. This table shows predicted earnings of gay and heterosexual men in all three occupational categories. The results of this model lead to mixed support for hypothesis 3. The evidence does not support either hypothesis 3_a or hypothesis 3_b , as gay men experience a wage premium in both female-dominant occupations and male-dominant occupations. Only hypothesis 3_c is supported, heterosexual men make more than gay men in gender-neutral occupations.



As for hypothesis 4, Table 5 shows a large wage premium for the interaction effect of



gay men who reside in a primary city in a MSA.

Table 6 shows ample support for hypothesis 5_a , black gay men almost make a onefold increase in wages relative to black heterosexual men. Hypothesis 5_b is not supported, white heterosexual men make less than white gay men.

DISCUSSION

This examination of occupational segregation suggests the differences in occupational outcomes for gay and heterosexual men may be easily demarcated, but also extremely nuanced due to the surprising differences in earnings. The findings that gay men earn more than heterosexual men in female-dominant and male-dominant occupations invites theorists to explore these implications. Gay men, however, earn less than heterosexual men in gender-neutral occupations; this is problematic due to the magnitude of gay men in this category (approximately 53 percent of gay men in the sample are employed in gender-neutral occupations).

This research purposely avoided examining atomistic, individual motives in labor market practices to emphasize the broader social implications of occupational segregation regarding gender norms and gay identity. Entrenched in gender stratification scholarship is the notion of "persistent gendered patterns of heterosexual romantic, sexual, and marital relationships" (England 2010:150). Collins (2015) and other intersectional scholars extend the critical role of hegemonic masculinities to white heterosexual male hegemonic masculinities, as research shows that even among men in female-dominated work, black men did not share the same "glass escalator experience" (Wingfield 2009). The interesting and complicated findings of this research reflect the complex relationship regarding gendered norms, race, and sexuality.

England's (2010) discussion regarding the negative consequences of gender essentialism provide a springboard to conceptualize a parallel notion of gay essentialism. The quantitative findings in this research showing gay men are more likely to work in female-dominant occupations help reinforce this notion of gay essentialism. England calls for more men to enter women's occupations to make gender egalitarianism less asymmetric. This creates a sociological paradox: does the increased presence of gay men in female-dominant jobs suggest the dismantling of gender essentialism or is it reinforcing the process due to the conflation of gendered attributes towards gay men?

Urban scholars link the popular waves of migrating gay men in helping establish certain industries, specifically the fashion and entertainment industries in both New York City and Los Angeles (Currid-Halkett and Stolarick 2010). This explanation equates and perpetuates certain female-dominant occupations as gay occupations, re-emphasizing the stereotypes associated with gender essentialism as an outcome of socialization. The large earnings premium found in this research may help perpetuate this notion of gay essentialism, mythologizing the affluent, urban dwelling gay man. Other social scientists posit the benefits of gay culture on innovation (Florida 2002, Florida 2012, Knudsen, Florida, Gates et al. 2007).

Circling back to England and her criticism of gender essentialism and its contribution to occupational segregation, the same question can be asked regarding this notion of gay essentialism. Do the different occupational outcomes for gay and heterosexual men perpetuate inequality? Even though the findings of this research show gay men earning more than heterosexual men in female-dominated occupations, the increase in earnings must be examined through the lens of the other penalties accrued from female-dominant occupations.

LIMITATIONS

It bears repeating that these data capture male gay or heterosexual married or cohabitating partners. The ACS unfortunately does not ask a respondent to directly identify their sexual orientation so there is no way to distinguish single gay and heterosexual men. These subpopulations are no doubt large and capturing such data would lead to stronger results. Other surveys, such as the General Social Survey, ask candid questions about past sexual behavior and many researchers see this response as a way to identify sexual orientation. This interpretation highlights the issue surrounding identity claims for LGBT research: is sexual orientation an identity or is sexual orientation a behavior? In using the ACS data and identifying sexual orientation through either same-sex marriage or cohabitation, I make the claim that "gay" is an identity. This claim bypasses the conundrum of men who have sex with men but self-identify as heterosexual.

Other limitations involve the accuracy of self-reported data in the contexts of social stigmatization and internalized homophobia. Hence, underreporting is likely (Granovetter 1973, McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook 2001). Like other researchers in this area, I take the responses regarding sexuality at face value and avoid sexual identity issues such as sexual fluidity.

This research does not attempt to capture statistical or taste-based sexual orientation discrimination from employers; qualitative or mixed-methods approaches are best suited to test those explanations (see Pager, Western, and Bonikowski 2009). This research also does not qualitatively test gay employee's preferences for certain occupations.

37

It also bears mentioning that this research does not examine those respondents who are unemployed or no longer in the labor market due to sexual orientation discrimination. Unemployment and labor market exit create distressing and sometimes catastrophic outcomes on the life-course of individuals and families.

CONCLUSION

This research examines social inequality through the lens of occupational segregation. Labor market outcomes and subsequent earnings greatly influence the life-course of and individual and are two major components to the study of stratification and mobility. Gay men historically faced formal institutional barriers to certain occupations and still face stigmatization and discrimination. Stratification scholars' empirical research shows female-dominant occupations pay less, offer less advancement opportunities, fewer benefits, and lower rates of on-the-job training than male-dominant and gender-neutral occupations (England et al. 1988, England 2010, Reskin 1993). Feminist and social inequality scholarship posits that the hegemonic power of white, heterosexual men dominate labor market occupational outcomes and earnings and this dominant group seeks to reproduce such favorable outcomes, unintentionally or planned (Tilly 1999).

These processes led to the hypotheses that gay men are overrepresented in femaledominated occupations and underrepresented in male-dominated occupations, relative to their heterosexual cohorts. Using a large nationally representative sample, I modeled two equations to test these hypotheses. The findings presented strong evidence supporting these hypotheses: gay men are more likely to work in female-dominant occupations and less likely to work in male-dominant occupations compared to their heterosexual cohorts.

Sociological research from other sub-disciplines complicates the interpretations of these outcomes, as studies have shown men earn more than women in female-dominant occupations and receive advantages not afforded to women (Williams 1992). Still other research suggests that it is possible gay men have developed employment niches in certain female-dominant occupations.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH

The complex and nuanced findings regarding the intersections of gay identity and suggest an ever-changing social identity for this marginalized group. Pedulla (2014) posits that gay black men receive a benefit in the job application process over white gay men because the stereotype of being gay (effeminate and weak) negates the stereotype of the heterosexual black male (overly aggressive and violent). While this finding is provocative, it aligns with the research presented here, suggesting groups facing persistent stereotypes might carve out occupational niches.

