Man Up, Man Down: Race-ethnicity and the Hierarchy of Men in Female-dominated Work

Jill E. Yavorsky¹

Philip N. Cohen²

Yue Qian³

Preprint

Published in *Sociological Quarterly*, 20 July 2016, doi: 10.1111/tsq.12152

1. Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, 200 Townshend Hall, 1885 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210
2. Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, 2112 Art-Sociology Building College Park, Maryland 20742
3. Department of Sociology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver Campus, 6303 NW Marine Drive, Vancouver, BC Canada

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jill Yavorsky, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43206 (Yavorsky.3@osu.edu)

ABSTRACT

Scholars have largely overlooked the significance of race and socioeconomic status in determining which men traverse gender-boundaries into female-dominated, typically devalued, work. Examining the gender composition of the jobs that racial minority men occupy provides critical insights into mechanisms of broader racial disparities in the labor market – in addition to stalled occupational desegregation trends between men and women. Using nationally representative data from the three-year American Community Survey (2010–2012), we examine racial/ethnic and educational differences in which men occupy gender-typed jobs. We find that racial minority men are more likely than white men to occupy female-dominated jobs at *all* levels of education—except highly-educated Asian/Pacific Islander men—and that these patterns are more pronounced at lower levels of education. These findings have implications for broader occupational inequality patterns among men as well as between men and women.

Keywords: female-dominated jobs, gender, occupational segregation, racial inequality, work and occupation

Man Up, Man Down: Race-ethnicity and the Hierarchy of Men in Female-dominated Work

Occupational segregation is a critical determinant of economic gender inequality. The concentration of men and women into different and usually unequal jobs perpetuates disparate statuses between men and women. Although significant occupational integration has occurred since the 1960s, gains stalled after the early 1990s (Blau, Brummund, and Liu 2013). Moreover, occupational changes have been asymmetrical; gender desegregation has mostly resulted from the movement of women into formerly male-dominated occupations, rather than the reverse (England 2010), partly because of women's increasing representation in the labor force (Cohen and Bianchi 1999). Considering that female-dominated occupations have traditionally paid less and carried lower status (England 1992), movement of women into male-dominated jobs represents progress toward gender equality (Cohen and Huffman 2003; Levanon, England and Allison 2009). Unsurprisingly, therefore, most research on occupational gender segregation focuses on women's entry into traditionally male-dominated occupations (e.g., Cotter et al. 1995; Mandel 2013). However, as women's entry into the labor force has stalled, the failure of men to enter female-dominated occupations has emerged as a sticking point in progress toward further gender equality (Cohen 2013).

Intersectional scholars argue that race-ethnicity (race, hereafter) and gender, along with multiple other identities, influence people's occupations, economic mobility, and well-being. Not all men are similarly advantaged relative to women at work and, like gender, race is a defining characteristic of the U.S. labor market. Racial minority men are concentrated in lower-paying jobs with fewer opportunities for upward mobility than white men and some white women (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012; Hamilton and Darity 2011; Harrison and Loyd 2013). Yet scholars have devoted scant attention to the gender composition of the jobs that racial

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

minority men occupy and its broader implications for exacerbating (or mitigating) racial disparities. The research that does exist investigates only one industry or one strata of the occupational hierarchy (e.g., Dwyer 2013; McMurry 2011; Lupton 2006). For example, Duffy (2007) examines whether racial minority men are more likely than white men to occupy low paying “reproductive labor” service jobs. Although important, this leaves the presence of men across the *spectrum* of gender-dominated occupations ripe for investigation. Thus, the question remains: If female-dominated jobs tend to pay less than comparable male-dominated jobs (Mandel 2013), do racial minority men—who already have race-based disadvantages—have a higher tendency to occupy them, and does this vary by educational status? The answer to this question is critical to understanding both social closure processes that govern minority access to high paying jobs and informing theories surrounding the obstinacy of racial and gender inequality in the labor market.

Using the nationally representative American Community Survey (ACS), three-year data for 2010-2012, we leverage an intersectional framework to examine whether racial and educational differences exist in which men occupy male-dominated, mixed-gender, or female-dominated jobs. Men crossing occupational gender boundaries have the potential to increase the wages and prestige of female-typical jobs (Cohen and Huffman 2003), yet depending on the racial status of the men who enter them, progress could instead be further stalled—for both women and marginalized men (McTague, Stainback, and Tomaskovic-Devey 2009). These analyses contribute to our empirical and theoretical understandings of the intersectionality of race and social class with gendered occupational hierarchies and segregation.

OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION AND CROSSING GENDER BOUNDARIES

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

At every educational level and occupational sector, men and women tend to occupy different jobs (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). Even within professions, men and women often specialize in different subfields (Ku 2011). This separation of work has detrimental consequences for women and the small percentages of men who work in female-dominated jobs because these jobs pay significantly less than comparable male-dominated jobs (England 1992; Gauchat, Kelly, and Wallace 2012; Levanon et al. 2009; Mandel 2013). Indeed, occupational segregation – and wage inequality *between* jobs (i.e., working in different jobs of comparable skill but paid differently) – is a more important determinant of gender wage inequality than is inequality *within* jobs (i.e., a majority and minority worker in the same job but paid differently) (Gauchat et al. 2012; Hegewisch et al. 2010). While these patterns are well established, less is understood about the men who traverse occupational gender boundaries.

Hegemonic gender scripts that stress the “oppositeness” of sexes and encourage men and women to act in socially prescribed and divergent ways influence occupational boundaries. Although there is debate over what defines gender-typical, men are generally rewarded for enacting rationality, competitiveness, leadership, physical and sexual prowess, and mechanical aptitude (Connell 2005; Levant and Richmond 2007; Smiler and Epstein 2010), whereas women are rewarded for exhibiting behaviors associated with caring for and cooperating with others (Gaunt 2006). These gender scripts influence the type of jobs employers steer men and women toward (Gorman 2005) and the type of jobs that applicants seek (Correll 2004). Accordingly, women tend to dominate care and service work (e.g., customer service jobs, waitressing, nurses, etc.) whereas men disproportionately occupy STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) occupations, along with blue-collar work that stresses physicality and strength (Bergmann 2011; Blau et al. 2013; Dwyer 2013; Moccio 2010). While women have clear economic

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

incentives to pursue male-dominated work, the incentives for men to cross occupational boundaries are less straight-forward.

Advantages and Disadvantages Men Experience in Female-dominated Jobs

A robust line of research investigates the advantages and disadvantages men experience when working in female-dominated jobs. On one hand, hegemonic masculinity—or the set of masculine practices typically valued most in a given context—specifically devalues the traits and skills associated with female-typical work, suppressing wages and benefits (Connell 2005; Levanon, England, and Allison 2009; Levant and Richmond 2007). Men have little economic incentive to enter female-dominated jobs that typically pay less than comparable male-typical jobs (England 1992; Gauchat et al. 2012; Levanon et al. 2009; Mandel 2013), and they risk being harassed by family, friends or co-workers for working in jobs tightly linked to traditional feminine values (Henson and Rogers 2001; Pullen and Simpson 2009). On the other hand, some men, particularly those who value non-hegemonic masculinity, may seek out female-dominated jobs because these contexts exert less masculine pressures on workers (Barber 2008). Moreover, men in female-typical occupations frequently experience pronounced (relative) advantages, with higher promotion rates and wages relative to women with equal qualifications (Budig 2002; Williams 1992).

Williams (1992) coined the term “glass escalator” to describe men’s experiences in female-dominated work as employers quickly promote them to higher-level, masculine-typed positions—and such promotions can be a way into a more masculine occupation. Men, therefore, may enter female-dominated jobs if they perceive an easier path to leadership since competition with other men is minimized (Lupton 2006). Other, more obscure, processes are also frequently at play. Kmec and colleagues (2010: 230) find that even when men are not actively searching for

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

male-dominated jobs they often receive unsolicited job leads from their informal social networks that result in them moving out of female-dominated work into higher-paying, male-dominated jobs with increased authority. In other words, informal networks act as an “invisible hand” that guides men back into gender-appropriate jobs. Although it is important to understand the advantages and disadvantages that men experience while working in female-dominated jobs, we also need to understand which men enter female-dominated work in the first place.

