

Out of Sorts: An intersectional analysis of disabled men's and women's workplace  
outcomes

Jenny Dick-Mosher

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State  
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy  
In  
Sociology

T. Calasanti, Committee Chair

J. Kiecolt

N. King

B.E. Smith

September 27, 2018

Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: occupations, income, gender, race

# Out of Sorts: An intersectional analysis of disabled men's and women's workplace outcomes

Jenny Dick-Mosher

## ABSTRACT

This study builds on previous research that demonstrated that disabled men and racial/ethnic minority men are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations, while at the same time not reaping the same privileges in those occupations as non-disabled white men do. Using an intersectional approach and a large, nationally representative dataset, this study explores how race, gender, and disability intersect to sort workers into occupations. It also examines how advantage and disadvantage cluster with regards to income inequality within and across occupation types. My research finds that disability has an impact on how people are sorted into occupations; however, that impact varies with race as well as by gender. In addition, disability leads to income disadvantages for disabled white men, but has no additional impact on the earnings of white women and racial/ethnic minority men and women. Race has a larger impact on the earnings of racial/ethnic minority men than on racial /ethnic minority women; the latter are already disadvantaged based on their gender. Class, measured by education and professional occupation, had the strongest impact on workplace outcomes both occupation and income for Hispanic men.

## Acknowledgements

This work would not have been possible without the help of so many people. First of all Tish Glosch is a rock star and none of this would have been possible without her friendship and assistance. I am grateful to my Dissertation Committee who provided me with extensive support and guidance. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Toni Calasanti, the chairperson of my committee, who has taught me so much and stayed the course with me after I moved away for work.

Nobody has been more important to me in the pursuit of this project than members of my family. I would like to thank my parents for their love and support. Most importantly, I'd like to thank my betrothed, John Ralston, whose support made this all possible. He took up more than his fair share of chores and cooking (at times) to make time for me to focus on this project. He is a quick study and made himself a great person for me to brainstorm with when I was stuck.

Finally, I'd like to thank Ruben Blades, whose good music was always playing in the background and likely inspired some of my best work.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table of Contents                          |     |
| ABSTRACT.....                              | 0   |
| Acknowledgements.....                      | 1   |
| Chapter 1: Introduction.....               | 4   |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review.....          | 5   |
| Chapter 3: Research Questions.....         | 33  |
| Chapter 4: Methods and Data.....           | 37  |
| Chapter 5: Results.....                    | 47  |
| Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions..... | 96  |
| References.....                            | 122 |
| Appendix.....                              | 129 |

## List of Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Unweighted Ns for Study Variables, by Disability.....   | 44 |
| Table 2: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations without Control Variables .....  | 47 |
| Table 3: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations with Controls for Education, Work, and Family .....  | 50 |
| Table 4: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation .....   | 52 |
| Table 5: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Gender and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation .....                | 53 |
| Table 6: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Race and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation .....                  | 55 |
| Table 7: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Race and Gender Intersections without Control Variables.....  | 58 |
| Table 8: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Race and Gender Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation .....                      | 59 |
| Table 9: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Three-way Intersections without Control Variables .....   | 63 |
| Table 10: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Three-way Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation.....                   | 66 |
| Table 11: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings without Control Variables .....  | 69 |
| Table 12: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Controls for Education, Work and Family .....   | 71 |
| Table 13: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Controls for Education, Work, and Family, Including Professional Occupation.....  | 72 |
| Table 14: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, and Disability Income .....                                | 74 |
| Table 15: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, Disability Income, and Age .....                           | 75 |
| Table 16: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Gender and Disability intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income, and Age ...    | 77 |
| Table 17: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Race and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, Disability Income, and Age .....    | 79 |
| Table 18: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings. Race and Gender Intersections without Control Variables .....   | 81 |
| Table 19: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Race and Gender Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income, and Age .. | 84 |
| Table 20: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Three-way Intersections without Control Variables .....  | 86 |
| Table 21: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings. Three Way Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income and Age ..       | 88 |
| Table 22: Summary of Results.....   | 89 |

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

This study applies an intersectional approach to examine how gender, race, and disability influence labor market outcomes in terms of different occupations and incomes. The modern definition of disability has evolved from the advent of an industrialized society that emphasizes paid labor and participation in the economy. From this perspective, the very perception of impairment and disability are inextricably linked to the social organization of work. Within much of Western society, the meaning of work has centered around able-bodied standards regarding production quotas, rigid time schedules, and standardization of tasks, which tends to exclude disabled people with any form of functional limitation or impairment (Barnes and Mercer 2005; Oliver 1990). In this way, able-bodied norms became embedded in workplaces through the exclusion of disabled people.

Today, disabled people continue to face disadvantages in both their rates and types of employment. Their employment rate is less than half that of non-disabled people (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016). This gap persists across all levels of education, although it varies by race and to a lesser degree, by gender. In addition, disabled people are more likely than nondisabled people to have contingent or temporary employment (Schur 2003), that is, “any job in which an individual does not have an explicit or implicit contract for long-term employment” (Hipple 2001:4). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2015, 32 percent of disabled workers were employed part-time, compared to 18 percent of those with no disability. Disabled women are especially disadvantaged in this regard; Stoddard et. al. (1998) found that disabled women remained concentrated in low-waged, non-union jobs, and that unemployment rates remained high especially among disabled women of color. Further, disabled people were more

concentrated in service occupations than those with no disability (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016). Finally, in 2015 disabled people were less likely to work in managerial, professional, and related occupations than non-disabled people (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016). This indicates that disabled people may face barriers in advancement in their careers.

Although the above analyses indicate that disability can influence labor-market experiences, these studies do not consider the ways in which gender and race can interact with disability to influence employment outcomes. An intersectional approach gives us a lens to explore the complex ways in which those systems of inequality interact. As Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) has shown, disadvantage and advantage cannot be understood along a single categorical axis. While researchers sometimes depend on an additive model to explain the workplace disadvantages for disabled women, an intersectional approach reveals unique experiences that do not fall under just one social inequality--they cannot be explained by adding the disadvantages of those identities (King 1988; West and Fenstermaker 1995; McCall 2008).

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

### *Sociology of disability*

Disability scholars fault mainstream social science for showing little interest in the issues of disability. Most research on disability has been confined to the fields of medicine and psychology. Sociologists, too, tend to accept the dominant perspectives of disability in medical and psychological terms rather than exploring the social causes of the oppression of disabled people (Barton 1996; Hahn 1988). Further, sociologists who have theorized disability have been influenced heavily by functionalist and interactionist theories.

In particular, medical sociologists relied upon Parsons' functionalist concept of the sick role to describe disability. According to this perspective, everyone in society has a social role to

play in a normal state of health. Illness is a deviation from the normal state of health and people who are ill take the temporary sick role, which is legitimate and permissible, so long as they strive to get well and return to their normal social roles. Extending the sick role to disability, however, creates a number of problems. First of all, the sick role assumes that the patient desires and works to get well (Barnes, Mercer, and Shakespeare 1999; Haber and Smith 1971; Parsons 1951). However, many people with disabilities have permanent or even degenerative conditions. It is not practical or desirable to exclude people with disabilities from social obligations in the manner of the sick role. Secondly, excusing disabled people from social obligations cuts them off from many social relationships, which contribute to both their physical and emotional well-being. For example, Schur (2002) found that work not only alleviated social isolation among people with disabilities, but also increased their level of life satisfaction and greatly increased their political participation.

In the early 1960s, sociologists turned to interactionist theory over functionalist theory to understand disability. Interactionist theory conceptualized disability as social deviance (Oliver 1996). The relationship between disability and deviance came out of the freedom from social obligations and responsibilities afforded by the sick role. In industrial and post-industrial societies, the freedom from social obligations afforded by the sick role took on a negative image as these societies valued the liberal ideals of individual responsibility, competition, and paid employment (Oliver 1996).