Florida's (Florida 2012) conception of the creative class and desirable cities specifically mentions the LGBT community as a component that adds value to the community through cultural capital. Conceptually, this view of the gay community parallels Portes' (Portes 2000) immigrant ethnic niche theory. More broadly, this notion of gay essentialism offers many avenues to explore social inequality. The curious result that gay men earn less in gender-neutral occupations rather than female-dominant or male-dominant occupations points to challenging research for understanding. Now that there are large nationally representative samples of gay men.

The paradox of gay essentialism and the dismantling of gender essentialism offers a theoretic puzzle for researchers. How do scholars solve the riddle that addresses the large number of gay men in female-dominated occupations with the gendered stereotypes that reinforce gay men's participation in female-dominated occupations?

40

REFERENCES

- Adelman, Madelaine and Kathryn Woods. 2006. "Identification without Intervention: Transforming the Anti-Lgbtq School Climate." *Journal of Poverty* 10(2):5-26.
- Allison, Paul D. 2012. Logistic Regression Using Sas: Theory and Application, Second Edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Almeida, Joanna, Renee M Johnson, Heather L Corliss, Beth E Molnar and Deborah Azrael. 2009. "Emotional Distress among Lgbt Youth: The Influence of Perceived Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 38(7):1001-14.
- Antecol, Heather, Anneke Jong and Michael Steinberger. 2008. "The Sexual Orientation Wage Gap: The Role of Occupational Sorting and Human Capital." *Industrial and labor relations review* 61(4):518-43.
- Auerswald, Colette L and Stephen L Eyre. 2002. "Youth Homelessness in San Francisco: A Life Cycle Approach." *Social Science & Medicine* 54(10):1497-512.
- Badgett, MV Lee. 1995. "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." Industrial and Labor Relations Review:726-39.
- Badgett, MV Lee. 2003. Money, Myths, and Change: The Economic Lives of Lesbians and Gay Men. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bailey, J Michael and Michael Oberschneider. 1997. "Sexual Orientation and Professional Dance." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 26(4):433-44.
- Berg, Nathan and Donald Lien. 2002. "Measuring the Effect of Sexual Orientation on Income: Evidence of Discrimination?" *Contemporary Economic Policy* 20(4):394-414.
- Blashill, Aaron J and Kimberly K Powlishta. 2009. "Gay Stereotypes: The Use of Sexual Orientation as a Cue for Gender-Related Attributes." *Sex Roles* 61(11-12):783-93.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. "Masculine Domination Revisited." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 41:189-203.
- Carpenter, Christopher S. 2005. "Self-Reported Sexual Orientation and Earnings: Evidence from California." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 58(2):258-73.
- Castells, Manuel. 1983. The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements: Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Castells, Manuel. 2011. The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, Vol. 1. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2015. "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas." *Annual Review* of Sociology 41:1-20.
- Correll, Shelley J, Stephen Benard and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty? 1." *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5):1297-339.
- Currid-Halkett, Elizabeth and Kevin Stolarick. 2010. "Cultural Capital and Metropolitan Distinction: Views of Los Angeles and New York." *City, Culture and Society* 1(4):217-23.
- England, Paula. 1982. "The Failure of Human Capital Theory to Explain Occupational Sex Segregation." *Journal of Human Resources* 17(3):358-70.
- England, Paula, George Farkas, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne and Thomas Dou. 1988.
 "Explaining Occupational Sex Segregation and Wages: Findings from a Model with Fixed Effects." *American Sociological Review* 53(4):544-58.
- England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. New York: Transaction Publishers.
- England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society* 24(2):149-66.
- Fetner, Tina. 2001. "Working Anita Bryant: The Impact of Christian Anti-Gay Activism on Lesbian and Gay Movement Claims." *Social Problems* 48(3):411-28.
- Florida, Richard. 2002. "Bohemia and Economic Geography." *Journal of Economic Geography* 2(1):55-71.
- Florida, Richard L. 2002. The Rise of the Creative Class. New York: Basic Books.
- Grodsky, Eric and Devah Pager. 2001. "The Structure of Disadvantage: Individual and Occupational Determinants of the Black-White Wage Gap." *American Sociological Review* 66(4):542-67.
- Gross, Edward. 1968. "Plus Ca Change...? The Sexual Structure of Occupations over Time." *Social Problems* 16(2):198-208.
- Hegewisch, Anne and Heidi Hartmann. 2014. "Occupational Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap: A Job Half Done." Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Hirshman, Linda. 2012. *Victory: The Triumphant Gay Revolution*. New York: HarperCollins.

- Hochschild, Arlie R. 1983. "The Managed Heart." Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jaccard, James and Robert Turrisi. 2003. Interaction Effects in Multiple Regression: Sage.
- Johnson, David K. 2009. The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Knudsen, Brian, Richard Florida, Gary Gates and Kevin Stolarick. 200. "Density and Creativity in U.S. Regions." Annals of the Association for American Geographers 98(2):461-478.
- Kosciw, Joseph G, Emily A Greytak, Mark J Bartkiewicz, Madelyn J Boesen and Neal A Palmer. 2012. "The 2011 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth in Our Nation's Schools." Vol. New York: The Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network.
- Lauria, Mickey and Lawrence Knopp. 1985. "Toward an Analysis of the Role of Gay Communities in the Urban Renaissance." *Urban Geography* 6(2):152-69.
- Martin, Karin A. 2009. "Normalizing Heterosexuality: Mothers' Assumptions, Talk, and Strategies with Young Children." *American Sociological Review* 74(2):190-207.
- McCall, Leslie. 2001. Complex Inequality: Gender, Class, and Race in the New Economy: New York: Routledge Press.
- Pager, Devah and Hana Shepherd. 2008. "The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:181.
- Pager, Devah, Bruce Western, and Bart Bonikowski. 2009. Discrimination in a Low Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment. American Sociological Review 74:777-799.
- Pedulla, D. S. 2014. "The Positive Consequences of Negative Stereotypes: Race, Sexual Orientation, and the Job Application Process." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77(1):75-94.
- Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1):74-96.
- Portes, Alejandro. 2000. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:1-24.