Prior Research on Racial Demographics of Men Who Work in Female-dominated Jobs and Remaining Literature Gaps

Although most men prefer not to work in female-dominated occupations (Busch-Heizmann 2014; Hardie 2015), research is mixed on whether marginalized men (i.e., racial minority or lower educated men) are more likely to occupy these jobs. One large-scale survey showed that marginalized men are not any more likely to occupy female-dominated positions than are white or higher SES men (Hayes 1989), and in some professions such as nursing white men are more prevalent (Hayes 1989; Lupton 2006; McMurry 2011). More recent research, however, suggests that marginalized men may be more likely to enter into female-dominated jobs (Dwyer 2013). In the expanding service economy, black and Hispanic men are more likely than white men to occupy low-wage service positions associated with the maintenance of daily living (e.g., food preparation, laundry service), referred to as “dirty work” or “nonnurturant” reproductive labor (Glenn 1992; Duffy 2007). Data based on personnel records from a large organization in the United Kingdom also suggest that ethnic minority men are more likely to occupy disadvantaged female-dominated jobs (Woodhams, Lupton, and Cowling 2015). These studies, however, primarily focus on one industry or one level of the occupational hierarchy (e.g., lower-income jobs; Dwyer 2013; McMurry 2011; Lupton 2006) or are based on non-U.S. data (Woodhams et

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

al. 2015). Given the changing U.S. economy (e.g., deindustrialization, the disappearances of middle-class jobs; Kollmeyer 2009), new research is critical to understanding racial and educational intersections with gender-typed jobs. This paper expands the focus to examine men's concentration in female-dominated work across the occupational spectrum, and captures the variation and inequality present across occupational status levels.

THE GENDERED RACIAL HIERARCHY

Explanations for the Distribution of Men across Gender-Dominated Jobs

Intersectionality scholars have helped clarify how overlapping identities create advantages and disadvantages depending on the context (Collins 2000). As with gender segregation, the concentration of minorities in certain jobs contributes to racial inequality (Hamilton and Darity 2011; Huffman and Cohen 2004). Black and Hispanic men experience wage penalties both within jobs and between jobs. They also have fewer opportunities for leadership roles (Cohen and Huffman 2007) and are often excluded from advantageous informal networks that lead to better jobs (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). Audit studies testing hiring discrimination confirm racial preferences for white job seekers, at least in certain white-collar and low-wage jobs (Gaddis 2014; Pager 2003; Pager, Western, and Bonikowski 2009). Yet, limited research exists on the intersectional patterns between race, class, and gender that characterize gender-dominated jobs (Browne and Misra 2003).

A queuing perspective suggests “employers hire workers from as high in the labor queue as possible, and workers accept the best jobs available to them” (Reskin and Roos 1990:30). Employers may believe that minorities—particularly black men—have weaker “soft” skills and are less productive, or that their valued customers prefer to interact with white workers over black workers (Hamilton and Darity 2011). Employers may also “select for subordination” by

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

targeting certain groups to fill jobs that require compliance with work structures that include low pay, few benefits, and a lack of autonomy (Harrison and Lloyd 2013). This line of research would suggest that employers potentially rank racial minorities lower than white men in the labor queue, evaluating them as either less productive or more costly, and therefore, employers would be more likely to push marginalized men into relatively devalued, female-dominated jobs. Likewise, if racial minorities have fewer options than white men, they may more readily accept a lower ranked female-dominated job. A higher concentration of minority men in female-dominated jobs would help reproduce racial economic inequality.

There is no reason, however, to expect monotonic compositional patterns across occupations. Inequality varies across occupational status levels with relative wage inequality highest between white and minority men at lower levels of education (Hamilton and Darity 2011). White men at lower education levels have greater incentives to preserve unequal racial and gender statuses since these men are not afforded class privileges (Cohen 2001). In contrast, higher educated white men can express less exclusionary attitudes and behaviors toward marginalized groups because their social status is less precarious and they have greater opportunities to occupy high paying jobs (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

Historically, pitting working-class whites against low-income blacks has been an effective political strategy in redirecting class antagonism toward racial minority groups who are perceived to benefit from taking jobs that “belong” to white men (Alexander 2012). White men, therefore, may block access to blue-collar work, in particular, since these jobs are coveted in low-wage markets due to their relatively high wages and benefits and because this work is associated with prized masculine characteristics (i.e., mechanical aptitude, competence, and physical strength; Bergmann 2011). Blocking access can occur through homosocial reproduction processes by which the group with managerial and/or hiring power (most often, white men) hires

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

workers who reproduce their ascriptive traits (Bergmann 1986; Elliott and Smith 2001). The exclusion of minorities may operate in more indirect ways as well. Royster (2003) argues that the use of social capital is particularly strong at lower education levels, as white men leverage their informal social networks to gain access to better jobs. Informal exclusion of minorities could also occur earlier in the social mobility chain during the credentialing process. White men may have greater access to training or licensing opportunities that would better qualify them for coveted blue-collar jobs (DiTomaso 2013; Heywood and Peoples 1994).

This review suggests that employers and white employees may combine to exclude black and Hispanic men from male-dominated jobs that pay more, and carry higher status, in particular among workers with relatively low levels of education. On the other hand, in addition to their desire to have better-remunerated jobs, black and Hispanic men also may assert a compensatory masculinity in the face of racial inequality. Generally, men strive to meet ideal hegemonic masculinity through repetitious demonstrations of suitable traits and behaviors (Schrock and Schwalbe 2009). In the U.S. culture, a man's job and breadwinning ability are central identity markers that communicate masculine status; thus, securing occupations aligned with masculine ideals can result in elevated esteem. When traditional routes to masculine status are denied, rejecting femininity remains a key tactic of asserting masculinity (Connell 2005). Minority men, therefore, may feel heightened desires to repudiate femininity in order to establish a credible masculine identity, leading to "exaggerated displays of manhood" (Ezzell 2012:191), including seeking more masculine jobs.

Another theoretical explanation, proposed by Lamont (2000), complicates prior social closure perspectives and suggests that minority men, particularly black men, could take an alternative approach to female-dominated work. Lamont contends that working-class black men develop a "caring self" in which they value traits like collectivism, morality, and kindness as

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

well as activities that provide care to others—in part, as a strategy to combat racialized oppression and to adopt an alternate definition of success that contrasts with “white culture.” Wingfield (2010), indeed, finds that in response to lowered assumed competency, black male nurses emphasize their caretaking abilities and reconstruct feminized carework as masculine. As such, the valuing of care work (and therefore female-dominated work) may be leveraged as a tool to fight hegemony, particularly when more hegemonic routes to status are deemed unattainable or incongruent with broader racial in-group values. Racial minority (especially black) men may also be afforded more leeway to pursue feminized work without compromising their masculine status (even if they still experience gendered-racialized disadvantages) because of cultural and historical depictions of racial minority men as hypermasculine. These hypermasculine images help neutralize assaults that they are “unmanly” for doing “women’s work” (Collins 2000; Wingfield 2010).

Up to this point, our review has concerned black and Hispanic men. Asian and Pacific Islander (hereafter, Asian) men, however, encounter unique racial stereotypes that may afford them advantages or disadvantages depending on an occupation’s required education level. Some racial stereotypes feminize Asian men by depicting them as nerds, sexless, or weak (Oyserman and Sakamoto 1997). This may have negative consequences for Asian men particularly at lower levels of education, where working-class jobs promote masculine stereotypes of men’s physically strong and impenetrable bodies as necessary work qualifications (Wong et al. 2012). Contrarily, white-collar and professional jobs stress mental capabilities, such as technical aptitude and rationality. Given Asian men’s high average educational attainment and racial stereotypes that privilege their intelligence, Asian men may be afforded access to male-dominated jobs at higher levels of education. Such a pattern is evident in STEM areas where Asian men make up a disproportionate share of workers (Beede et al. 2011).