Erving Goffman (1963) was the first sociologist to examine the way that the meaning of disability is crafted not by the impairment itself but by the interactions disabled people have with society. He developed his interactionist theory through his use of the concept of stigma. He defined stigma as an attribute that reduced someone from a whole person to one who is tainted or

discredited (Goffman 1963:3). Stigma is the outcome of social interactions between the “normal” and the “abnormal” within certain contexts. For Goffman, there were three different types of stigma: abominations of the body, blemishes of individual character, and tribal stigma of race, nation and religion (Goffman 1963:4). Goffman frequently used disability as an example of stigma, particularly abominations of the body. However, he failed to examine the social causes of this stigmatization. Susan Wendell (1996) critiqued Goffman for failing to consider that someone with a disability could take pride in their disability status and find solidarity with other people who are members of the same oppressed group. Instead, Goffman viewed pride in one’s stigmatized identity as a kind of coping mechanism. Further, the term stigma was based upon the perspective of the oppressor rather than the oppressed (Wendell 1996).

### *Social Model of Disability*

Today, disability scholars recognize two major conceptual models of disability: the social model and the medical model. In the 1970s, the Independent Living Movement redefined disability issues as civil rights issues. Scholars who identify as disabled themselves, such as Harlan Hahn and Irving Zola, began to write about disability in terms of a collective experiences of discrimination and oppression rather than interpersonal stigmatization (Oliver 1996). The social model of disability emerged from the perspectives of these disabled scholars and activists. The social model of disability distinguishes between impairment and the social and cultural experiences of disability. An impairment refers to any physical or mental limitation a person may have. This impairment becomes a disability in the context of a culture that has set able-bodied norms and a society organized around these norms. The exclusion of disabled people from public life guarantees that disabled people are not taken into consideration in the design of public life. In this context, people with impairments become disabled when they fail to fit into spaces that

were not designed for them, and when they face discriminatory attitudes. Moreover, disability is also constructed through the “pace of life” (Wendell 1996:37). Taken for granted by nondisabled people, the pace of life dictates the expectations of normal performance, and those who cannot keep up are marginalized. When the pace of life in society increases, more people will become disabled, as fewer people will be able to meet the expectations of normal performance (Wendell 1966).

One strength of the social model is that it positions disabled people as a group with shared experiences of oppression, whereas the medical model positions disabled people as facing an individual challenge only (Shakespeare 2010). Irving Zola illustrates this distinction as follows: “we think of ourselves and are thought of in terms of our specific chronic conditions. We are polios, cancers, paras, deaf, blind, lame, amputees, and strokes. Whatever else this does, it blinds us to our common social disenfranchisement. Our forms of loss may be different, but the resulting invalidity is the same” (Zola 1982: 243). The social model positions disabled people as a minority group that faces disadvantages from an oppressive society, not from their individual impairments.

The term “people with disabilities” reflects the medical model of disability and its focus on individual impairment (Shakespeare 2010). In contrast, the social model of disability mandates anti-discrimination legislation, barrier removal, and independent living (Shakespeare 2010). Hence, for this project I will use the term disabled people to reflect the social model of disability. The term disabled person represents the interaction between the person and society wherein a person becomes disabled from the barriers and discrimination in society. An impairment only becomes disabling in certain environments. It is possible to have an impairment and be disabled in some environments and not others. To describe disabled people as “people

with disabilities” implies that the disability and resulting disadvantage is caused by the individual impairment, not the conditions of the environment.

### *Defining Disability*

Through the lens of the social model of disability we see that the meaning of disability varies across time and space, because it takes shape from its social and cultural context (Conrad and Barker 2010). First, the problems of disabled people were seen as acts of God, or karma for some kind of moral failing. Then, following the Enlightenment, disability became a medical term and conceptualized as a biological deficit (Shakespeare 2010). Finally, disability came to be defined in relation to the values of industrialized society wherein disability represented dependency and the inability to work. Only in the last few decades have scholars moved away from conceptualizing disability in purely medical terms and have instead moved toward a social model of disability (Barnes, Mercer, and Shakespeare 1999).

However, disability is still defined in varying ways for different purposes. Industrial society distinguishes between workers and disabled people who don't work for pay. Thus, federal programs, such as Social Security Disability Insurance, define disability narrowly in terms of the limitation or impairment that leads to the need for the program (Brault 2012). Specifically, in this instance, disability refers to “the inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of medically determinable physical and/or mental impairment(s) which can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months or result in death” (20 CFR 404.1505, 416.905). In other words, in order to qualify for Social Security disability benefits, one has to have a condition that limits one's ability to work. Thus, disabled is essentially defined as the inability to work for pay.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), however, takes a different view. It offers protections for workers with disabilities and reasonable accommodations to help disabled workers perform the essential functions of a job. This breaks down the distinction between “the workers” and “the disabled” by creating protections for disabled people at work. The authors of the ADA of 1990 based it on the idea that a person’s impairment does not have to be disabling if barriers in society are removed (Conrad and Barker 2010). In this definition, someone can be disabled but also be a worker. The ADA defines disability as a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a history of such an impairment, or a perception by others as having such an impairment (Gregory 2004).

Research on ADA discrimination cases suggests that federal court justices and judges have concentrated more on determining who deserves protection under the ADA than on whether discrimination against someone with a disability has occurred (O’Brien 2001). The judges very narrowly applied the definition of disability in these cases in order to disqualify plaintiffs from ADA protections, essentially focusing on whether someone is actually disabled and covered by the ADA. A worker also has to be qualified for the job in order to be protected by the ADA. In *Cleveland v. Policy Mgmt. Sys. Corp.*, 526 U.S. 795 (1999), the judge ruled that the plaintiff’s application for SSDI, in which they stated that they were unable to work (which is a requirement for the benefit) contradicted their seeking protections at work. Thus, the plaintiff would have to provide a sufficient explanation for how they could perform the essential functions of the job (Donelson 2017). In addition, federal courts do not tend to comply with EEOC guidelines that they are not legally bound to follow (Colker 1999; O’Brien 2001). For example, nontraditional impairments, such as back problems and carpal tunnel syndrome, qualify as disabilities under the ADA only as long as they affect a “major life activity” such as walking, standing, seeing,

breathing, and caring for oneself or working. Federal courts applied the ‘major life activities’ standard so narrowly that very few people with disabilities will be perceived as qualified for protection (O’Brien 2001).

The ADA Amendments Act (ADAAA) was enacted in 2008 in order to override these court decisions and refocus the ADA on discrimination (Befort 2013). An analysis of ADA employment discrimination cases before and after the ADAAA found a small improvement in victories for plaintiffs. This also resulted in an increase in courts finding the plaintiffs to be “not qualified” for the job demonstrating a continued resistance to disability and accommodations at work (Befort 2013). Thus, the ADAAA has only led to very small improvements for workers with disabilities. Even if a disabled worker qualifies for protections under the ADA, that same worker may subsequently fail to meet the definition of disability under Social Security because they can engage in substantial gainful activity. Workers who qualify for SSDI due to their inability to work may be perceived as ineligible for protections under the ADA, which protects workers who can perform the essential functions of the job with or without accommodations. Therefore, definitions of disability can be contradictory, and as a result, one can be considered “disabled” by one set of criteria but not by another (Brault 2012). The definitions under the ADA covers a much broader demographic of disabled people than the rigid requirements for social security benefits.

The high unemployment and poverty rate among disabled people demonstrates that the ADA protections have not brought about equality in the workplace. Yet, sociologists have not yet fully theorized or examined how biases against disabled people permeate work places and affect their employment. Indeed, the definition of disability is often in opposition to labor.

Scholars of gender and work offer theories that are useful in theorizing such disadvantages in paid work.