- Reskin, Barbara. 1993. "Sex Segregation in the Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19(1):241-70.
- Reskin, Barbara. 2008. "Including Mechanisms in Our Models of Ascriptive Inequality." Handbook of Employment Discrimination Research New York: Springer.
- Ruggles, Steven, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Josiah Grover, and Matthew Sobek. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 6.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2015.
- 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(7-8):269-76.
- Tilcsik, András, Michel Anteby and Carly R Knight. 2015. "Concealable Stigma and Occupational Segregation toward a Theory of Gay and Lesbian Occupations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 60(3):446-481.
- Tilly, Charles. 1999. Durable Inequality. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Table 11. Employed Persons by Detailed Occupations and Sex. 2010 Annual Averages. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Also available at http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlftable11-2011.pdf)
- Vandello, Joseph A and Jennifer K Bosson. 2013. "Hard Won and Easily Lost: A Review and Synthesis of Theory and Research on Precarious Manhood." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 14(2):101
- Weston, Kath. 1995. "Get Thee to a Big City: Sexual Imaginary and the Great Gay Migration." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 2(3):253-77.
- Williams, Christine L. 1989. Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in Non-Traditional Occupations Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Williams, Christine L. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the "Female" Professions." *Social Problems* 39(3):253-67.
- Williams, Christine L. 2013. "The Glass Escalator, Revisited Gender Inequality in Neoliberal Times." *Gender & Society*: 27(5):609-629.
- Wingfield, A. H. 2009. "Racializing the Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 23(1):5-26.

- 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):733-58.
- Yep, Gust A. 2003. "The Violence of Heteronormativity in Communication Studies: Notes on Injury, Healing, and Queer World-Making." *Journal of Homosexuality* 45(2-4):11-59.

APPENDIX A: FEMALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS

Note: From Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Table 11. Employed Persons by Detailed Occupations and Sex. 2010 Annual Averages.

| Female-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|---------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| | | | |
| Waiters and waitresses | 2,057 | 70.10 | 1,441,957 |
| Psychologists | 193 | 70.30 | 135,679 |
| Models, demonstrators, and product promoters | 68 | 70.70 | 48,076 |
| Miscellaneous community and social service specialists, including health educators and community health workers | 117 | 70.80 | 82,836 |
| Food servers, nonrestaurant | 190 | 70.90 | 134,710 |
| First-line supervisors of personal service workers | 185 | 71.00 | 131,350 |
| Counselors | 802 | 71.40 | 572,628 |
| Physical therapists | 274 | 72.10 | 197,554 |
| Food batchmakers | 101 | 72.30 | 73,023 |
| Cashiers | 3,246 | 72.50 | 2,353,350 |
| Physician assistants | 74 | 72.60 | 53,724 |
| Credit authorizers, checkers, and clerks | 52 | 72.90 | 37,908 |
| Compensation, benefits, and job analysis specialists | 68 | 73.00 | 49,640 |
| Human resources managers | 290 | 73.30 | 212,570 |
| Fundraisers | 77 | 73.40 | 56,518 |
| Medical and health services managers | 636 | 73.70 | 468,732 |
| Other education, training, and library workers | 161 | 73.70 | 118,657 |
| Diagnostic related technologists and technicians | 322 | 73.70 | 237,314 |
| Human resources workers | 662 | 74.00 | 489,880 |
| Data entry keyers | 281 | 74.30 | 208,783 |
| Sewing machine operators | 196 | 74.80 | 146,608 |
| Flight attendants | 86 | 74.90 | 64,414 |
| Travel agents | 89 | 75.90 | 67,551 |
| Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians | 327 | 76.10 | 248,847 |
| Miscellaneous legal support workers | 172 | 76.40 | 131,408 |

| | Total | | |
|--|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Female-dominated Occupations | workers, in | % Female | Total Female |
| Information and record along all other | 1,000 \$ | 76.00 | 07.662 |
| Information and record clerks, all other | 127 | /0.90 | 97,003 |
| clerks | 287 | 77.10 | 221,277 |
| Eligibility interviewers, government programs | 74 | 77.30 | 57,202 |
| Library assistants, clerical | 98 | 77.30 | 75,754 |
| Office and administrative support | 477 | 77.40 | 260 109 |
| workers, all other | 4// | //.40 | 369,198 |
| Massage therapists | 189 | 77.90 | 147,231 |
| Meeting, convention, and event planners | 159 | 78.60 | 124,974 |
| Elementary and middle school teachers | 3,152 | 80.70 | 2,543,664 |
| Therapists, all other | 189 | 80.90 | 152,901 |
| Health practitioner support technologists and technicians | 626 | 81.50 | 510,190 |
| Hosts and hostesses, restaurant, lounge, and coffee shop | 293 | 82.10 | 240,553 |
| File clerks | 203 | 82.20 | 166,866 |
| Tailors, dressmakers, and sewers | 83 | 82.20 | 68,226 |
| Office clerks, general | 1,288 | 82.30 | 1,060,024 |
| Social and human service assistants | 194 | 82.60 | 160,244 |
| Human resources assistants, except payroll and timekeeping | 59 | 82.90 | 48,911 |
| Librarians | 166 | 83.00 | 137,780 |
| Interviewers, except eligibility and loan | 151 | 83.20 | 125,632 |
| Loan interviewers and clerks | 139 | 83.50 | 116,065 |
| Social workers | 765 | 83.80 | 641,070 |
| Phlebotomists | 106 | 84.10 | 89,146 |
| Personal care aides | 1,251 | 85.10 | 1,064,601 |
| Miscellaneous personal appearance workers | 324 | 85.30 | 276,372 |
| Paralegals and legal assistants | 400 | 85.40 | 341.600 |
| Court, municipal, and license clerks | 71 | 87.00 | 61.770 |
| Tellers | 357 | 87.30 | 311.661 |
| Special education teachers | 330 | 87.50 | 288.750 |
| Occupational therapists | 116 | 88.00 | 102.080 |
| Maids and housekeeping cleaners | 1.510 | 89.30 | 1.348.430 |
| Payroll and timekeeping clerks | 138 | 89.30 | 123.234 |
| Registered nurses | 2,973 | 89.40 | 2,657,862 |