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

We note, however, that the Asian population comprises many ethnic groups that differ in language, culture, length of residence in the United States, and employment experience. Educational attainment and occupations also vary widely within the Asian population (Kao and Thompson 2003). For example, in 2000, almost two-thirds of Asian Indians aged 25 and older had at least a bachelor's degree, whereas less than 10 percent of Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmong achieved similar education levels. More advantaged Asian groups such as Asian Indians, Chinese, and Japanese are more likely to be employed in management, professional, and related occupations, whereas Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmong are more likely to be employed in production, transportation, and material moving jobs (Reeves and Bennett 2003). Yet, broader patterns regarding Asian men's presence in gender-typed work remain opaque, despite its importance for understanding the distribution of Asian men to higher and lower status jobs.

Study Expectations: Racial Hierarchy of Men In Female-dominated Jobs

We examine men's representation in female-dominated occupations—controlling for other demographic characteristics—separately across education levels and by race. We analyze data discretely across education levels because potential movements up and down the status hierarchy tend to occur within education levels, not between them (e.g., from carpenter to janitor, from computer programmer to computer software manager). Based on the above review, we hypothesize that black and Hispanic men will be more likely to work in female-dominated jobs than white men. And we suspect that such patterns will be stronger at lower levels of education. We expect a slightly different pattern for Asian men. Specifically, similar to other racial minority men, Asian men at the bottom of the educational hierarchy will also be more likely to occupy female-dominated jobs than their white counterparts. Yet, due to high concentrations of Asian men in STEM jobs (i.e., male-dominated jobs that typically require at least a bachelor degree),

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

we expect that Asian men at higher education levels will hold fewer female-dominated jobs than white men. We need to be cautious to generalize findings based on the entire Asian group to its sub-groups, however, considering the cultural, political, and historical variations between these ethnic groups. Regardless, this research reveals austere racialized and gendered hierarchies among men who cross occupational gender boundaries. These patterns hold important implications for occupational segregation that characterizes widespread inequality between men and women—and broader racial disparities among men.

DATA, MEASUREMENT, AND METHODS

Data

We analyze data from the American Community Survey (ACS) for the period 2010 to 2012. The ACS is an ongoing national survey that provides vital and timely information about demographic, social, economic, and housing characteristics on an annual basis. The ACS is implemented by the Census Bureau, and contains a representative sample of about one percent of the U.S. population. In order to obtain sufficient sample sizes for unique combinations of industrial and occupational categories (see below), we use the 2010–2012 multi-year file. By cumulating three years of data, the multi-year file provides a weighted sample of three percent of the U.S. population and yields estimates representing averages over the three-year period (see National Research Council 2015 for a detailed description of the ACS).

We restrict our analytic sample to men ($N = 4,524,421$) who were employed and between 25 and 54 years of age at the time of the survey ($N = 1,375,778$). This sample represents the active male workforce during prime working ages. We use age 54 as a cut-off in order to exclude retired workers who may be working in part-time jobs that are less reflective of their prior, longer-term work history. ACS only asked questions about respondents' primary jobs, and not

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

about any secondary jobs. Respondents reported their current job if working and only had one job. If they were not working but had a job within the past five years, then respondents recorded their most recent job. If the respondent had more than one job then the respondent reported the job with the most hours worked. If a respondent worked an equal number of hours in each job, then they reported the job most recently worked in the past week. We exclude military workers ($N = 16,442$); specifically, we drop respondents in military specific occupations *or* the active duty military industrial category. We drop a small proportion of individuals ($N = 32,339$; 2%) working in occupation-industry categories with 10 people or fewer (e.g., public relations and fundraising managers in the crop production industry) to ensure valid estimates for unique combinations of industrial and occupational categories.¹ In addition, we restrict our sample to respondents in four major racial/ethnic groups—whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asian/Pacific Islanders. Our final sample size is 1,297,984.

Measurement

Our dependent variable is a categorical variable with three categories, indicating whether a job is female-dominated, mixed-gender, or male-dominated (reference category). Using standard cut-off points (Kmec 2005; Jacobs 1989), we define female-dominated as 70% female or higher in an occupation-industry, male-dominated as 30% female or lower, and mixed-gender as between 31% and 69% female. For robustness checks, we conducted sensitivity analyses that used different cut-off points (e.g., 80% female or higher for female-dominated jobs and 80% male or higher for male-dominated jobs), and used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models to examine a continuous measure of percentages of female-workers in jobs; all the modeling strategies produce similar results. The gender composition of jobs is measured at the occupation-by-industry cell level to capture the intersection of detailed industry and occupation categories

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

for all currently employed workers aged 16 years and above. Using this age range takes into consideration the gender composition of the entire labor force in each cell, which we then apply to the workers in our analytical sample, who are ages 25–54. To generalize to the U.S. population, we apply person weights when computing the gender composition of jobs and for descriptive statistics; multivariate regressions are unweighted.

There are 259 industrial categories and 487 occupational categories in our sample, yielding 18,740 occupation-by-industry cells. Situating the analysis at this scale of disaggregation allows insight into gender dynamics with much greater precision than occupation alone (England, Budig, and Folbre 2002) and captures higher levels of segregation (Cohen and Huffman 2003). To illustrate this distinction, consider cooks as an occupational category (occupation code = 4020 in the ACS). The percentage female in this occupation ranges from 2.4% in the construction industry (industry code = 0770 in the ACS) to 94.7% in elementary and secondary schools (industry code = 7860). For convenience, we refer to occupation-by-industry cells as “jobs.”

Our main independent variables are educational attainment and race. We code educational attainment into four categories: high school or less, some college (including associate’s degree), college graduate (bachelor’s degree), and advanced degree. We include four racial groups in our sample, which we code as mutually exclusive—white, black, Hispanic, and Asian (which includes Pacific Islanders), with whites as the reference group. Note that while we include Hispanic respondents who reported multiple races, we exclude non-Hispanic respondents who reported multiple races from our sample, given their small share of the sample. We control for personal characteristics and family factors that might contribute to men’s career choices (Chusmir 1990). Personal characteristics that may differentiate men in nontraditional jobs include age (we include both age and a squared term of age in the model), school enrollment (in

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

school = 1; otherwise = 0), and veteran status (veteran = 1). Following Levanon et al. (2009), we also control for men's usual work hours through a set of dummy variables: 1-14, 15-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40 (reference group), 41-48, 49-59, 60+. Because immigrants and the U.S.-born tend to work in different industries and occupations (Wright and Ellis 2000), we include a dummy variable indicating that the respondent was foreign born. We also control for family factors including marital status, measured through a set of dummy variables (currently married, previously married, and never married; never married is the reference group), the number of own children residing with each individual, and a dummy variable indicating the presence of own children under age 5 in the household. We create a dummy variable for each of the nine Census regions in order to account for different labor market conditions across regions of the country.

Methods

We use multinomial logit models because our dependent variable is a categorical variable with more than two categories (Long and Freese 2001). Because we are interested in investigating which men take gender-atypical jobs (i.e., female-dominated jobs), we set male-dominated jobs as the base (reference) category. We first estimate the effects of race on the gender composition of male workers' jobs in the full sample. Then, to examine how racial hierarchies vary across educational levels, we fit identical models for each educational group and make a side-by-side comparison of coefficients across four educational groups. Notably, because large samples, such as ours, are more conducive to producing significant results than smaller samples³, we place more emphasis on interpreting the substantive meaning of our results; though we still note significant findings throughout the results section. Lastly, we use the *suest* command in Stata to formally test the differences in the coefficients across educational-group-specific models. For example, we test significant differences between the coefficient for black men with high school

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

education or less in female-dominated jobs versus the coefficient for black men with some college education in female-dominated jobs etc.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents means or percentage distributions of the variables used in the analysis by race. Among four racial groups, black and Asian men are more likely than Hispanic and white men to work in female-dominated jobs: the percentages working in female-dominated jobs are 12%, 11%, 7%, and 7% for black, Asian, Hispanic, and white men, respectively. Correspondingly, the share of men working in male-dominated jobs is higher among Hispanics (67%) and whites (62%) than among blacks (54%) and Asians (48%). However, the racial pattern alone conceals the strong influence of education levels, which vary markedly across racial groups. Hispanic and Asian men mark the extremes of education, as 64% of Hispanic men but only 21% of Asian men have high school education or less, while 28% of Asian men but only 4% of Hispanic men have advanced degrees. White and black men are in between those extremes, with white men on average having higher education levels than black men.