### *Theories of Gender and Organizations*

While there is extensive research on gender in the workplace, sociologists have given limited attention to how gender intersects with disability in the workplace. However, some scholarship on gender in the workplace can suggest directions for the study of disability in the workplace, in particular, that which speaks to the ways that workplaces have been built on norms of disembodied male workers (Acker 1990; Cockburn 1991). Acker (1990) argues that workplaces assume a worker who is implicitly male. Therefore, men's bodies, sexualities, and relationship to procreation and paid work underpin the image of the worker. Cockburn (1991) elaborates this notion, asserting that organizations are not only gendered but also able-bodied and raced. In her study of organizations, she found that employers disadvantaged disabled workers by failing to remove barriers for them and underestimating them (Cockburn 1991). In furthering Acker's concept of the disembodied worker, she states, "we are accustomed to measure ourselves against a model of physical perfection in contrast to which impairment is perceived variously as a curse, an omen, a source of shame. The model [worker] is male. Women's bodies are characterized as less strong, less effective. The model is white. The model is physical fitness" (Cockburn 1993: 209). She asserts that disabled people must claim their bodies and make them visible in the workplace in order to challenge able-bodied norms. It is important to challenge the ideology that disability comes from 'acts of God' and show that handicaps are created and perpetuated by organizational structures that erect barriers to disabled people's full participation in the workplace and society.

More recently, Acker (2006:143) coined the phrase “inequality regimes” to describe the “interrelated practices, processes, actions and meanings that result in and maintain class, gender, and racial inequalities within particular organizations.” Beyond the class, gender, and racial inequalities, she acknowledged that inequality in organizations accrue to other statuses as well. Specifically, she writes that homosexuality disrupts organizing processes, and suggests that religion, age, and physical disability are also bases for inequality in organizations. However, she provides no concrete suggestions for how disability fits within inequality regimes.

Further insight on how to conceptualize disability in the workplace can be gleaned from research that has examined the embodied ways in which the patriarchal character of organizations disadvantage women. For instance, Byron and Roscigno (2014) found that employers rely on gendered assumptions regarding the ideal worker, and that women who become pregnant are often targeted as a result. Further, they demonstrated that employers legitimized their discriminatory conduct through a dual-pronged process wherein they vilified pregnant women and their competencies, while they amplified meritocratic policies and capitalist business logic. For example, employers drew on stereotypes of pregnant workers as less dependable to make vilifying arguments of poor performance, poor attendance, and voluntary quitting. In response to these assumptions, employers amplify the seemingly neutral meritocratic policies, such as leave policies, in order to fire pregnant women even though they are protected by the FMLA. In another example, an employer stated that accommodations are only for employees who have been injured on the job. The employers also cited business costs as justification for their discriminatory behavior.

Byron and Roscigno (2014) argue that such structural power mechanisms as this two-pronged legitimation process affect other forms of gender inequality. Such legitimation processes

may also apply to other workers who do not fit the stereotype of the ideal worker, such as disabled workers. Research on reasonable accommodations finds that both employers and coworkers have negative views of workers with accommodations, vilifying them both in terms of cost but also inconvenience, especially when coworkers are asked to participate in the accommodations (Harlan and Robert 1998). Employers affirm meritocratic policies, viewing workers with accommodations as having unfair advantages, and not having to compete like the other workers (Wilkerson and Frieden 2000). Requests for changes in physical space as accommodation are more likely to be approved than requests for changes in work schedules or job functions (Harlan and Robert 1998). This mirrors the organizational rigidity that creates barriers for women with reproductive or childcare needs.

Finally, Young (1990:200) argues that workplaces are organized in a ‘natural’ hierarchy of intellect and skill. Underlying this is an assumption that the most competent and hardest working people will get ahead. This meritocratic assumption within organizations thus hinders women and disabled people because it creates the perception that people with accommodations or flexible hours do not work as hard.

In this context, the ADA has the potential to disrupt the embodied assumptions in organizations. The ADA disrupts the ideology that organizations are neutral by directing employers to alter conditions to enable members of a minority group to participate on an equal basis with nonminority groups (Harlan and Robert 1998). Further, no other law directs employers to accommodate individual needs in the workplace. The individualization of the workplace through accommodations defies the assumptions of the standardized worker (O’Brien 2005). These accommodations can comprise architectural or structural changes in the work environment as well as changes in the way that jobs are performed. Examples of changes in the

ways that jobs are performed are accommodations in scheduling, and eliminating non-essential job functions. (Harlan and Robert 1998). Accommodations are negotiated between employers and employees wherein they re-determine the essential and nonessential functions of a job and how tasks can be performed. This challenges the standardized work environment and creates the possibility for redefining work (O'Brien 2005).

However, researchers have found that organizations reinforce disabling work environments by resisting employees' requests for reasonable accommodations (Harlan and Robert 1998). Employers discourage employees from asking for accommodations and reject requests they perceive as disruptive to the organization. When employers decide an accommodation is reasonable they calculate not only the monetary cost of the accommodation but also the cost of the disruption in the institutionalized class-based division in the workplace (Harlan and Robert 1998). Within organizations, employers fear that providing an accommodation to a disabled employee may elevate the disabled employee above their non-disabled colleagues in way that is disproportionate to their worth on the organization. Employers respond to requests for accommodations by determining how expendable the employee is according to the cultural definition of their worth; the decision to accommodate someone was almost always associated with the position of the worker within the job hierarchy. Finally, in instances when an accommodation might be perceived as equally beneficial to non-disabled employees, employers resist the accommodation to discourage requests for changes in the organizational structure from non-disabled employees (Harlan and Robert 1998). Ultimately, accommodations threaten authority in organizations, revealing the possibility for restructured work and redesigned jobs that would give employees more say in how they do their jobs. This could increase the control of employees in the workplace with regard to defining the way that

work is done, threatening the organizational hierarchy of employers defining the structure of jobs (Harlan and Robert 1998).

While the ADA may address organizational biases in workplaces through reasonable accommodations, it has not had enough of an impact, as evidenced by the high poverty rates and low employment of disabled people. In an examination of the ADA discrimination cases, Ruth Colker (1999) found that defendants prevail in more than 93% of reported ADA employment discrimination cases. Konur (2007) replicated this study in England and also found an overwhelming pro-defendant outcome in Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) cases. Thus, the ADA has not had the intended effect of disrupting organizational biases. According to Acker, inequality in organizations comes from systemic disparities. The ADA and other similar laws have not had the desired effect due to “entrenched economic interests, the legitimacy of class interests, and allegiances to gendered and racialized identities and advantages” (Acker 2006: 460). Therefore, we find that women and disabled people face similar (and different) barriers in the face of organizational biases. However, we cannot assume that both disabled men and disabled women are having the same experiences in workplaces with gendered biases. Before we can theorize about disabled men in organizations, we first must examine work on how non-disabled men maintain privilege in all workplaces.

### *Male Privilege across Occupations?*

Researchers have demonstrated that men’s privileged status in organizations extends across all occupation types, even those that are female-dominated (Williams 1995). Previously, Kanter (1977) had argued that women were disadvantaged in managerial jobs in which they were tokens, meaning that they made up less than 15 percent of those job incumbents. However, this token effect does not work the same way for men, as they retain privilege in the workplace even

when they are a numerical minority in an occupation, a phenomenon that Williams (1995) referred to as a “glass escalator”. This effect has been confirmed in terms of both mobility and income. Budig (2002) found a uniform male advantage in wages and wage growth across all occupations, and that men were more likely to be promoted in male and balanced occupations although that advantage was smaller in female occupations.

In contrast to white men, minority men have already had a strong presence in female-dominated, reproductive work (Duffy 2007). Duffy (2007:318) examined workers in reproductive labor, a typically female-dominated class of occupations which are characterized as “work that maintains daily life or work that reproduces the next generation.” She coded jobs within these occupations as nurturant and non-nurturant. Nurturant occupations involve a caregiving dimension while non-nurturant jobs are “dirty work” such as cleaning, and food preparation. She found that Hispanic and black men are overrepresented in non-nurturant reproductive work (Duffy 2007). Although they are overrepresented in female dominated occupations, they do not enjoy the same privileges as white men in these occupations. In interviews with black male nurses, Wingfield (2009) found that the glass escalator was not only a function of gender advantage but also racial privilege. She found that black men do not experience the same privilege as white men when they are tokens in female-dominated occupations. Black men in female-dominated professions face gendered racism. While white men in female-dominated professions are viewed as overqualified for their jobs, the opposite was true for the men in Wingfield’s study who were consistently mistaken for janitors and service workers. Rather than being pushed into higher level positions like their white counterparts, black men faced cold treatment by their colleagues and suspicion from their supervisors. White men and black men use different strategies to deal with being in gender atypical jobs. White men

justify their position in female-dominated occupations by saying that it is path to a higher level position. Black men, on the other hand, embrace the caring and nurturing aspects of the job as part of their personality (Wingfield 2009). Wingfield coined the phrase “glass barriers” to describe this process where black men are denied the privileges that white men enjoy in female-dominated occupations (Wingfield 2009).