| Female-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| Nursing, psychiatric, and home health aides | 2,032 | 89.40 | 1,816,608 |
| Medical records and health information technicians | 200 | 89.60 | 179,200 |
| Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks | 1,182 | 89.80 | 1,061,436 |
| Licensed practical and licensed vocational nurses | 670 | 90.10 | 603,670 |
| Billing and posting clerks | 473 | 90.10 | 426,173 |
| Receptionists and information clerks | 1,232 | 90.60 | 1,116,192 |
| Medical assistants | 524 | 90.70 | 475,268 |
| Nurse practitioners | 149 | 90.80 | 135,292 |
| Teacher assistants | 960 | 91.40 | 877,440 |
| Word processors and typists | 103 | 92.10 | 94,863 |
| Dental assistants | 286 | 94.10 | 269,126 |
| Hairdressers, hairstylists, and cosmetologists | 707 | 94.20 | 665,994 |
| Secretaries and administrative assistants | 2,870 | 94.50 | 2,712,150 |
| Dietitians and nutritionists | 108 | 94.60 | 102,168 |
| Childcare workers | 1,206 | 94.90 | 1,144,494 |
| Dental hygienists | 177 | 96.40 | 170,628 |
| Preschool and kindergarten teachers | 695 | 96.80 | 672,760 |
| Speech-language pathologists | 158 | 98.60 | 155,788 |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | 40,753 | 83.86 | 34,173,898 |

APPENDIX B: MALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS

| Note: From Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. 7 | Table 11. Em | ployed Per | sons by Detai | led |
|--|--------------|------------|---------------|-----|
| Occupations and Sex. 2010 Annual Averages. | | | | |
| | | | | 1 |

| Male-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | |
| Heavy vehicle and mobile equipment service technicians and mechanics | 233 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Bus and truck mechanics and diesel engine specialists | 345 | 0.10 | 345 |
| Cement masons, concrete finishers, and terrazzo workers | 54 | 0.20 | 108 |
| Automotive body and related repairers | 154 | 0.60 | 924 |
| Brickmasons, blockmasons, and stonemasons | 172 | 0.70 | 1,204 |
| Pipelayers, plumbers, pipefitters, and steamfitters | 573 | 0.70 | 4,011 |
| Electrical power-line installers and repairers | 119 | 1.20 | 1,428 |
| Helpers, construction trades | 52 | 1.30 | 676 |
| Automotive service technicians and mechanics | 924 | 1.50 | 13,860 |
| Drywall installers, ceiling tile installers, and tapers | 151 | 1.60 | 2,416 |
| Carpet, floor, and tile installers and finishers | 156 | 1.70 | 2,652 |
| Heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration mechanics and installers | 408 | 1.70 | 6,936 |
| Carpenters | 1,281 | 1.80 | 23,058 |
| Miscellaneous vehicle and mobile equipment mechanics, installers, and repairers | 81 | 1.90 | 1,539 |
| Operating engineers and other construction equipment operators | 357 | 1.90 | 6,783 |
| Highway maintenance workers | 103 | 2.00 | 2,060 |
| Structural iron and steel workers | 58 | 2.20 | 1,276 |
| Electricians | 773 | 2.30 | 17,779 |
| Roofers | 221 | 2.30 | 5,083 |
| Mining machine operators | 67 | 2.50 | 1,675 |
| Logging workers | 51 | 2.80 | 1,428 |
| Construction laborers | 1,649 | 2.90 | 47,821 |
| Small engine mechanics | 54 | 3.10 | 1,674 |
| Maintenance and repair workers, general | 527 | 3.20 | 16,864 |

| Male-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| First-line supervisors of construction trades and extraction workers | 712 | 3.30 | 23,496 |
| Millwrights | 57 | 3.30 | 1,881 |
| Crane and tower operators | 76 | 3.40 | 2,584 |
| Stationary engineers and boiler operators | 81 | 3.40 | 2,754 |
| Locomotive engineers and operators | 50 | 3.50 | 1,750 |
| Industrial and refractory machinery | 425 | 3.60 | 15,300 |
| Home appliance repairers | 53 | 3 80 | 2 014 |
| Other extraction workers | 64 | 3.80 | 2,011 |
| Security and fire alarm systems installers | 74 | 3.80 | 2,132 |
| Computer control programmers and operators | 88 | 3.90 | 3,432 |
| Welding, soldering, and brazing workers | 615 | 4.20 | 25.830 |
| Water and wastewater treatment plant and | 89 | 4.40 | 3,916 |
| Sheet metal workers | 122 | 4 50 | 5 490 |
| Pest control workers | 85 | 4 70 | 3 995 |
| Precision instrument and equipment repairers | 66 | 4 80 | 3 168 |
| Driver/sales workers and truck drivers | 3 469 | 5 10 | 176 919 |
| Aircraft mechanics and service technicians | 140 | 5 20 | 7 280 |
| Surveying and mapping technicians | 65 | 5.20 | 3,380 |
| Painters, construction and maintenance | 572 | 5.70 | 32,604 |
| Other installation, maintenance, and repair workers | 200 | 5.80 | 11,600 |
| Firefighters | 293 | 5.90 | 17.287 |
| Telecommunications line installers and repairers | 177 | 6.00 | 10,620 |
| First-line supervisors of mechanics, installers, and repairers | 262 | 6.10 | 15,982 |
| Grounds maintenance workers | 1,349 | 6.40 | 86,336 |
| First-line supervisors of landscaping, lawn service, and groundskeeping workers | 215 | 6.60 | 14,190 |
| Construction managers | 737 | 6.70 | 49,379 |
| Machinists | 363 | 6.70 | 24,321 |
| Industrial truck and tractor operators | 589 | 7.10 | 41,819 |
| Architectural and engineering managers | 110 | 7.40 | 8,140 |
| Railroad conductors and yardmasters | 52 | 7.70 | 4,004 |
| Cabinetmakers and bench carpenters | 60 | 7.90 | 4,740 |