Table 1 about here

These descriptive results are most consistent with the hypothesis that black and Asian men are less likely to work in male-dominated jobs and more likely to work in female-dominated jobs compared to white men. Furthermore, these descriptive results would suggest that Hispanic men may actually be more likely to work in male-dominated jobs than white men. To rule out compositional effects of other socio-demographic characteristics, we turn to the multivariate models. Because our main interest is concerned with uncovering which men cross occupational

gender boundaries, we predominately focus our attention on comparisons between male-dominated jobs and female-dominated jobs, rather than mixed-gender jobs.

Table 2 shows multinomial regression coefficients indicating log-odds of working in female-dominated jobs or mixed-gender jobs relative to male-dominated jobs, estimated in the full sample. For interpretation ease, we convert coefficients into odds ratios in the text when relevant. When pooling all educational levels, we find that all the groups of minority men are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated jobs, compared to male-dominated jobs, holding other variables constant. For example, the odds of black men working in a female-dominated job, relative to a male-dominated job, are about 2.09 ($=\exp(0.736)$, $p < 0.001$) times the odds of white men. The odds of Hispanic and Asian men working in a female-dominated job, compared to working in a male-dominated job, are 1.41 ($=\exp(0.347)$, $p < 0.001$) and 1.54 ($=\exp(0.432)$, $p < 0.001$) times, respectively, the odds of white men.

Table 2 about here

Based on the regression results from Table 2, we computed the marginal predicted values of men's probabilities of working in a male-dominated, gender-neutral, and female-dominated job by race. Supplemental figure is available from authors upon request. These are the probability of an event occurring (in this case, working in a specific job type) for an "average" individual in all four racial groups. Unless otherwise specified, all the comparisons we make below are statistically significant.

Consistent with the patterns shown in the descriptive statistics, the marginal predicted values illustrates what we call a gendered racial hierarchy—a hierarchy that is most pronounced and consistent between white and black men. White men, among all racial groups, have the lowest probability of working in female-dominated (prob. = .07) or mixed-gender jobs (prob. = .29) and the highest probability of working in male-dominated jobs (prob. = .64). Of racial

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

minority men, the patterns of Hispanic men most closely mirror white men; although Hispanic-white racial gaps are still significant and follow the broader racial minority pattern (i.e., Hispanic men are more likely to be in female-dominated jobs and mixed-gender jobs). Asian and black men are most likely to cross occupational gender boundaries among the four groups, with black men having the highest probability (.12) of working in female-dominated jobs and the lowest probability of working in male-dominated jobs (.54) among the four racial groups examined here. However, the pooled model conceals the variation by educational groups. Therefore, we run all of the models separately by educational groups (see Table 3), using the *suest* command in Stata to test differences in each of the coefficients for race across educational levels.

After stratifying the sample by education, we find that with the exception of Asian men with advanced degrees, minority men across all four educational levels have significantly higher odds of working in female-dominated jobs, relative to male-dominated jobs, than their white counterparts. In addition, such white-minority differences are strongest at the *lowest* level of education (high school or less) for black and Asian men. Interestingly, the coefficient for black men across educational levels does not increasingly diminish as black men's education increases. Instead, black men with an advanced degree are significantly more likely to work in female-dominated jobs (relative to white men) than black men with some college experience (even if both educational groups still have lower odds of working in a female-dominated job than a black man with a high school or less education). Although not all female-dominated jobs are low paying, those at the bottom of the educational hierarchy tend to be especially characterized by low wages and minimal benefits (Dwyer 2013; Duffy 2007). These findings highlight how intersecting identities, specifically race and class, can exacerbate disadvantage, as low-educated black and Asian men are more likely to work in female-dominated jobs (Collins 2000).

Table 3 about here

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

Hispanic men show a different story, however. Although Hispanic men are still more likely than white men to work in female-dominated jobs, the white-Hispanic gap is *least* pronounced among those with the least education. In other words, white-Hispanic racial gaps in female-dominated jobs are smaller among men who have a high school or less education than among men with higher levels of education.

White-minority gaps are also present in mixed-gender jobs and likewise, are most pronounced among the *least* educated for all racial groups. Combined, these findings support the hypothesis that the exclusion of minority men from male-dominated jobs is most pronounced at lower levels of education—for black and Asian men and potentially also for Hispanic men. White-Hispanic gaps are most pronounced among the *least* educated in mixed-gender jobs, but not for female-dominated jobs, making this assessment less clear for Hispanic men.

The dissection of results by educational level uncovers a key pattern reversal at the highest education levels for Asian men. Asian men who hold an advanced degree have lower odds than their white counterparts of working in female-dominated jobs, relative to male-dominated jobs. Specifically, the odds of Asian men who hold an advanced degree of working in a female-dominated job, relative to a male-dominated job, are about 46% lower than ($b = -0.607$, $(1 - \exp(-0.607)) = .46$, $p < 0.001$) the odds for white men. These results contrast starkly with the white-Asian gap at the lower end of the educational hierarchy: the odds of Asian men with high school education or less working in a female-dominated job, relative to a male-dominated job, are 391% higher than ($=\exp(1.777)-1$, $p < 0.001$) the odds for white men.

Figure 1 illustrates these results using marginal predicted values (probabilities) for each racial group, analyzed separately by educational levels and with all variables (except race) fixed at their means. We use non-overlapping confidence intervals of predicted values to assess significant differences between each racial group, within education (Schenker and Gentleman

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

2001). All comparisons discussed below are statistically significant. Figure 1 shows clear racialized patterns, especially at lower education levels. For example, Asian (prob. = .12) and black men (prob. = .07) with a high school education or less have significantly higher probabilities of working in a female-dominated job than white (prob. = .03) and Hispanic men (.04). Not surprisingly then, while white and Hispanic men with a high school or less education both have high probabilities of working in a male-dominated job—.78 and .75, respectively—similarly educated Asian and black men have only a .51 and .66 probability, respectively, of working in a male-dominated job.

Figure 1 about here

For the most part, these same racial patterns hold for men with some college experience. A new pattern emerges, however, between racial groups among men who hold higher education (bachelor degree and advanced degree): Asian men no longer have the highest probability of occupying female-dominated jobs. And at the highest education level (advanced degree), the pattern reverses altogether. Asian men with an advanced degree have a significantly lower probability of occupying a female-dominated job (prob. = .07) and a significantly higher probability of occupying a male-dominated job (prob. = .45) than each of the other three racial groups. A pattern that does remain, however, is the concentration of black men in female-dominated jobs. In both higher education levels (bachelor degree and advanced degree), black men have significantly higher probability (bachelor degree, prob. = .16; advanced degree, prob. = .18) of working in female-dominated jobs and a significantly lower probability of working in male-dominated jobs than each of the racial groups.

Importantly, at higher educational levels, a broader pattern characterizes men's occupational locations. Men of all races have higher probabilities of working in female-dominated and mixed-gender jobs and lower probabilities of working in male-dominated jobs

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

when they have either a bachelor or advanced degree, relative to those with less education. In fact, men with advanced degrees actually have greater probabilities of working in a mixed-gender job than a male-dominated job, unlike men at lower educational levels. Even though gendered-racialized patterns persist, higher education among men reduces gender segregation.

DISCUSSION

The movement of men into female-dominated jobs is critical to increasing gender occupational integration and improving wage inequality between men and women, yet progress has been stalled and uneven (England 2010; Gauchat et al. 2012; Hegewisch et al. 2010). These results help to explain this phenomenon, in addition to persistent racial inequality in the labor market. Despite prior research that shows white men are more likely than racial minority men to transgress gender boundaries at higher education levels (Lupton 2006; McMurry 2011), the current study indicates that minority men at *all* education levels work in jobs with greater representation of women (except Asian men with advanced degrees). Whereas prior research has predominately examined a single occupation, such as nursing, this finding expands the scope to all gender-typed jobs—a leading impetus for the contrasting findings.