While researchers have demonstrated that racial minority men are disproportionately more likely to be sorted into feminized work, there is scant evidence on how this applies to disabled men. In a recent study of men in female-dominated occupations in the UK, Woodhams, Lupton, and Cowling (2014) examined whether ethnicity and disability intersect with gender in ways which give rise to different outcomes for men than for women. The researchers did not explore how ethnicity and disability might intersect. Rather, they compared men of ethnic minority status with white men, and disabled men to men without disabilities, to examine the likelihood of each group’s being sorted in lower-level jobs within female-dominated occupations. They hypothesize that while women are typically found in lower level work, the men who find themselves in these jobs are more likely to carry another disadvantage such as racial or ethnic minority status or disability.

They also tracked promotions within the organizations to examine patterns of employees who progress out of the lowest grade of employment. Comparing across these groups, and the differences they found between men and women, they found that ethnicity and disability have relatively larger detrimental effects on men’s employment outcomes than on women’s.<sup>1</sup> They found that while men, in general, are unlikely to be found in lower grade jobs, female-dominated jobs, minority ethnicity men are significantly more likely to be in those jobs. The same is true for

---

<sup>1</sup> Women are already more likely to be in low-level positions. Therefore the impact of disability and ethnicity on them is likely to be less relative to that on men.

disabled men and disabled men are more likely to be found in there than disabled women. Further, non-disabled men were more than 4 times more likely to be promoted than disabled men. This was also the case for disabled women but it was on a smaller scale. Ethnic minority men were also less likely to progress from low level work than white men. While this study showed that both ethnic minority men and disabled men face disadvantage in female-dominated occupations it did not explore the ways in which race and disability intersect in these occupations.

Socioeconomic status also intersects with race to determine which men are sorted into female-dominated occupations. Yavorsky et al. (2016) examined the racial and ethnic differences and educational differences in men who occupy gender typed jobs. Yavorsky and colleagues point out that previous research cited above only focus on men in single occupations (Duffy 2007; Wingfield 2009) or at a particular organization (Woodhams, Lupton and Cowling 2014). This research examines men across all female-dominated occupations. They found that racial minority men are more likely to occupy female-dominated jobs at all levels of education (with the excepted of highly education Asian men). When examining occupation outcomes by education levels they find that racialized inequalities are exacerbated at the lower end of the social class spectrum. They also point out that many racial minority men from lower socio-economic status end up in female-dominated occupations because they are blocked from blue collar jobs which pay more and have better benefits by white men (Yavorsky et al 2016).

Although wage differences between men and women result in part from occupational segregation between men and women, the fact that white men have income and mobility advantages in *all* types of jobs—male-dominated, female-dominated, or mixed-- demonstrates that these inequalities may persist even if the jobs are more integrated. This supports Acker

(1990) and Williams' (1995) work, which argues that the very structure of most employment advantages white men. While Acker's theories have been applied to disability in the workplace (Harlan and Robert 1998), such research is both qualitative and scarce. To date, no studies have used large-scale, quantitative data to test Acker's theories to see if organizations also hold able-bodied biases. Such a quantitative approach is needed to explore the extent to which the patterns identified in qualitative studies are generalizable to the broader society. My goal, then, is to build on the work on both gender and disability in the workplace by testing the intersection of disability with both gender and race in different occupations using a large, nationally representative data set. I discuss the research related to race in greater detail below.

### *Gender and Disability: An Intersectional Approach*

An intersectional approach acknowledges that the category *woman (or man)* does not equally represent the experiences of all people, and thus allows researchers to examine differences within such identity categories. Disability can position men and women uniquely, in that disabled people are not gendered in the same way as non-disabled people (Garland Thomson 2011; Fine and Asch 1992; Gerschick 1998; Morris 1991). Gerschick (2000) argues that it is through bodies that we recognize and acknowledge gender. Therefore men and women with physical disabilities may be denied recognition as men and women. Feminist disability theorists, including Rosemarie Garland Thomson, Michelle Fine and Adrienne Asch, and Jenny Morris point out that normative femininity is often denied to disabled women, as they are often stereotyped as asexual, unfit to reproduce, overly dependent, and unattractive (Garland Thomson 2011). In this way, disability both intensifies and attenuates scripts of femininity (Garland Thomson 2011). Fine and Asch (1992) also point out that disabled women experience discrimination and stereotyping because of their disabilities without the relative "pedestals" that

other women experience. In fact, scholars note that disabled women tend to be more tolerant of sexual harassment than non-disabled women because it offers a recognition of their femininity and sexual desirability (Fine and Asch 1992; Waxman Fiduccia 1999). Thus, Garland Thomson (2011: 32) points out that the “asexual objectification” of disabled women “complicates the feminist critique of normative sexual objectification.” In an examination of gender discrimination in the workplace, Bobbitt-Zeher (2011) found that employers discriminated against women due to prescriptive notions about how women should be. For example, employers would sanction women workers who they perceived to violate expectations of physical attractiveness. Most commonly, this occurred with pregnant women. Disabled women could be similarly penalized for having bodies which contradict the expectations of physical attractiveness for women (Bobbitt-Zeher 2011). Researchers have also found that physical attractiveness affects the wages of workers (Hammermesh and Biddle 1993). People with below average looks have lower wages than average looking workers. There is also a wage premium for good looking workers although it is slightly smaller than the penalty (Hammermesh and Biddle 1993). Again, disabled people who do not conform to appearance norms of their genders may suffer a wage penalty as a result.

This banishment from femininity has been shown to impact lives of disabled women such that they are less likely than nondisabled women to fulfill roles customarily reserved for their gender (Fine and Asch 1992). The cultural script of women being dependent is intensified for disabled women while at the same time disabled women may not experience some of the penalties associated with being a woman. Fine and Asch (1992) argue that disabled women are depicted as unable to fulfill traditional male employment roles while simultaneously being perceived as unable to perform traditionally feminine nurturant and reproductive roles. However,

there is a wage penalty associated with motherhood for some women (Budig and England 2001). This “wage penalty” is measured as 5% per-child decrease in wages (Budig and England 2001). Researchers also found a motherhood penalty in the ways in which women job applicants with children were evaluated by potential employers (Correll, Bernard, and Paik 2007). Men were not penalized and some even benefitted by their parenthood status. The perception of disabled women as unable to reproduce may actually spare them from the motherhood penalty in the workplace. However, this distinction between worker and nurturer tends to apply more to white women than to women of color as the latter have long needed to engage in paid employment. This difference points to the importance of using an intersectional lens. Not all women experience gender in the same way and these differences occur not only on the basis of disability but also race. Current literature, however, has not probed these intersections of gender, race and disability in the workplace.

Research on disability and masculinity also demonstrates that normative gender seems to be at odds with men’s disability experiences. Dependency and disability are contradictory to normative masculinity, as a result disabled men struggle to fill traditional gender roles. (Morris 1996; Fine and Asch 1992; Shuttleworth, Wedgewood and Wilson 2012). Gerschick and Miller (1994) argue that the experiences of men with physical disabilities are informed by both hegemonic masculinity and the stigmatization of disability. On the one hand, hegemonic masculinity includes ideals of strength, aggression, and independence. On the other hand, the general public perceives disabled people as weak, pitiful, and dependent. As a result, they assert, disabled men have little access to cultural resources to help them negotiate gender; they are constrained and have limited options. Gershick (1998) argues further that men with physical disabilities experience gender domination from non-disabled people. Gender domination refers

to the way that men with physical disabilities are simultaneously judged by standards of hegemonic masculinity and blocked from opportunities to achieve that type of masculinity. They are blocked from achieving hegemonic masculinity in the areas of work, the body, athletics, sexuality, and independence and control. Work, in particular, is key domain for men to achieve hegemonic masculinity norms. That is why it is especially important to examine the kind of gender dominated jobs disabled men typically occupy compared to their non-disabled counterparts.