| Male-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Mechanical engineers | 323 | 8.30 | 26,809 |
| Radio and telecommunications equipment | 158 | 8 50 | 13 /30 |
| installers and repairers | 150 | 0.50 | 13,430 |
| Broadcast and sound engineering technicians and radio operators | 119 | 9.20 | 10,948 |
| Aircraft pilots and flight engineers | 140 | 9.40 | 13,160 |
| Motor vehicle operators, all other | 51 | 9.40 | 4,794 |
| Construction and building inspectors | 90 | 9.90 | 8,910 |
| Parking lot attendants | 91 | 10.00 | 9,100 |
| Grinding, lapping, polishing, and buffing machine tool setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 51 | 10.30 | 5,253 |
| Refuse and recyclable material collectors | 97 | 10.40 | 10,088 |
| Automotive and watercraft service attendants | 99 | 11.00 | 10,890 |
| Crushing, grinding, polishing, mixing, and blending workers | 86 | 11.00 | 9,460 |
| Cleaners of vehicles and equipment | 338 | 11.10 | 37,518 |
| Aerospace engineers | 138 | 11.30 | 15,594 |
| Computer network architects | 114 | 12.10 | 13,794 |
| Parts salespersons | 124 | 12.40 | 15,376 |
| Electrical and electronics engineers | 302 | 12.50 | 37,750 |
| Civil engineers | 360 | 12.60 | 45,360 |
| Computer hardware engineers | 72 | 12.80 | 9,216 |
| First-line supervisors of police and detectives | 110 | 12.80 | 14,080 |
| Painting workers | 151 | 12.90 | 19,479 |
| Chemical processing machine setters, operators, and tenders | 63 | 13.00 | 8,190 |
| Computer, automated teller, and office machine repairers | 241 | 13.20 | 31,812 |
| Engineers, all other | 440 | 13.60 | 59,840 |
| Police and sheriff's patrol officers | 688 | 13.60 | 93,568 |
| Couriers and messengers | 235 | 14.30 | 33,605 |
| Taxi drivers and chauffeurs | 446 | 14.60 | 65,116 |
| Chemical engineers | 84 | 14.70 | 12,348 |
| Television, video, and motion picture camera operators and editors | 64 | 14.80 | 9,472 |
| Network and computer systems administrators | 218 | 15.90 | 34,662 |

| Male-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Baggage porters, bellhops, and concierges | 76 | 16.10 | 12,236 |
| Announcers | 55 | 16.50 | 9,075 |
| Cutting workers | 64 | 16.70 | 10,688 |
| Laborers and freight, stock, and material movers, hand | 1,908 | 17.60 | 335,808 |
| Cost estimators | 112 | 17.80 | 19,936 |
| Software developers, applications and systems software | 1,353 | 17.90 | 242,187 |
| Supervisors of transportation and material moving workers | 205 | 18.10 | 37,105 |
| Industrial production managers | 280 | 18.30 | 51,240 |
| First-line supervisors of production and operating workers | 817 | 18.60 | 151,962 |
| Chefs and head cooks | 415 | 19.60 | 81,340 |
| Information security analysts | 70 | 19.70 | 13,790 |
| Printing press operators | 180 | 20.00 | 36,000 |
| Industrial engineers, including health and safety | 214 | 20.20 | 43,228 |
| Engineering technicians, except drafters | 403 | 20.30 | 81,809 |
| Clergy | 469 | 20.60 | 96,614 |
| Computer programmers | 480 | 21.00 | 100,800 |
| Transportation, storage, and distribution managers | 263 | 21.10 | 55,493 |
| Drafters | 133 | 21.20 | 28,196 |
| First-line supervisors of farming, fishing, and forestry workers | 54 | 21.20 | 11,448 |
| Dishwashers | 281 | 21.30 | 59,853 |
| Cutting, punching, and press machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 82 | 21.60 | 17,712 |
| Miscellaneous agricultural workers | 789 | 21.90 | 172,791 |
| Security guards and gaming surveillance officers | 869 | 22.00 | 191,180 |
| Barbers | 116 | 22.10 | 25,636 |
| Metal workers and plastic workers, all other | 376 | 22.50 | 84,600 |
| First-line supervisors of protective service workers, all other | 81 | 23.20 | 18,792 |
| Bailiffs, correctional officers, and jailers | 443 | 23.80 | 105,434 |
| Farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural managers | 1,052 | 23.90 | 251,428 |

| Male-dominated Occupations | Total workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Computer occupations, all other | 547 | 24.30 | 132,921 |
| Production workers, all other | 944 | 25.50 | 240,720 |
| Architects, except naval | 203 | 25.70 | 52,171 |
| Butchers and other meat, poultry, and fish processing workers | 302 | 25.70 | 77,614 |
| Dentists | 196 | 25.90 | 50,764 |
| Securities, commodities, and financial services sales agents | 258 | 26.20 | 67,596 |
| Computer support specialists | 475 | 26.40 | 125,400 |
| Computer and information systems managers | 652 | 27.20 | 177,344 |
| Detectives and criminal investigators | 144 | 27.20 | 39,168 |
| Environmental scientists and geoscientists | 92 | 27.50 | 25,300 |
| General and operations managers | 899 | 27.60 | 248,124 |
| Chief executives | 1,517 | 27.90 | 423,243 |
| Sales representatives, wholesale and manufacturing | 1,281 | 27.90 | 357,399 |
| First-line supervisors of non-retail sales workers | 1,242 | 28.70 | 356,454 |
| Chiropractors | 75 | 29.50 | 22,125 |
| Shipping, receiving, and traffic clerks | 575 | 29.50 | 169,625 |
| Computer systems analysts | 552 | 34.20 | 188,784 |
| Janitors and building cleaners | 2,263 | 34.30 | 776,209 |
| Web developers | 204 | 34.30 | 69,972 |
| Lawyers | 1,160 | 34.50 | 400,200 |
| Physicians and surgeons | 1,007 | 37.90 | 381,653 |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | 51,594 | 15.85 | 8,179,844 |

APPENDIX C: GENDER-NEUTRAL OCCUPATIONS

Note: From Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Table 11. Employed Persons by Detailed Occupations and Sex. 2010 Annual Averages.