Gender devaluation theory suggests that traits and activities tied to women are devalued, thereby incentivizing men to avoid feminine domains, including female-dominated jobs. Labor market and gender stratification scholars have used this theory to help explain why female-dominated jobs pay less than comparable male-dominated jobs (England, Budig, and Folbre 2002; Mandel 2013). Not surprisingly, the presence of men increases the wages of female-dominated jobs (Cohen and Huffman 2003). While we know that most of the gender integration gains have occurred from women moving into male-dominated fields (Blau et al. 2013), scant attention has focused on how race affects the movement of men into female-dominated jobs

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

(Reskin, McBrier, and Kmec, 1999). Racial minority men's entrance into cross-gender jobs contributes to gender integration overall, but it may also undermine the relative status of these female-dominated jobs, and further reduce their attractiveness to white men. These racialized patterns may, thus, contribute to continued stalled progress toward gender equality in wages. Future research should confirm this prediction by examining wage changes, if any, to female-dominated jobs that have experienced recent entrance gains by white men compared to racial minority men.

These results clearly illustrate how gendered jobs are part of the racial hierarchy among male workers. Not only do minority workers find themselves in lower-status jobs (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012) and earning less than white men even within their jobs (Huffman and Cohen 2004), but they also work in jobs with more women, where they share in the reduced rewards resulting from the devaluation of work done by women. Even if men experience hidden perks from working in female-dominated jobs (Williams 1992), those benefits do not make up for the gender penalties they face—and they are in any event less likely to accrue to minority men (Wingfield 2009). Until a significant number of men enter female-dominated jobs, helping to increase wages, or market-actors start valuing feminine-typed domains, racial minority men who initially enter these jobs will suffer disproportionate economic penalties.

These findings help inform intersectionality theory and highlight specifically how race and class statuses intersect to exacerbate inequality patterns. Indeed, racialized patterns are exacerbated at the lower end of the social class spectrum, as men in female-dominated occupations are disproportionately black, Hispanic, and Asian. Likewise England (2010) and others (Charles and Grusky 2004; Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2004) have shown that gender integration has been much more pronounced at higher levels of education, where men can pursue a variety of occupational avenues to achieve masculine status markers, such as economic

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

stability and achievement. At lower levels of education, men have fewer opportunities to secure comparable status markers. Not only do male-dominated jobs provide access to higher wages and upward mobility among lower-educated workers but these jobs also secure a masculine identity by promoting an image of physical competence and strength (Bergmann 2011). Thus, white men, who often expect hegemonic masculine rewards, may be particularly motivated to block racial minority men's—and women's—access to male-dominated jobs where resources are scarce (Cohen 2001; Levant and Richmond 2007). Although we do not know the magnitude of their influence overall, white workers may help exclude racial minorities and women from advantageous networks that result in job leads or opportunities (McGuire 2000), or white male employers may reserve positions for other white men, as indicated in audit studies on low-wage markets (Pager 2003; Pager, Western, and Bonikowski 2009). On the other hand, black men may apply to fewer male-dominated jobs in anticipation of higher racial exclusion and mistreatment (Pager and Pedulla 2015).

Although racial minority men appear to be excluded from male-dominated jobs, it is also possible that they place a higher value on feminine-typed activities, such as caretaking, that are associated with female-dominated work (Lamont 2000). For example, if racial minority men gained more intrinsic value from caretaking or providing service to others than white men, supply-side processes may influence this gendered-racial hierarchy as well. Research based on nationally representative data indicates that black men, on average, report more egalitarian ideologies (Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2011; Kane 2000) and perform more feminine-typed work such as childcare and housework compared to white men in intimate partnerships (Vespa 2009). This suggests that black men may hold a greater willingness to participate in feminine-typed work; although, this might instead result from fewer economic resources to outsource childcare and housekeeping tasks (Gerstel and Clawson 2014). Hispanic men, in

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

contrast, typically express more traditional gender ideologies than white men and report performing fewer household responsibilities than white men (Vespa 2009; Cotter et al. 2011), which suggests that Hispanic men would be less inclined to seek out female-dominated jobs.

Notably, Asian men absorb fewer of the integration costs at higher levels of education since Asian men are the least likely to work in female-dominated jobs. Prior research indicates that compared with other racial groups, Asian students are significantly more likely to graduate college with a STEM degree and Asian workers with STEM degrees are even more likely to have STEM jobs (Beede et al. 2011; Landivar 2013). Hispanic and black men, however, have fewer footholds in STEM jobs at higher education levels than Asian workers (Beede et al. 2011; Landivar 2013), which may influence Hispanic and black men's tendency to work in more female-dominated jobs at elevated educational tiers. Without higher education, Asian men, however, are unevenly distributed in female-dominated jobs. Foreign-born populations (e.g., Asian and Hispanic immigrants) often work in service jobs that U.S. citizens are not willing to do because they are low-paying and considered menial or degrading (Duffy 2007; Dwyer 2013). Not surprisingly, these jobs also tend to be female-dominated.

To examine the actual jobs that men tend to occupy (and explore racial differences), we conducted a supplementary analysis of the top five female-dominated occupations and the top five male-dominated occupations that employ the highest percent of men from our sample within each educational and racial group (analysis available upon request from authors). At lower levels of education, the female-dominated occupations that employ the highest percent of Asian men from the sample are, indeed, service occupations: personal appearance workers in nail and beauty salons, waiters and waitresses, cashier, hairdressers, and registered nurses. Lower-educated white men also work in care-sector or service jobs, but importantly, three of the top five occupations that employ the highest percentage of white men with less than a bachelor degree

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

education (registered nurse, diagnostic technologist and technician, and nursing, psychiatric, and home health aide) require a certification or license (e.g., nursing license)—an indicator of higher wages (Duffy 2011). While lower educated Hispanic men also work in service sector jobs (waiter and waitresses, sewing machine operators, cashiers, maids and housekeepers, and health aids) they comprise a smaller amount of all Hispanic men. Instead, due to a variety of historical, cultural, and immigration factors, Hispanic men have greater footholds in male-dominated work such as construction and other outdoor labor. In fact, two jobs, construction laborers and grounds maintenance workers, comprise about 9% of all jobs held by Hispanic men with less than a bachelor degree. Notably, even when Hispanic men have some college experience and a bachelor's degree, they may still be more likely to occupy male-dominated jobs than black and Asian men because Hispanic college-educated immigrants are sometimes unable to secure a job in their field of training and instead take lower-wage work (but remain in male-dominated jobs) (Mattoo, Neagu, and Özden 2008). Indeed, two of the top five jobs that Hispanics with a bachelor's degree or higher occupy are construction jobs. Contrarily, the top five jobs that higher educated Asian men occupy are all well-paying professional jobs (computer systems design workers or physicians). At higher levels of education, the United States government is more likely to grant access to and compete for workers, such as immigrants from Asian countries with specialized skills, especially where there are shortages, such as computer science or engineering (Sana 2010).

Although this study provides important insights into stark racialized patterns, we face limitations. First, these findings cannot tell us the driving mechanisms behind these patterns. Future research should investigate men's career pathways into female-dominated work and how these pathways differ by education and race. Second, although we know that female-dominated jobs generally reward workers less than comparable male-dominated jobs, jobs dominated by

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

women are complex and vary in wages. The scope of our paper is limited to the occupational placement among jobs with different gender-composition. Additional research is necessary to examine the wages of the female-dominated jobs that racial minorities and white men occupy and how wage gaps vary across the educational spectrum. Third, our data only accounts for workers' primary jobs, so we cannot assess whether a racialized-gendered hierarchy also exists and is magnified or ameliorated in worker's secondary jobs. Finally, men's occupational concentration in gender compositional jobs may not be simply a function of racial marginalization. Additional factors, such as gender identity and sexual orientation, incarceration and unemployment history, may influence the gender composition of workers' jobs. For example, racial minorities have higher rates of unemployment and incarceration (Western 2006), and men with previous unemployment bouts or incarceration records are less likely to be hired (Pedulla forthcoming; Pager, Western, and Bonikowski 2009). Such disenfranchised economic actors, therefore, could also be less likely to obtain higher wage male-dominated work, if they are in the labor market at all. Unfortunately, these factors cannot be assessed with these data.

In light of broader labor market changes and predicted occupational growth areas, we expect (speculatively) that men will continue to increase their representation in female-dominated jobs. Since many of the jobs with the highest future occupational growth (e.g., health-care and service-sector jobs) are female-dominated, women as a group may not be able to meet the total demand. Increased demand may incentivize more men to enter these jobs. Of course, this depends on men's alternative job options, which likely will still vary by race. Considering the flexibility of power to accommodate labor market shifts (Kalleberg 2013), inequality may still manifest in new divisions of labor within female-dominated jobs.