### *Gender and Race*

Crenshaw (1989) points out that conceptualizing discrimination on a single axis framework erases black women's experiences in race and sex discrimination. To demonstrate, she examines law suits where black women were plaintiffs. In *DeGraffenreid v. General Motors*, black women alleged that the employer's seniority system was discriminatory against black women. General Motors had not hired black women prior to 1964 which subsequently led to all of the black women losing their jobs in a layoff that was based on employee's seniority. The court rejected the plaintiff's law suit which alleged that the black women faced unique discrimination based on both their race and sex. They were not able to prove discrimination along the single axis of sex or race and the court refused to acknowledge that the combined race and sex discrimination that black women experienced. Although black women's experiences are distinct from white women or black men black women are only protected from discrimination in cases where their experiences aligned with either white women or black men. Black women face unique disadvantage and the policies and laws that exist to protect them from that discrimination do not account for the intersectional effects of race and gender. This is an experience that black women have been theorizing since the 1800s. Notably, Sojourner Truth's famous "Ain't I a

Woman” speech demonstrated the unique position of black women at the time based on the intersection of race and gender (Guy-Shefall 1995). In this statement she draws on bodily differences between white and black women that are caused by their different positions in society. She comments on the way that women at the time were considered delicate and in need of assistance. In contrast she invites the crowd to look at her muscled arm which is strong from the labor she endured. The socially constructed bodily differences between white and black women could be an important component in theorizing intersectionality of gender, race, and disability.

### *Race and Disability*

Research in disability studies has been critiqued for focusing too narrowly on the experiences of white disabled people (Bell 2010), while scholarship on race and ethnicity has not fully incorporated disability. Erevelles and Minear (2010) argue that when disability is brought into a discussion of race/ethnicity and gender intersections, it is often treated as a nuance or added context. However, they argue that “individuals located perilously at the interstices of race, class, gender, and disability are constituted as non-citizens and (no) bodies by the very social institutions (legal, educational, and rehabilitational) that are designed to protect, nurture, and empower them” (p. 129). In the U.S., associations of race and disability were used to justify the brutality of slavery, colonialism, and neocolonialism. Colonial ideologies equate non-whiteness with biological deficit, degeneracy, and disease and use these perceived disabilities as justification for bringing those bodies under control. In spite of this association, they argue, critical race theorists continue to conceive of disability in biological or medical terms rather than as a socially constructed minority group. Thus it is important to use an intersectional lens that fully integrates disability as a minority group.

Disability culture is central to the theoretical framework of this study but there is some evidence that disability culture is not universal for all people with disabilities. Researchers interviewed disabled African Americans in Chicago in order to find out how disabled African Americans understand disability culture (Devlieger and Albrecht 2000). Disability culture is central to disability studies as it provides a sense of cohesion and shared experience. However, the most visible people in the disability community are white. White disabled people represent the disability community even though blacks have a higher prevalence of disability than whites. The daily experiences of Blacks with disabilities do not correspond with those of the activists in the disability movement and their experiences are not accurately represented in the larger disability community. In fact, the interviewee's narratives do not reflect notions of independent living, disability civil rights, or disability pride (Devlieger and Albrecht 2000). The researchers found that while Blacks are knowledgeable and realistic about disability, they respond differently based on the context of their culture; for Blacks in the inner city that context is defined by poverty, drug use, violence, racism, and poor medical services. Disability is not the most critical life issue to inner city Blacks (Devlieger and Albrecht 2000). Devlieger and Albrecht found that the people they interviewed subjugated disability to other master statuses more symbolic of their circumstances and did not consider other disabled people to be their group of people. This research is important because it shows the limits of applying a disability studies framework to all disabled people regardless of their race/ethnicity.

### *Intersectionality at Work*

In the handful of studies that have explored gender and disability at work, researchers have taken different approaches. Some write of disabled women as having a 'double disadvantage' (O'Hara 2004; Randolph 2005; Deegan and Brooks 1985; Fine and Asch 1988), an

approach that adds the negative effects of their gender and disability. Hanna and Rogovsky (1991) found that disabled women have a “double handicap plus” because their employment rates and education are lower than what would be expected from the combined effects of gender and disability. I would argue that Hanna and Rogovsky’s (1991) findings are better explained in terms of intersectionality. In this regard and in what follows, I draw on Clarke and McCall’s (2013) argument that an intersectional lens can be applied to work which has already been done but has been theorized in a different way. For them, an intersectional approach enables a different interpretation of the same facts (Clarke and McCall 2013). Thus, while the following studies on disability and gender in the workplace do not employ an intersectional focus in their analysis, they do provide evidence that suggests important gender and disability intersections in the workplace.

Researchers in Belgium employ a double disadvantage framework in their study of gender and disability in the workplace by studying women with mental illness in job training programs. Vandekinderen and colleagues (2012) found that a one-size-fits-all approach to vocational training disadvantages women in the program, because the discrimination these women face is based on both their gender and disability. Specifically, the women who enter the training program learn standardized work according to a pre-determined view of what male disabled people should do. Such an approach does not take into account individual aspirations and capabilities as well as the childcare responsibilities of the women and thus does not offer them appropriate vocational services. The authors argue that the respondents face discrimination due to the stigmatization of people with mental health problems as unproductive and deviant compared to the norm within the neo-liberal framework. In a context wherein disabled people may be blamed for their own un-employability, the authors argue that women with these kinds of

disabilities may be doubly disadvantaged in that disabled women have fewer work options available compared to disabled men or non-disabled women yet face the same stigma for being unemployed due to their mental illness. Although the researchers theorized this effect in terms of additive disadvantage, their findings could also indicate an intersectional effect where disabled women are uniquely situated within the job training programs. That is, rather than speaking in terms of double disadvantage, it makes more sense to point out that disabled women are disadvantaged by their unique status as disabled women. In this case, disabled women's experiences are unique when compared to the men in the gender-neutral employment program.

Disability also intersects with gender in ways that effect disabled men. As stated previously, men with physical disabilities face barriers in achieving the standards of hegemonic masculinity at work (Gershick 1998). A recent study by Mik-Meyer (2015) examined the perceptions that coworkers had of employees with physical disabilities, specifically men with cerebral palsy. The researcher found that coworkers did not view employees with cerebral palsy as being typically gendered. This stigma accrued to the men with cerebral palsy across all industry types. For example, she found that in both male-dominated fields like IT and female-dominated fields like social work, if male employees with impairments displayed masculine traits, co-workers viewed them as acting inappropriately. In addition, she also found that the impairments automatically transformed the male employee into a person in need of help, a trait associated with femininity. Based on these findings, the author argues that disabled women are not the only ones who are "twice penalized" in the workplace by both their gender and disability as disabled men are also twice penalized: first by their impairments and second by being perceived as being in the wrong sexed body because they are viewed as feminine. I would agree that disabled men also occupy a unique position in the workplace compared with their able-

bodied counterparts; however, I do not view this in additive terms. The disabled men in this study are in a unique position because they are disabled men and thus not gendered in the same way as non-disabled men. Disabled women also experience this but it is different from the experiences of disabled men. The men face penalties due to their disability because they lose male privilege. This underscores the importance of using an intersectional framework rather than additive models. Intersectionality allows researchers to examine the unique ways that different identities combine to impact people's experiences.

Gender and disability also interact in important ways in male-dominated occupations. Sang et. al. (2016) conducted a qualitative study of the lived experiences of men and women with disabilities working in the UK transport industry, an industry traditionally dominated by men. They found that the working practices within this industry are both gendered and ableist. They found that a hierarchy of masculinities existed in the transportation industry that reinforced the privileges held by nondisabled men over disabled men and disabled and nondisabled women. They discovered that the negative impact of disability varied depending on both the type of disability and gender. These findings point to an intersectional effect of gender and disability in the workplace.