| Gender-neutral Occupations | Workers, in 1.000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | |
| First-line supervisors of correctional officers | 52 | 31.40 | 16,328 |
| Emergency medical technicians and paramedics | 220 | 32.90 | 72,380 |
| Food processing workers, all other | 135 | 34.20 | 46,170 |
| Managers, all other | 4,315 | 34.30 | 1,480,045 |
| Musicians, singers, and related workers | 202 | 34.50 | 69,690 |
| Sales representatives, services, all other | 479 | 34.80 | 166,692 |
| Stock clerks and order fillers | 1,529 | 35.80 | 547,382 |
| Chemists and materials scientists | 99 | 36.10 | 35,739 |
| Athletes, coaches, umpires, and related workers | 296 | 36.10 | 106,856 |
| Producers and directors | 169 | 36.90 | 62,361 |
| Inspectors, testers, sorters, samplers, and weighers | 752 | 37.30 | 280,496 |
| Personal financial advisors | 498 | 37.90 | 188,742 |
| Database administrators | 93 | 38.00 | 35,340 |
| Private detectives and investigators | 100 | 38.40 | 38,400 |
| Miscellaneous assemblers and fabricators | 1,026 | 38.60 | 396,036 |
| Judges, magistrates, and other judicial workers | 58 | 39.00 | 22,620 |
| Miscellaneous entertainment attendants and related workers | 221 | 39.20 | 86,632 |
| Appraisers and assessors of real estate | 76 | 39.30 | 29,868 |
| Management analysts | 848 | 39.70 | 336,656 |
| Cooks | 2,091 | 39.90 | 834,309 |
| Chemical technicians | 82 | 40.00 | 32,800 |
| First-line supervisors of housekeeping and janitorial workers | 293 | 40.60 | 118,958 |
| Logisticians | 117 | 40.90 | 47,853 |
| Postal service mail carriers | 320 | 41.20 | 131,840 |
| Physical scientists, all other | 232 | 41.40 | 96,048 |
| Biological scientists | 86 | 42.60 | 36,636 |
| Financial analysts | 322 | 43.00 | 138,460 |
| Marketing and sales managers | 1,006 | 43.20 | 434,592 |

| Gender-neutral Occupations | Workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Lifeguards and other recreational, and all other protective service workers | 144 | 43.70 | 62,928 |
| First-line supervisors of retail sales workers | 3,245 | 44.00 | 1,427,800 |
| Dining room and cafeteria attendants and bartender helpers | 321 | 44.20 | 141,882 |
| Purchasing managers | 198 | 44.80 | 88,704 |
| Postal service clerks | 130 | 46.00 | 59,800 |
| Postsecondary teachers | 1,341 | 46.50 | 623,565 |
| First-line supervisors of gaming workers | 168 | 46.60 | 78,288 |
| News analysts, reporters and correspondents | 68 | 46.70 | 31,756 |
| Sales and related workers, all other | 236 | 46.80 | 110,448 |
| Computer operators | 69 | 46.80 | 32,292 |
| Food service managers | 1,192 | 47.10 | 561,432 |
| Bus drivers | 550 | 47.10 | 259,050 |
| Administrative services managers | 195 | 47.70 | 93,015 |
| Medical, dental, and ophthalmic laboratory technicians | 110 | 48.60 | 53,460 |
| Compliance officers | 246 | 49.00 | 120,540 |
| Retail salespersons | 3,346 | 49.40 | 1,652,924 |
| Financial managers | 1,197 | 49.60 | 593,712 |
| Purchasing agents, except wholesale, retail, and farm products | 280 | 49.70 | 139,160 |
| Advertising sales agents | 200 | 49.70 | 99,400 |
| Personal care and service workers, all other | 149 | 49.80 | 74,202 |
| Photographers | 180 | 49.90 | 89,820 |
| Packaging and filling machine operators and tenders | 250 | 49.90 | 124,750 |
| Postal service mail sorters, processors, and processing machine operators | 64 | 50.00 | 32,000 |
| Operations research analysts | 123 | 50.70 | 62,361 |
| Property, real estate, and community association managers | 685 | 50.90 | 348,665 |
| Animal trainers | 54 | 50.90 | 27,486 |
| Counter and rental clerks | 109 | 50.90 | 55,481 |
| Editors | 160 | 51.00 | 81,600 |
| Insurance sales agents | 615 | 51.20 | 314,880 |
| Electrical, electronics, and | 122 | 51 40 | 69.262 |
| electromechanical assemblers | 155 | 51.40 | 08,302 |
| Packers and packagers, hand | 505 | 51.90 | 262,095 |

| | Workers, | % | Total |
|---|------------|--------|---------|
| Gender-neutral Occupations | in 1,000's | Female | Female |
| Gaming services workers | 89 | 52.20 | 46,458 |
| Wholesale and retail buyers, except farm products | 190 | 52.70 | 100,130 |
| Other healthcare practitioners and technical occupations | 108 | 52.70 | 56,916 |
| Statisticians | 86 | 52.90 | 45,494 |
| Lodging managers | 159 | 53.50 | 85,065 |
| Advertising and promotions managers | 67 | 53.60 | 35,912 |
| Miscellaneous life, physical, and social science technicians | 203 | 53.90 | 109,417 |
| Tour and travel guides | 54 | 54.30 | 29,322 |
| Credit counselors and loan officers | 332 | 54.60 | 181,272 |
| Financial specialists, all other | 71 | 54.60 | 38,766 |
| Medical scientists | 157 | 54.90 | 86,193 |
| Designers | 899 | 54.90 | 493,551 |
| Production, planning, and expediting clerks | 286 | 55.00 | 157,300 |
| Claims adjusters, appraisers, examiners, and investigators | 321 | 55.30 | 177,513 |
| Probation officers and correctional treatment specialists | 99 | 55.40 | 54,846 |
| Real estate brokers and sales agents | 906 | 55.50 | 502,830 |
| Dispatchers | 277 | 56.30 | 155,951 |
| Business operations specialists, all other | 213 | 56.70 | 120,771 |
| Artists and related workers | 222 | 56.90 | 126,318 |
| Pharmacists | 282 | 57.00 | 160,740 |
| First-line supervisors of food preparation and serving workers | 527 | 57.40 | 302,498 |
| Directors, religious activities and education | 78 | 57.80 | 45,084 |
| Weighers, measurers, checkers, and samplers, recordkeeping | 72 | 57.80 | 41,616 |
| Technical writers | 68 | 58.20 | 39,576 |
| Insurance underwriters | 107 | 58.60 | 62,702 |
| Market research analysts and marketing specialists | 261 | 58.80 | 153,468 |
| Religious workers, all other | 73 | 59.00 | 43,070 |
| Food preparation workers | 858 | 59.10 | 507,078 |
| Public relations and fundraising managers | 61 | 59.20 | 36,112 |
| Secondary school teachers | 1,144 | 59.20 | 677,248 |
| Writers and authors | 208 | 59.40 | 123,552 |
| Mail clerks and mail machine operators, | 81 | 59.40 | 48,114 |