In conclusion, this research provides a comprehensive view of the men who are most likely to traverse occupational gender boundaries across the educational hierarchy. While men's

entrance into female-dominated jobs symbolizes gender progress, advancement is likely limited in view of race-devaluation processes that afflict the U.S. labor market. Moreover, minority men absorb more of the occupational integration costs initially imposed on men who enter into lower-paying, female-dominated jobs. In other words, early integrators are least likely to realize valuation gains that may occur as a result of men's entrances since wage-increases could take years, even decades, to transpire—particularly if white men are slow to enter these jobs. Accordingly, female-dominated jobs are another area in which inequality is produced not only for women but also for racial minority men. This research highlights how racialized and gendered patterns in female-dominated jobs help secure white men's access to higher-status jobs at all educational levels.

ENDNOTES

1. We did additional robustness checks on the cell-size threshold, varying the cell-size cut-off to include only those in occupation-industry categories with 50 people or fewer, and also 100 people or fewer. Results did not vary.
2. In order to check for multicollinearity, we calculated variance inflation factors (VIFs) for each variable used in the analysis in the total sample and the educational-group-specific samples, respectively (results available upon request). Based on Paul Allison's (2012) recommendation (<http://statisticalhorizons.com/multicollinearity>), a variable whose variance inflation factor (VIF) values are greater than 2.50 may merit further investigation. The variables of interest—race and education—all had VIFs smaller than 2.50; the race VIFs ranged between 1.05 and 2.33, and education VIFs ranged between 1.28 and 1.35. The VIFs for the control variables were either below 2.50 (ranging between 1.01 and 2.20) or were above 2.50 but met one of the criteria outlined by Allison (2012) in which a high VIF is not an issue. Specifically, the variables with a VIF above 2.50 were either caused by the inclusion of age and the squared term of age (VIFs ranged from 118.21 and 134.79) or by dummy variables that represent a categorical variable of Census regions with nine categories (VIF ranged from 1.56 to 4.53). In the case of age and age squared, Allison contends that the presence of powers or products of variables can cause high VIFs, however, multicollinearity will not adversely affect results and thus can be safely ignored. According to Allison, we can also safely ignore multicollinearity either when our control variables are high but our independent variables have low VIFs (as is the case for our control variable, region, and our independent variables, race and education) and/or when the variables with high VIFs are dummy variables that depict a categorical variable with three or more

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

categories (which our region variable also fits). Based on these guidelines, we conclude that multicollinearity does not pose any issues in our model.

3. Statistical significance in research typically requires a large enough sample to detect differences between two groups on a variable being measured. Larger samples, however, can also show significant results that may not otherwise occur if the same variable was tested on a smaller sample drawn from the population in question. A large sample can make even small differences between two groups statistically significant because two groups rarely fare exactly the same on a tested variable (Carver 1978). This is why in this study we place more emphasis on interpreting the substantive meaning of our results than the significant results.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Allison, Paul. 2012. "When Can You Safely Ignore Multicollinearity?" *Statistical Horizons*. Retrieved March 1, 2016 (<http://statisticalhorizons.com/multicollinearity>).
- Barber, Kristen. 2008. "The Well-Coiffed Man Class, Race, and Heterosexual Masculinity in the Hair Salon." *Gender & Society* 22(4):455–76.
- Beede, David et al. 2011. *Education Supports Racial and Ethnic Equality in STEM*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved December 4, 2015 (http://www.esa.doc.gov/sites/default/files/education_supports_racial_and_ethnic_equality_in_stem.pdf).
- Bergmann, Barbara R. 2011. "Sex Segregation in the Blue-Collar Occupations: Women's Choices or Unremedied Discrimination? Comment on England." *Gender & Society* 25(1):88–93.
- Bergmann, Barbara R. 1986. *The Economic Emergence of Women*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blau, Francine D., Peter Brummund, and Albert Yung-Hsu Liu. 2013. "Trends in Occupational Segregation by Gender 1970–2009: Adjusting for the Impact of Changes in the Occupational Coding System." *Demography* 50(2):471–92.
- Browne, Irene and Joya Misra. 2003. "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29(1):487–513.
- Budig, Michelle J. 2002. "Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator?" *Social Problems* 49(2):258–77.
- Busch-Heizmann, Anne. 2014. "Supply-Side Explanations for Occupational Gender Segregation: Adolescents' Work Values and Gender-(A)Typical Occupational Aspirations." *European Sociological Review* 31(1):48–64.
- Carver, Ronald. 1978. "The Case Against Statistical Significance Testing." *Harvard Educational Review* 48(3):378–99.
- Charles, Maria, David Grusky. 2004. *Occupational Ghettos: The Worldwide Segregation of Women and Men*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Chusmir, Leonard H. 1990. "Men Who Make Nontraditional Career Choices." *Journal of Counseling & Development* 69(1):11–16.
- Cohen, Philip N. 2001. "Race, Class, and Labor Markets: The White Working Class and Racial Composition of U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Social Science Research* 30(1):146–69.
- Cohen, Philip N. 2013. "The Persistence of Workplace Gender Segregation in the US." *Sociology Compass* 7(11):889–99.
- Cohen, Philip N. and Matt L. Huffman. 2003. "Individuals, Jobs, and Labor Markets: The Devaluation of Women's Work." *American Sociological Review* 68(3):443–63.
- Cohen, Philip N. and Matt L. Huffman. 2007. "Black Under-Representation in Management across U.S. Labor Markets." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 609(1):181–99.
- Cohen, Phillip N. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1999. "Marriage, Children, and Women's Employment: What Do We Know." *Monthly Labor Review* 122(22):22–31.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York. Routledge.
- Connell, Raewyn W. 2005. *Masculinities: Second Edition*. University of California Press.

- Connell, Raewyn W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19(6):829–59.
- Correll, Shelley J. 2004. "Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status, and Emerging Career Aspirations." *American Sociological Review* 69(1):93–113.
- Cotter, David A., Joann M. DeFiore, Joan M. Hermsen, Brenda Marsteller Kowalewski, and Reeve Vanneman. 1995. "Occupational Gender Desegregation in the 1980s." *Work and Occupations* 22(1):3–21.
- Cotter, David, Joan M. Hermsen, and Reeve Vanneman. 2011. "The End of the Gender Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes from 1977 to 2008." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(1):259–89.
- Cotter, David, Joan M. Hermsen, and Reeve Vanneman. 2004. "Gender Inequality at Work." Pp. 107–38 in *The American People: Census 2000*. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.
- DiTomaso, Nancy. 2013. *The American Non-Dilemma: Racial Inequality Without Racism*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Duffy, Mignon. 2007. "Doing the Dirty Work Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective." *Gender & Society* 21(3):313–36.
- Duffy, Mignon. 2011. *Making Care Count: A Century of Gender, Race, and Paid Care Work*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Dwyer, Rachel E. 2013. "The Care Economy? Gender, Economic Restructuring, and Job Polarization in the U.S. Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 78(3):390–416.
- Elliott, James R. and Ryan A. Smith. 2001. "Ethnic Matching of Supervisors to Subordinate Work Groups: Findings on 'Bottom-up' Ascription and Social Closure." *Social Problems* 48(2):258–76.
- England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
- England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society* 24(2):149–66.
- England, Paula, Michelle Budig, and Nancy Folbre. 2002. "Wages of Virtue: The Relative Pay of Care Work." *Social Problems* 49(4):455–73.
- Ezzell, Matthew B. 2012. "'I'm in Control' Compensatory Manhood in a Therapeutic Community." *Gender & Society* 26(2):190–215.
- Gaddis, Michael S. 2014. "Discrimination in the Credential Society: An Audit Study of Race and College Selectivity in the Labor Market." *Social Forces*, 93(4):1451–79.
- Gauchat, Gordon, Maura Kelly, and Michael Wallace. 2012. "Occupational Gender Segregation, Globalization, and Gender Earnings Inequality in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Gender & Society* 26(5):718–47.
- Gaunt, Ruth. 2006. "Biological Essentialism, Gender Ideologies, and Role Attitudes: What Determines Parents' Involvement in Child Care." *Sex Roles* 55(7-8):523–33.
- Gerstel, Naomi and Dan Clawson. 2014. "Class Advantage and the Gender Divide: Flexibility on the Job and at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 120(2):395–431.
- Gorman, Elizabeth H. 2005. "Gender Stereotypes, Same-Gender Preferences, and Organizational Variation in the Hiring of Women: Evidence from Law Firms." *American Sociological Review* 70(4):702–28.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1992. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." *Signs* 18(1):1–43.