### *Class and Wage Inequality*

In a review of literature on race and gender in the workplace Browne and Misra (2003) found that most studies of wage inequality tend to find a consistent and strong pattern of the intersection of race and gender with social class. While it is well known that women typically earn less than men and most racial and ethnic minority groups earn less than whites. When examined through an intersectional lens, the effects of gender and race cannot be considered separately from each other. Greenman and Xie (2008) tested wage differences across all racial

and ethnic groups using an intersectional lens. They found that, there is no such thing as a pure "gender effect" or "race effect" when it comes to earnings. They found that among minority ethnic groups the race penalty in wages is always smaller among women than men. They also found that among minority groups the gender penalty is smaller for minority women than for white women, demonstrating that additive approaches in studying gender and race do not accurately capture workplace inequalities (Greenman and Xie 2008). This underlines the importance of using an intersectional approach to examining wage differences. The class effect that Browne and Misra (2003) pointed to suggests that while wage inequality is inextricably linked to race and gender, the effects of race and gender on wage inequality may also vary based on class. Therefore, whatever effect that disability has on wages must be considered in intersection with gender, race and class in order to be meaningful.

Disability is strongly associated with poverty. Poverty can be considered both a cause and a consequence of disability. Researchers have found that low childhood socio-economic status places people at a greater risk for developing a disability later in life (Bowen and Gonzalez 2010). Disabled people who receive SSI or SSDI benefits are often stuck in a poverty trap (Stapleton et. al. 2006). Federal programs like SSI and SSDI are a poverty trap because they pay disabled people very little money and penalize recipients who earn too much. This makes it extremely difficult for people who rely in these programs to pull themselves out of poverty. However, the high poverty rate among disabled people is not only a result of disabled people who cannot work. The high unemployment rate of disabled people compared to non-disabled people shows disabled people who are actively looking for work still face a greater disadvantage in being employed compared to non-disabled people (Schur et.al. 2017). Disabled people who do work have lower average wages than non-disabled people and lower job security (Schur et. al.

2017). In addition, Schur (2003) found that people with disabilities are almost twice as likely to work in part-time contingent jobs. Schur suggests that part time work can be a benefit to people whose disabilities require them to work more flexible schedules. However, people who work in lower grade contingent work often have very little control over their schedules making these jobs not as flexible as they may seem. There is similar research regarding women in contingent work. Women occupy a much higher percentage of contingent jobs than men. This has been understood to be a result of women's need for more flexible schedules in order to balance their family demands with their paid work. However, Spalter-Roth and Hartmann (1998) suggest that employers make decisions not to invest in female workers and steer them into part-time contingent work. Women who work in these types of jobs often rely on welfare benefits in addition to their pay. Many disabled people who work in part time and contingent work also make ends meet with social security benefits. In their study of disability in organizations, Robert and Harlan (2006) found that more than half of the disabled women interviewed reported being steered into entry-level positions like clerk and other traditionally female jobs. At the same time, more than three-quarters of the disabled men with comparable qualifications reported being placed in jobs with better career ladders. These studies illustrate how women with disabilities find themselves in lower grade jobs, which may make them more vulnerable to discrimination based on their disabilities. Maroto and Pettinicchio (2014) found that while disabled people experience less occupational segregation than women and racial minorities there is evidence that disabled people work in occupations with lower wages, fewer requirements and different skill levels. In addition to being overrepresented in lower paying occupations, disabled people also earned less than non-disabled people within those occupations. In a later study, Pettinicchio and Maroto (2017) examined labor market inequality between disabled men and women. They found

that women with cognitive or multiple disabilities had the lowest earnings levels. However, disability had the strongest impact on the earnings of disabled men who had more to lose. They interpreted this as quantitative evidence of Gerschick's (2000) and Shuttleworth and colleagues' (2012) studies that demonstrated how disability is at odds with hegemonic masculinity.

The class of job has a particular impact on the workplace experiences of people with disabilities who rely on accommodations. Harlan and Robert (1998) found that disabled people who worked in professional jobs were more likely to ask for and receive accommodations. In addition, disabled people in higher class positions were more likely to have knowledge about their rights under the ADA which also makes them more likely to request needed accommodations. Further, gender intersected with class such that women's requests for accommodations were denied more often than were men and people in lower grade jobs were also more likely to have their requests denied (Harlan and Robert 1998). Generally women's jobs were in lower grades than men's jobs, and the type of impairments women had was more incompatible with the work they did. Disabled people who work in lower or working class jobs may face additional barriers in these jobs due to the lack of accommodations.

Schur et.al. (2009:397) also found that disabled workers reported having less job security, being more closely supervised, and having lower levels of participation in decisions at work. All of those attributes are associated with lower or working class jobs. In a comparison across different worksites at two companies, Schur and colleagues found that company climate and culture have a notable impact on the experiences of disabled workers. Disabled workers do much better in companies that are viewed as fair and responsive to the needs of all employees, attributes associated with higher class jobs (Schur et.al. 2009). These findings regarding the effect of company culture and climate are also revealing about the effects of the class of jobs on

the workplace experiences of people with disabilities. Joan Acker views organization controls as being class controls in that they maintain the power of managers over workers (Acker 2006). The literature reviewed above already explored the ways that accommodations threaten the organizational hierarchy at work by giving employees more control over the way that they do their work (Harlan and Robert 1998; Byron and Roscignio 2014). The power to deny an accommodation request is an example organizational control, making disabled people particularly vulnerable in working class jobs.

Research on disability discrimination claims finds that disability type, class, and gender also have an influence on the discrimination someone is likely to experience. Dick-Mosher (2015) examined 200 law suits regarding disability discrimination in the workplace. The types of discrimination disabled people reported differed based on disability, job type and gender which suggests intersections of disability and class as well as gender (Dick-Mosher 2015). Gender and disability intersected in unique ways depending on the class of the job. For example, in working-class jobs, non-visible pain disability had more of an impact on the employment experiences of women while men who were in working class jobs were more likely to be impacted by non-visible mental disabilities in the types of discrimination that they faced (Dick-Mosher 2015). This means that men and women in the same class of jobs have different and unique workplace experiences depending on their gender and disability. In this study, job class was coded as working class, professional, and semi-professional. Working class jobs, in particular, can differ from one another greatly depending on whether those jobs are dominated by women, men, or are mixed-gender. This may account for some of the variability in experiences between men and women in working class jobs. Thus, in the proposed study, I examine the unique differences

between disabled men and women in occupations that are male-dominated and female-dominated.

### **Chapter 3: Research Questions**

Much of the research examining race, gender and disability in the workplace has been qualitative. Although the findings reviewed above illuminate the experiences of disabled people in the workplace, scholars also tend to add these statuses together rather than investigate them within an intersectional framework. In addition, these findings have not been tested on large, nationally representative data sets, which could speak to their generalizability. I used an intersectional focus to ask questions about gender, race, and disability at work, employing nationally representative data to do so. This work will contribute to the literature on workplace disadvantage by combining issues of disability, gender, and race in a unique way. If I find that disability has an impact on the workplace outcomes for both men and disabled women across all occupations, then I will argue that workplaces are not only gendered but that there is also an embedded disadvantage for disabled people within workplaces. If there are differences in the kind of disadvantage that men and disabled women face, it will show that gender, race and disability intersect in unique ways which cannot be understood by examining those statuses separately. This will help us to better address the problems that disabled people face in the workplace.

The literature reviewed above demonstrates the impact of gender, race, and disability on wages (Brown and Misra 2003; Greenman and Xie 2008; Schur 2017). I examined the effect of gender, race, and disability on wages in male-dominated, female-dominated jobs, and mixed gender-occupations. When Budig (2002) tested inequality in occupations, she found a male advantage in wages across all occupations.

For this study, I focused on disabled people who have physical impairments. The literature has shown that there are differences in the workplace experiences between people with visible and non-visible impairments, as well as differences between people with physical and mental impairments. I will use physical impairments for this analysis because physical impairments tend to be more visible in workplaces. The literature shows that people with less visible impairments or impairments which are less traditional often struggle to be recognized as disabled (Harlan and Robert 1998).