| Gender-neutral Occupations | Workers, | % | Total |
|---|------------|--------|-----------|
| Gender-neutral Occupations | in 1,000's | Female | Female |
| except postal service | | | |
| Hotel, motel, and resort desk clerks | 156 | 59.50 | 92,820 |
| Accountants and auditors | 1,732 | 59.70 | 1,034,004 |
| Crossing guards | 57 | 59.80 | 34,086 |
| Bartenders | 451 | 59.80 | 269,698 |
| Archivists, curators, and museum | 53 | 60.10 | 31 853 |
| technicians | 55 | 00.10 | 51,055 |
| Opticians, dispensing | 52 | 60.40 | 31,408 |
| Veterinarians | 90 | 60.50 | 54,450 |
| Bakers | 231 | 60.80 | 140,448 |
| Laundry and dry-cleaning workers | 192 | 60.80 | 116,736 |
| Public relations specialists | 147 | 61.30 | 90,111 |
| Reservation and transportation ticket agents and travel clerks | 111 | 61.30 | 68,043 |
| Tax preparers | 109 | 61.40 | 66,926 |
| Recreation and fitness workers | 429 | 61.60 | 264,264 |
| Graders and sorters, agricultural products | 97 | 61.70 | 59,849 |
| Training and development specialists | 118 | 62.10 | 73,278 |
| Other teachers and instructors | 876 | 62.30 | 545,748 |
| Financial clerks, all other | 69 | 63.30 | 43,677 |
| Combined food preparation and serving | 420 | 63 40 | 266 280 |
| workers, including fast food | 420 | 03.40 | 200,200 |
| Telemarketers | 60 | 64.30 | 38,580 |
| Customer service representatives | 2,271 | 65.10 | 1,478,421 |
| Tax examiners and collectors, and revenue agents | 58 | 65.50 | 37,990 |
| Order clerks | 84 | 65.60 | 55,104 |
| Education administrators | 928 | 65.70 | 609,696 |
| Counter attendants, cafeteria, food concession, and coffee shop | 233 | 66.70 | 155,411 |
| Respiratory therapists | 108 | 66.80 | 72,144 |
| Door-to-door sales workers, news and street | 156 | 67.00 | 104,520 |
| Social and community service managers | 378 | 67.40 | 254.772 |
| Miscellaneous health technologists and | | | |
| technicians | 117 | 67.50 | 78,975 |
| Physical therapist assistants and aides | 68 | 67.70 | 46,036 |
| Miscellaneous media and communication workers | 84 | 67.90 | 57,036 |

| Gender-neutral Occupations | Workers, in 1,000's | % Female | Total Female |
|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Nonfarm animal caretakers | 252 | 67.90 | 171,108 |
| First-line supervisors of office and administrative support workers | 1,474 | 68.30 | 1,006,742 |
| Bill and account collectors | 168 | 68.30 | 114,744 |
| Miscellaneous healthcare support occupations, including medical equipment preparers | 170 | 69.60 | 118,320 |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | 52,538 | 49.98 | 26,189,948 |

APPENDIX D: OCCUPATIONS WITH GENDER RATIO NOT REPORTED

Note: From Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Table 11. Employed Persons by Detailed Occupations and Sex. 2010 Annual Averages.

| Occupations With Gender Ratio Not Reported | Workers, in 1,000's |
|--|---------------------|
| | |
| Legislators | 13 |
| Compensation and benefits managers | 23 |
| Training and development managers | 41 |
| Funeral service managers | 15 |
| Gaming managers | 23 |
| Natural sciences managers | 25 |
| Postmasters and mail superintendents | 24 |
| Emergency management directors | 10 |
| Agents and business managers of artists, performers, and athletes | 46 |
| Buyers and purchasing agents, farm products | 10 |
| Budget analysts | 44 |
| Credit analysts | 21 |
| Financial examiners | 15 |
| Computer and information research scientists | 24 |
| Actuaries | 21 |
| Mathematicians | 6 |
| Miscellaneous mathematical science occupations | 4 |
| Surveyors, cartographers, and photogrammetrists | 38 |
| Agricultural engineers | 6 |
| Biomedical engineers | 16 |
| Environmental engineers | 40 |
| Marine engineers and naval architects | 11 |
| Materials engineers | 40 |
| Mining and geological engineers, including mining safety engineers | 15 |
| Nuclear engineers | 6 |
| Petroleum engineers | 44 |
| Agricultural and food scientists | 25 |
| Conservation scientists and foresters | 25 |
| Life scientists, all other | 1 |
| Astronomers and physicists | 19 |
| Atmospheric and space scientists | 12 |
| Economists | 34 |

| Occupations With Gender Ratio Not Reported | Workers, in 1,000's |
|--|---------------------|
| Survey researchers | 0 |
| Sociologists | 1 |
| Urban and regional planners | 25 |
| Miscellaneous social scientists and related workers | 45 |
| Agricultural and food science technicians | 25 |
| Biological technicians | 18 |
| Geological and petroleum technicians | 21 |
| Nuclear technicians | 3 |
| Social science research assistants | 4 |
| Judicial law clerks | 13 |
| Library technicians | 31 |
| Actors | 49 |
| Dancers and choreographers | 19 |
| Entertainers and performers, sports and related workers, all other | 41 |
| Media and communication equipment workers, all other | 2 |
| Optometrists | 39 |
| Podiatrists | 15 |
| Audiologists | 16 |
| Radiation therapists | 13 |
| Recreational therapists | 11 |
| Exercise physiologists | 5 |
| Nurse anesthetists | 27 |
| Nurse midwives | 7 |
| Health diagnosing and treating practitioners, all other | 17 |
| Occupational therapy assistants and aides | 23 |
| Medical transcriptionists | 42 |
| Pharmacy aides | 36 |
| Veterinary assistants and laboratory animal caretakers | 38 |
| First-line supervisors of fire fighting and prevention workers | 49 |
| Fire inspectors | 19 |
| Fish and game wardens | 6 |
| Parking enforcement workers | 10 |
| Transit and railroad police | 1 |
| Animal control workers | 5 |
| Transportation security screeners | 38 |
| Food preparation and serving related workers, all other | 5 |
| Motion picture projectionists | 6 |
| Ushers, lobby attendants, and ticket takers | 44 |