- Hamilton, Derrick and William Jr. Darity. 2011. *Whiter Jobs, Higher Wages: Occupational Segregation and the Lower Wages of Black Men*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved January 23, 2015 (http://www.epi.org/publication/whiter_jobs_higher_wages/).
- Hardie, Jessica Halliday. 2015. "Women's Work? Predictors of Young Men's Aspirations for Entering Traditionally Female-Dominated Occupations." *Sex Roles* 72(7): 349-362.
- Harrison, Jill L. and Sarah E. Lloyd. 2013. "New Jobs, New Workers, and New Inequalities: Explaining Employers' Roles in Occupational Segregation by Nativity and Race." *Social Problems* 60(3):281-301.
- Hayes, Rayder. 1989. "Men in Female-Concentrated Occupations." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 10(3):201-12.
- Hegewisch, Ariane, Hannah Liepmann, Jeff Hayes, and Heidi Hartmann. 2010. "Separate and Not Equal? Gender Segregation in the Labor Market and the Gender Wage Gap. Briefing Paper, IWPR C377. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Henson, Kevin D. and Jackie Krasas Rogers. 2001. "'Why Marcia You've Changed!' Male Clerical Temporary Workers Doing Masculinity in a Feminized Occupation." *Gender & Society* 15(2):218-38.
- Heywood, John S. and James H. Peoples. 1994. "Deregulation and the Prevalence of Black Truck Drivers." *The Journal of Law & Economics* 37(1):133-55.
- Huffman, Matt L. and Philip N. Cohen. 2004. "Racial Wage Inequality: Job Segregation and Devaluation across U.S. Labor Markets." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(4):902-36.
- Jacobs, Jerry A. 1989. *Revolving doors: Sex segregation and women's careers*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kane, Emily W. 2000. "Racial and Ethnic Variations in Gender-Related Attitudes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:419-39.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. 2013. *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States 1970s to 2000s*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kao, Grace and Jennifer S. Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417-42.
- Kmec, Julie 2005. "Setting Occupational Sex Segregation in Motion: Demand-Side Explanations of Sex Traditional Employment." *Human Resources Abstracts* 40(4):322-354.
- Kmec, Julie A., Steve McDonald, and Lindsey B. Trimble. 2010. "Making Gender Fit and 'Correcting' Gender Misfits Sex Segregated Employment and the Nonsearch Process." *Gender & Society* 24(2):213-36.
- Kollmeyer, Christopher. 2009. "Explaining Deindustrialization: How Affluence, Productivity Growth, and Globalization Diminish Manufacturing Employment." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(6):1644-74.
- Ku, Manwai C. 2011. "When Does Gender Matter? Gender Differences in Specialty Choice Among Physicians." *Work and Occupations* 38(2):221-62.
- Lamont, Michele. 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Landivar, Liana. 2013. *Disparities in STEM Employment by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin*. U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration. Retrieved March 17, 2015 (<http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acs-24.pdf>).

- Levanon, Asaf, Paula England, and Paul Allison. 2009. "Occupational Feminization and Pay: Assessing Causal Dynamics Using 1950-2000 U.S. Census Data." *Social Forces* 88(2):865-91.
- Levant, Ronald F. and Katherine Richmond. 2007. "A Review of Research on Masculinity Ideologies Using the Male Role Norms Inventory." *Journal of Men's Studies* 15(2):130-46.
- Long, J. Scott and Jeremy Freese. 2001. "Predicted Probabilities for Count Models." *Stata Journal* 1(1):51-57.
- Lupton, Ben. 2006. "Explaining Men's Entry into Female-Concentrated Occupations: Issues of Masculinity and Social Class." *Gender, Work & Organization* 13(2):103-28.
- Mandel, Hadas. 2013. "Up the Down Staircase: Women's Upward Mobility and the Wage Penalty for Occupational Feminization, 1970-2007." *Social Forces* 91(4):1183-1207.
- Mattoo, Aaditya, Ileana Cristina Neagu, and Çağlar Özden. 2008. "Brain Waste? Educated Immigrants in the US Labor Market." *Journal of Development Economics* 87(2):255-69.
- McGuire, Gail M. 2000. "Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Networks The Factors Affecting the Status of Employees' Network Members." *Work and Occupations* 27(4):500-523.
- McMurry, Timothy B. 2011. "The Image of Male Nurses and Nursing Leadership Mobility." *Nursing Forum* 46(1):22-28.
- McTague, Tricia, Kevin Stainback, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2009. "An Organizational Approach to Understanding Sex and Race Segregation in U.S. Workplaces." *Social Forces* 87(3):1499-1527.
- Moccio, Fran. 2010. *Live Wire: Women and Brotherhood in the Electrical Industry*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- National Research Council. 2015. *Realizing the Potential of the American Community Survey: Challenges, Tradeoffs, and Opportunities*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Oyserman, Daphna and Izumi Sakamoto. 1997. "Being Asian American Identity, Cultural Constructs, and Stereotype Perception." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 33(4):435-53.
- Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5):937-75.
- Pager, Devah, Bruce Western, and Bart Bonikowski. 2009. "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market A Field Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 74(5):777-99.
- Pager, Devah and David Pedulla. 2015. "Race, Self-Selection, and the Job Search Process." *American Journal of Sociology* 120(4):1005-1054.
- Pedulla, David. Forthcoming. "Penalized or Protected? Gender and the Consequences of Non-Standard and Mismatched Employment Histories" *American Sociological Review*.
- Pullen, Alison and Ruth Simpson. 2009. "Managing Difference in Feminized Work: Men, Otherness and Social Practice." *Human Relations* 62(4):561-87.
- Reeves, Terrance and Claudette Bennett. 2003. *The Asian and Pacific Islander Population in the United States: March 2002*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved December 4, 2015 (<http://beta.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/p20-540.pdf>).
- Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Reskin, Barbara F., Debra B. McBrier, and Julie A. Kmec. 1999. "The Determinants and Consequences of Workplace Sex and Race Composition." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25(1):335-61.

- Royster, Deirdre. 2003. *Race and the Invisible Hand: How White Networks Exclude Black Men from Blue-Collar Jobs*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Sana, Mariano. 2010. "Immigrants and Natives in U.S. Science and Engineering Occupations, 1994–2006." *Demography* 47(3):801–20.
- Schenker, Nathaniel and Jane F. Gentleman. 2001. "On Judging the Significance of Differences by Examining the Overlap Between Confidence Intervals." *The American Statistician* 55(3):182–86.
- Schrock, Douglas and Michael Schwalbe. 2009. "Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35(1):277–95.
- Smiler, Andrew P. and Marina Epstein. 2010. "Measuring Gender: Options and Issues." Pp. 133–57 in *Handbook of Gender Research in Psychology*, edited by J. C. Chrisler and D. R. McCreary. Springer New York.
- Stainback, Kevin and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2012. *Documenting Desegregation: Racial and Gender Segregation in Private Sector Employment Since the Civil Rights Act*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Vespa, Jonathan. 2009. "Gender Ideology Construction A Life Course and Intersectional Approach." *Gender & Society* 23(3):363–87.
- Western, Bruce. 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Williams, Christine L. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions." *Social Problems* 39(3):253–67.
- Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. "Racializing the Glass Escalator Reconsidering Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 23(1):5–26.
- Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2010. "Caring, curing, and the community: Black masculinity in a feminized profession." Pp. 15–37 in *Research in the Sociology of Work*, edited by C. L. Williams, and K. Dellinger. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Wong, Joel, Jesse Owen, Kimberly K. Tran, Dana L. Collins, and Claire E. Higgins. 2012. "Asian American Male College Students' Perceptions of People's Stereotypes about Asian American Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 13(1):75–88.
- Woodhams, Carol, Ben Lupton, and Marc Cowling. 2015. "The Presence of Ethnic Minority and Disabled Men in Feminised Work: Intersectionality, Vertical Segregation and the Glass Escalator." *Sex Roles* 72(7-8):277–93.
- Wright, Richard and Mark Ellis. 2000. "The Ethnic and Gender Division of Labor Compared Among Immigrants to Los Angeles." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(3):583–600.