Specifically, and drawing on the literature above, I ask:

1. Do race, gender and physical disability influence the likelihood of placement into male-dominated, female-dominated occupations, or mixed-gender occupations?

Fine and Ash, Garland Thomson find that disabled women are viewed differently than women who are able-bodied. In addition, research by Cockburn (1993), Vanderkinderen et al. (2012), Mik-Meyer (2015), Harlan and Roberts (1998), finds that workplaces are inaccessible for disabled workers whose bodies are made problematic through the workplace norms which exclude them. Men with physical disabilities may also occupy a unique status; research by Mik-Meyer (2015) finds that they are feminized in the workplace such that they lose their male privilege. Thus, I expect to find that disabled men and women will be even more concentrated in female-dominated occupations than non-disabled men and women.

Thus, I ask:

- a) Are disabled men and women more likely to work in female-dominated occupations or male-dominated occupations than are non-disabled men and women?

Researchers have also found that racial minority men and women have different experience in paid employment compared to white men women. Thus, we may find that both disability and race influence the gender of occupations in which men and women are employed. We may find that disabled racial minority men and women fall into different job categories than their white counterparts.

- b) Do racial minority disabled and non-disabled men and women work in different types of occupations from disabled and non-disabled white men and women?

To answer the above questions, I conducted the following analyses:

- Multinomial logistic regression analysis: Using interaction terms, compare racial minority disabled and non-disabled men and women with disabled and non-disabled white men and women. I regressed the dependent variable of occupation type coded in three categories as female-dominated, male-dominated and mixed occupations on the independent variables:
  - Gender, Disability, and Race
  - Gender x Disability
  - Gender x Race
  - Disability x Race
  - Gender x Disability x Race

To explore earnings disadvantages, I ask:

2. Do race and disability intersect with gender to influence earnings within female-dominated, male-dominated, mixed-gender occupations, and across occupations?

Research on bodies in organizations finds that workplaces are gendered in ways that do not account for the bodies of women in the workplace. Researchers have shown that men maintain their advantage in workplaces even when they are tokens (Williams 1995) but that this does not apply to racial and ethnic minority men (Wingfield 2009; Woodhans et al 2014). Race and disability both impact men's and women's workplace outcomes such that being a racial or ethnic minority or disabled is associated with loss of privilege for men across occupations, regardless of typical sex make-up. Thus, I ask:

- a) Do disabled men and women differ from non-disabled men and women in terms of earnings in gendered occupations?
- b) Are there unique differences for earnings for disabled and non-disabled men and women of different races?

To answer the above questions, I conducted the following analyses:

I used a linear regression model to analyze whether the following independent variables cause an increase or decrease in the dependent variable of monthly income. I run linear regressions separately for male-dominated, female-dominated, mixed-gender occupations and all occupations:

- Gender, Race, Disability
- Disability x race
- Disability x gender
- Gender x race
- Gender x race x disability

## **Chapter 4: Methods and Data**

### *Measuring Intersectionality*

Intersectionality theory presents unique challenges to methodological practice. Scholars have taken different approaches to this complexity. According to McCall (2005), methodological practices for intersectionality fall into three categories. First, there is anti-categorical complexity that deconstructs analytical categories. Second, there is inter-categorical complexity wherein scholars use the existing categories to examine the inequality among social groups. This approach does not focus on the intersection of race, gender, and class in a single social group, but rather the intersecting forms of structural inequality (McCall 2005). Finally, the intra-categorical approach focuses on the heterogeneity within social groups, so that the category of “woman” is not used universally. McCall utilizes the inter-categorical approach in her work. For McCall, it is important to conduct comparative analysis in order to examine the different structures of domination above the level of the individual (Choo and Ferree 2010). Choo and Ferree (2010) refer to this as the process model of intersectionality. This model reveals the structural processes of organizing power by demonstrating the relations between these identities above the level of the individual. This model will show where privilege clusters and how it is carried in different contexts (Choo and Ferree 2010). Thus, this project takes an inter-categorical approach. The comparisons utilized in this study seek out the ways that structural power is not only gendered but also embedded with assumptions of able-bodiedness and racial bias. These power structures interact in unique ways for men and women of different races with and without disabilities. Through comparative analysis of disabled women, disabled men, able-bodied men, able-bodied women of different races in different occupation types, this analysis revealed the structural power in organizations (Choo and Ferree 2010). Examining employment outcomes of these

intersecting identities in different occupational contexts creates comparisons, which rise above the level of the individual.

In quantitative analysis, an interaction is identified when the effect of X on Y varies with the value of Z (Jaccard 2001). In other words, an interaction effect is significant when the effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable differs depending on the value of a third variable. In this approach the researcher theorizes a focal independent variable and a “moderator variable” (Jaccard 2001). The dependent variable is the outcome that is thought to be influenced by an independent variable. Multiplying product terms tests the difference between logistic coefficients in a regression analysis. For two- way interactions and three way interactions, researchers create product terms by multiplying all the dummy variables for one term by all the dummy variables for the other terms. For this project, I created product terms to test two-way and three-way interactions between the variables of gender, race, and disability.

### *Measuring Disability*

Researchers find that disability data tend to be inadequate in terms of variety and depth, and that they vary in their measurement of disability (Livermore, Whalen, and Stapleton 2011). That said, the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) and Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) are the most frequently used data sets that address disability-related questions, because they have relatively large amounts of relevant content and include large samples of disabled people (Livermore, Whalen, and Stapleton 2011).

Most data sets use a medical model of disability in their surveys. The health and functional measures that they use to identify disabled people vary in concept, detail, and quality across surveys (Livermore, Whalen, and Stapleton 2011). These variations lead to different

findings. A report by the AARP explored four national surveys that measured disability: the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), the American Community Survey (ACS), and the National Long-Term Care Survey (NLTC). All of the surveys use measures that focus on everyday life activities, including Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs), and all of the surveys, with the exception of the ACS, ask about assistance to perform those activities. However, they vary in how they ask this crucial question. Specifically, the NLTC asks respondents if they “received help” to perform the activity, whereas the SIPP and the NHIS ask if respondents “needed help.” In contrast, the ACS only asks about difficulty in performing certain activities (Gregory 2004). As a result of the different measures, the findings varied. In the 2002 ACS one in seven persons of all ages met at least one of the disability criteria, as did more than two in five persons age sixty-five and older. In the SIPP, nearly twenty percent of persons of all ages, and more than half of persons age sixty-five (65) and older experienced at least one of the nine conditions outlined in the survey (Gregory 2004). NHIS used broader disability measures and found that one in eight individuals of all ages and more than one in three persons age sixty five and older had a disability in 2002. AARP reports that the NLTC is the only survey they examined that specifically emphasizes functional impairment, ADLs, and IADLs.

The International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) is the one model that attempts to integrate all of the major perspectives on disability (World Health Organization 2010). The ICF recognizes the role of environmental factors in the creation of disability, as well as the relevance of associated health conditions and their effects (World Health Organization 2010). The ICF conceptualizes a person’s level of functioning as a dynamic interaction between her or his health conditions, environmental factors, and personal factors such

as level of support at home. This conceptualization of disability integrates of the social and medical models of disability (World Health Organization 2010). The ICF views human functioning on a continuum. It draws on the concepts of capacity and performance. Capacity refers to what a person can do in a standardized environment, while performance refers to what someone can do in their current environment (WHO 2010). The ICF aims to establish a common language for describing disability that allows for uniform coding systems and comparing data from different sources (World Health Organization 2010). The ICF offers four measures of disability for researchers to use. The first is impairment, which is defined as a deviation from or loss in body function or structure (Wittenburg 2006). Next, activity limitation is defined as difficulty in executing activities. Participation restriction refers to the inability to take part in conventional life situations, such as a working-age person being unable to work. Finally the term “any health condition” is used to describe the presence of any impairment, activity limitation and/or participation restriction (Wittenburg 2006). The ICF is the gold standard that other disability measures aspire to meet. The SIPP measures of disability are the closest to the ICF and are therefore preferred by scholars studying disability.