| Occupations With Gender Ratio Not Reported | Workers, in 1,000's |
|---|---------------------|
| Embalmers and funeral attendants | 9 |
| Morticians, undertakers, and funeral directors | 35 |
| Residential advisors | 38 |
| Sales engineers | 42 |
| Switchboard operators, including answering service | 16 |
| Telephone operators | 34 |
| Communications equipment operators, all other | 5 |
| Gaming cage workers | 14 |
| Procurement clerks | 40 |
| Brokerage clerks | 3 |
| Correspondence clerks | 3 |
| New accounts clerks | 26 |
| Cargo and freight agents | 21 |
| Meter readers, utilities | 41 |
| Desktop publishers | 1 |
| Office machine operators, except computer | 37 |
| Proofreaders and copy markers | 8 |
| Statistical assistants | 17 |
| Agricultural inspectors | 18 |
| Animal breeders | 8 |
| Fishers and related fishing workers | 39 |
| Hunters and trappers | 0 |
| Forest and conservation workers | 18 |
| Boilermakers | 20 |
| Paving, surfacing, and tamping equipment operators | 12 |
| Pile-driver operators | 2 |
| Glaziers | 47 |
| Insulation workers | 49 |
| Paperhangers | 1 |
| Plasterers and stucco masons | 28 |
| Reinforcing iron and rebar workers | 10 |
| Solar photovoltaic installers | 11 |
| Elevator installers and repairers | 30 |
| Fence erectors | 34 |
| Hazardous materials removal workers | 42 |
| Rail-track laying and maintenance equipment operators | 11 |
| Septic tank servicers and sewer pipe cleaners | 12 |
| Miscellaneous construction and related workers | 32 |

| Occupations With Gender Ratio Not Reported | Workers, in 1,000's |
|---|------------------------|
| Derrick, rotary drill, and service unit operators, oil, gas, and mining | 34 |
| Earth drillers, except oil and gas | 29 |
| Explosives workers, ordnance handling experts, and blasters | 9 |
| Roof bolters, mining | 2 |
| Roustabouts, oil and gas | 9 |
| Helpersextraction workers | 4 |
| Avionics technicians | 5 |
| Electric motor, power tool, and related repairers | 23 |
| Electrical and electronics installers and repairers, transportation equipment | 1 |
| Electrical and electronics repairers, industrial and utility | 20 |
| Electronic equipment installers and repairers, motor vehicles | 18 |
| Electronic home entertainment equipment installers and repairers | 38 |
| Automotive glass installers and repairers | 22 |
| Control and valve installers and repairers | 29 |
| Maintenance workers, machinery | 29 |
| Wind turbine service technicians | 4 |
| Coin, vending, and amusement machine servicers and repairers | 48 |
| Commercial divers | 1 |
| Locksmiths and safe repairers | 21 |
| Manufactured building and mobile home installers | 5 |
| Riggers | 10 |
| Signal and track switch repairers | 8 |
| Helpersinstallation, maintenance, and repair workers | 28 |
| Aircraft structure, surfaces, rigging, and systems assemblers | 14 |
| Engine and other machine assemblers | 11 |
| Structural metal fabricators and fitters | 32 |
| Food and tobacco roasting, baking, and drying machine operators and tenders | 14 |
| Food cooking machine operators and tenders | 13 |
| Extruding and drawing machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 9 |
| Forging machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 8 |
| Rolling machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 15 |
| Drilling and boring machine tool setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 5 |
| Lathe and turning machine tool setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 11 |

| Occupations With Gender Ratio Not Reported | Workers, in 1,000's |
|---|------------------------|
| Milling and planing machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 0 |
| Metal furnace operators, tenders, pourers, and casters | 30 |
| Model makers and patternmakers, metal and plastic | 5 |
| Molders and molding machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 46 |
| Multiple machine tool setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 1 |
| Tool and die makers | 47 |
| Heat treating equipment setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 5 |
| Layout workers, metal and plastic | 5 |
| Plating and coating machine setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic | 23 |
| Tool grinders, filers, and sharpeners | 6 |
| Prepress technicians and workers | 22 |
| Print binding and finishing workers | 20 |
| Pressers, textile, garment, and related materials | 34 |
| Shoe and leather workers and repairers | 7 |
| Shoe machine operators and tenders | 2 |
| Textile bleaching and dyeing machine operators and tenders | 3 |
| Textile cutting machine setters, operators, and tenders | 9 |
| Textile knitting and weaving machine setters, operators, and tenders | 9 |
| Textile winding, twisting, and drawing out machine setters, operators, and tenders | 9 |
| Extruding and forming machine setters, operators, and tenders, synthetic and glass fibers | 0 |
| Fabric and apparel patternmakers | 4 |
| Upholsterers | 40 |
| Textile, apparel, and furnishings workers, all other | 16 |
| Furniture finishers | 15 |
| Model makers and patternmakers, wood | 1 |
| Sawing machine setters, operators, and tenders, wood | 29 |
| Woodworking machine setters, operators, and tenders, except sawing | 24 |
| Woodworkers, all other | 31 |
| Power plant operators, distributors, and dispatchers | 33 |

| Occupations With Gender Ratio Not Reported | Workers, in 1,000's |
|--|------------------------|
| Miscellaneous plant and system operators | 36 |
| Extruding, forming, pressing, and compacting machine setters, operators, and tenders | 28 |
| Furnace, kiln, oven, drier, and kettle operators and tenders | 7 |
| Jewelers and precious stone and metal workers | 44 |
| Photographic process workers and processing machine operators | 33 |
| Semiconductor processors | 1 |
| Adhesive bonding machine operators and tenders | 11 |
| Cleaning, washing, and metal pickling equipment operators and tenders | 4 |
| Cooling and freezing equipment operators and tenders | 4 |
| Etchers and engravers | 19 |
| Molders, shapers, and casters, except metal and plastic | 27 |
| Paper goods machine setters, operators, and tenders | 30 |
| Tire builders | 10 |
| Helpersproduction workers | 40 |
| Air traffic controllers and airfield operations specialists | 30 |
| Ambulance drivers and attendants, except emergency medical technicians | 19 |
| Railroad brake, signal, and switch operators | 6 |
| Subway, streetcar, and other rail transportation workers | 15 |
| Sailors and marine oilers | 11 |
| Ship and boat captains and operators | 35 |
| Ship engineers | 6 |
| Bridge and lock tenders | 5 |
| Transportation inspectors | 29 |
| Transportation attendants, except flight attendants | 22 |
| Other transportation workers | 43 |
| Conveyor operators and tenders | 7 |
| Dredge, excavating, and loading machine operators | 35 |
| Hoist and winch operators | 6 |
| Machine feeders and offbearers | 33 |
| Pumping station operators | 23 |
| Mine shuttle car operators | 1 |
| Tank car, truck, and ship loaders | 5 |
| Material moving workers, all other | 43 |
| TOTAL | 3,953 |