TABLES

Table 1. Means or Percentage Distributions of the Variables Used in Analysis for Employed Men

Variables	Mean / %			
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Dependent Variable				
Male-dominated job (reference; %)	62	54	67	48
Mixed-Gender job (%)	31	33	26	41
Female-dominated job (%)	7	12	7	11
Explanatory Variables				
Education				
High school or less (%)	32	41	64	21
Some college (%)	31	36	22	19
Bachelor degree (%)	24	16	9	31
Advanced degree (%)	12	7	4	28
Age	40.3	39.7	37.8	39.0
Foreign born (%)	5	15	61	80
Veteran (%)	10	14	5	3
Marital status				
Never married (reference; %)				
Married (%)	63	47	58	69
Formerly married (%)	13	16	11	5
Number of Children	.98	.81	1.14	1.00
Any child under 5 (%)	17	13	20	21
In school (%)	5	8	4	7
Usual weekly work hours				
1–14 (%)	1	2	1	1
15–29 (%)	4	6	5	5
30–34 (%)	4	5	6	3
35–39 (%)	4	6	6	4
40 (reference; %)	45	56	57	57
41–48 (%)	13	8	8	8
49–59 (%)	18	10	10	12
60 + (%)	11	8	7	9
Region				
New England (reference; %)	6	3	2	4
Mid Atlantic (%)	14	14	11	18
East North Central (%)	18	12	7	9
West North Central (%)	9	4	2	3
South Atlantic (%)	18	35	16	13
East South Central (%)	6	9	2	2
West South Central (%)	10	14	20	8

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

Mountain (%)	7	2	9	4
Pacific (%)	12	7	30	39
<i>Sample Size</i>	926,588	100,412	196,597	74,387

Notes: 1. Includes means for continuous variables (Age and Number of Children) and percentage distributions for categorical variables. 2. Data are based on 2010-2012 American Community Survey.

Table 2. The Effects of Race and Other Variables on Men's Multinomial Log-odds of Working in Female-dominated and Mixed-gender Jobs, Relative to Male-dominated Jobs (in Full Sample)

Variables		Female-dominated	Mixed-gender
		Coefficient	Coefficient
<i>Race</i>			
	White (reference)	-----	-----
	Black	0.736*** (0.012)	0.364*** (0.008)
	Hispanic	0.347*** (0.012)	0.127*** (0.007)
	Asian	0.432*** (0.016)	0.324*** (0.010)
<i>Education</i>			
	Less than high school	-----	-----
	Some college	0.861*** (0.010)	0.464*** (0.005)
	Bachelor degree	1.653*** (0.010)	1.238*** (0.006)
	Advanced degree	1.995*** (0.012)	1.569*** (0.007)
Age		-0.012** (0.004)	-0.010*** (0.003)
Age-squared		0.000 (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
Foreign-born		-0.167*** (0.012)	-0.031*** (0.007)
Veteran		-0.114*** (0.013)	-0.123*** (0.007)
<i>Marital Status</i>			
	Never Married (reference)	-----	-----
	Married	-0.475*** (0.010)	-0.285*** (0.006)
	Formerly married	-0.315*** (0.013)	-0.261*** (0.008)
Number of children		-0.049*** (0.004)	-0.040*** (0.002)
Any child under 5		0.058*** (0.011)	0.014* (0.006)
In school		0.719*** (0.012)	0.358*** (0.009)
Constant		-2.262***	-0.852***

MAN UP, MAN DOWN

	(0.083)	(0.050)
Observations	1,297,984	1,297,984

Notes. 1. Standard errors in parenthesis. 2. Coefficients for Census regions and weekly work hours categories not shown for the sake of brevity. 3. Data are based on 2010-2012 American Community Survey.

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

Table 3. Multinomial Regression Coefficients of Mixed-gender and Female-dominated Jobs on Race and Other Variables by Education Level (Reference Category is Male-dominated Jobs)

	High school or less		Some college		Bachelor degree		Advanced degree	
	Female-dominated	Mixed-gender	Female-dominated	Mixed-gender	Female-dominated	Mixed-gender	Female-dominated	Mixed-gender
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>								
White (ref.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Black	1.007*** (0.022)	0.554*** (0.013)	0.600*** (0.019)	0.296*** (0.013)	0.637*** (0.025)	0.201*** (0.019)	0.689*** (0.038)	0.300*** (0.028)
Hispanic	0.266*** (0.025)	0.146*** (0.013)	0.346*** (0.020)	0.140*** (0.013)	0.388*** (0.024)	0.075*** (0.017)	0.384*** (0.036)	0.092*** (0.025)
Asian	1.777*** (0.034)	1.151*** (0.021)	0.925*** (0.030)	0.609*** (0.022)	0.262*** (0.028)	0.101*** (0.019)	-0.607*** (0.040)	-0.128*** (0.020)
Age	-0.030*** (0.009)	-0.042*** (0.005)	-0.008 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.014 (0.008)	0.007 (0.005)	0.049*** (0.012)	0.023** (0.008)
Age-squared	0.000* (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Foreign-born	0.019 (0.023)	0.056*** (0.012)	0.207*** (0.021)	0.111*** (0.014)	-0.236*** (0.023)	-0.233*** (0.015)	-0.902*** (0.030)	-0.197*** (0.017)
Veteran	0.065* (0.030)	0.038** (0.014)	-0.089*** (0.019)	-0.112*** (0.011)	-0.218*** (0.026)	-0.338*** (0.016)	-0.284*** (0.035)	-0.145*** (0.022)
<i>Marital Status</i>								
Never Married (ref.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Married	-0.525*** (0.020)	-0.303*** (0.010)	-0.580*** (0.018)	-0.326*** (0.011)	-0.370*** (0.018)	-0.218*** (0.012)	-0.235*** (0.026)	-0.163*** (0.018)
Formerly married	-0.359*** (0.024)	-0.260*** (0.013)	-0.380*** (0.022)	-0.290*** (0.014)	-0.230*** (0.027)	-0.208*** (0.018)	-0.054 (0.039)	-0.148*** (0.027)
Number of children	-0.067*** (0.008)	-0.036*** (0.004)	-0.080*** (0.007)	-0.050*** (0.004)	-0.055*** (0.007)	-0.043*** (0.004)	-0.043*** (0.009)	-0.056*** (0.006)
Any child under 5	0.045 (0.026)	-0.018 (0.013)	0.069** (0.021)	-0.009 (0.012)	0.046* (0.020)	0.015 (0.012)	0.081*** (0.024)	0.068*** (0.015)
In school	0.828*** (0.050)	0.392*** (0.034)	0.634*** (0.019)	0.309*** (0.014)	0.810*** (0.022)	0.346*** (0.018)	0.839*** (0.032)	0.574*** (0.024)
Constant	-1.914*** (0.172)	-0.169 (0.089)	-1.385*** (0.146)	-0.571*** (0.092)	-0.689*** (0.154)	-0.010 (0.101)	-1.246*** (0.239)	0.243 (0.158)
Observation	482,781	482,781	377,220	377,220	279,820	279,820	158,163	158,163

Notes. 1. Standard errors are in parenthesis; ref. = reference category. 2. To conserve space, coefficients for dummy variable indicating Census regions and weekly work hours are not shown for the sake of brevity (available upon request). 3. Data are based on 2010-2012 American Community Survey. *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

FIGURES

Figure 1. Predicted Probabilities of Men Working in a Female-dominated, Male-dominated, or Mixed-Gender Job by Race in Each Educational Level

Notes. 1. Bar graph results derive from marginal predicted values from Table 3 and control for age, age squared, family structure, and veteran, foreign-born and school enrollment status. 2. Data are based on 2010-2012 American Community Survey.