### *Data*

The SIPP’s Functional Limitations and Disability module uses an array of disability conceptualizations. The strength of this is that researchers are able to construct measures of health and functional status suited to their research (Wittenburg and Nelsom 2006). However, these conceptualizations lead to different results. For example, the employment rate for people with an impairment is higher than those with an activity restrictions or a participation restriction (Wittenburg and Nelson 2006). Researchers use SIPP data to measure different wealth and income patterns for various age, gender, and racial groups (see

<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/sipp/about/Uses-of-SIPP.html>). Therefore, I used the SIPP to examine how gender, race, and disability intersect to affect the incomes and occupations of disabled people. The SIPP topic module on Functional Limitations and Disability is very popular among disability researchers because of the detailed nature of the questions on disability (Wittenburg and Nelson 2006). The SIPP measures disability by collecting information concerning respondents' difficulties performing certain activities due to physical, mental, or emotional conditions. The section on disability covers a set of six functional limitations, whose questions cover difficulties with hearing, seeing, cognitive activities, ambulatory activities, self-care activities, and independent living activities. The questions are consistent with the standard disability questions implemented across multiple government surveys, including the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Current Population Survey (CPS) (see <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/sipp/about/sipp-content-information.html>).

The SIPP core files collect detailed employment information, including weeks of employment, amount and type(s) of earnings, and employer/business characteristics, such as industry, occupation, union status, the number of employees, and incorporation status. I use the SIPP 2008 wave 6 core file and topic module on Functional Limitations and Disability. The 2008 panel of the SIPP was collected in waves between 2008 and 2013. The data for wave 6 were collected through interviews from May 2010 to August 2010. The core data from wave 6 has information about respondents' income and work while the functional limitations topic module has in depth information about respondents' disabilities. The Census Bureau released the topic module data as a separate file from the core data from that wave. I obtained both data sets and merged them in Stata. The core data set contains four months of records for each respondent while the topic module only contains one record per person. I reformatted the core data set from

long to wide format; this created new variables to reflect the respondent's data in each of the four months. Once both data sets were formatted into comparable formats, I merged the core and the topic module files together. This created four different months of data for many of the variables in the core data set. I use only the data from the fourth reference month in my analysis. Before conducting my analyses, I pared down the data and kept only respondents who were employed during the month of interest and were between the ages of 18-65.

### *Weights*

The SIPP contains weights for use in data analysis. The different weights apply to the different possible units of analysis: persons, households, families, and subfamilies. I weigh my data set and my analyses to reflect survey sampling probabilities. The data from the SIPP is collected per household so I use person level weights to account for this.

### *Disability Variables*

Using the social model of disability, disability is defined not in terms of a condition that someone has but by difficulty that the person experiences in their environment. Most data sets, including the SIPP, have variables for work limiting disability. Kruse and Schur (2003) found that using the work disability measure in data presents problems in measuring the employment of people with disabilities. Work disability measures respondents who report having a mental or physical impairment limiting the kind of work one can do. Researchers using that measure found that employment for disabled people decreased after the ADA. The work disability variable only applies to disabled people who have limitations in working. However some employed disabled people have limitations in other activities. The ADA requires that employers accommodate disabled workers who are otherwise qualified for the job. Measures of work disability may miss

this population who are in the labor force. Using the alternative measures of disability from the SIPP, Kruse and Schur found more employed disabled people after the passage of the ADA. From the SIPP they used the disability topic module questions regarding functional and activity limitations. The SIPP asks respondents whether they have difficulty with functional activities and activities of daily living. Respondents who reported difficulty with any activities were asked whether they are able to perform the activity at all or if they need help doing the activity. These measures more closely fit the ADA definition of disability which is someone who is substantially limited in a major life activity (Kruse and Schur 2003). Therefore, this is a more appropriate measure to use when examining workplace outcomes for disabled people.

The literature suggests that there are difference in workplace experiences of disabled people depending on the type of impairment that they have as well as whether that impairment is visible. This project focuses on individuals with physical impairments because the literature finds the greatest gender differences between men and women with these impairments, and perhaps relatedly, because they tend to be more visible. For the Census Bureau Report on the 2008 SIPP findings, Brault (2012) used the following measures for physical disability:

1. Used a wheelchair, cane, crutches or walker.
2. Had difficulty walking a quarter of a mile, climbing a flight of stairs, lifting something as heavy as a 10 pound bag of groceries, grasping objects, or getting in or out of bed
3. Listed arthritis or rheumatism, back or spine problem, broken bone or fracture, cancer, cerebral palsy, diabetes, epilepsy, head or spinal cord injury, heart trouble or atherosclerosis, hernia or rupture, high blood pressure, kidney problems, lung or respiratory problem, missing limbs, paralysis, stiffness or deformity of limbs,

stomach/digestive problems, stroke, thyroid problem, or tumor/cyst/growth as a condition contributing to a reported activity limitation.

Using this measure, he found that in the in the 2008 SIPP there were 29,479,000 disabled people between the ages of 21-64. Of those, 12,115,000 were employed. Using his measure, he found that 40.8 percent disabled people with only physical impairments were employed (Brault 2012). Following Brault's example, I used the same variables for physical disability. I merged these variables to create the variable "disability" as a measure for physical disability in this study.

### *Race and Gender*

Racial categories were white, black, Asian, and other. The N's for Asian and other were too low so they are not used in this study. Hispanic ethnicity was a separate variable. I merged the variable for Hispanic with the race variables. Before merging with the racial category, 16 percent of whites identified as Hispanic compared to 5 percent of blacks. See table A3 in the appendix. In my analysis, I examined Hispanics and Blacks with whites as the reference category.

The gender variable only had options for male and female. The literature on masculinity and disability is largely focused on men with physical disabilities. I used males as the reference category in order to compare disabled and racial/ethnic minority men against the norm of the able-bodied white male.

### *Occupation and Income*

I used the code for occupation in the fourth reference month. I recoded occupation into a three-category variable, female-dominated, male-dominated, and mixed-gender occupations. I

categorized the percentage of female in each occupation using data on gender of occupation from the US census. I define female-dominated as at least 70 percent female. Male-dominated jobs are jobs that are no more than 30 percent female. Mixed-gender occupations are 31-69 percent female (Yavorsky, Cohen and Qian 2016). This three category variable is the dependent variable in multinomial logistic regressions testing the likelihood of disabled people working in male-dominated, female-dominated, and mixed-gender occupations. The regression is run with mixed-gender occupation as the reference category and again with male-dominated occupations as the reference category in order to capture all comparisons.

I also created a dummy variable for professional and managerial professions. Using the census bureau categories for professional and managerial occupations, I recoded the occupation variable into two categories: professional and managerial jobs, and non-professional jobs. I used non-professional jobs as the reference category. I used this variable as a control variable when testing for differences in type of occupation and wages.

The SIPP collects data on respondent's monthly pay from employment. I used these data in order to measure income and make comparisons between people in different occupation types. The data is gathered monthly to reflect the amount of earnings an individual received from paid work in the month. I used the natural log of monthly income from work in the fourth reference month from the data set. The coefficients were interpreted as the percentage of change in wage associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable (Budig 2002).

### *Control Variables*

Given my focus on working age adults, I included only respondents 18 to 65 in the analysis. I also pared down the data to only include people who worked during fourth reference

month which is the month corresponding to the variables that I use for my analysis. As well, I controlled for variables that contribute to labor market outcomes or are thought to represent alternative explanations for apparent discrimination. Thus, I controlled for human capital inputs by including education (Budig 2002). I coded education into five categories: less than high school, high school diploma, some college or associate's degree, bachelor's degree, and master's degree and above. In my analysis, I use less than high school as the reference category. For labor supply variables, I use part-time status (Budig 2002) and the variable indicating that someone receives SSI or SSDI. The SIPP does not measure receipt of SSDI. I measured disability income as receipt of social security and/or SSI along with having a work limiting disability (Kruse and Schur 2003). Part-time status (0= no, 1= yes) and disability income (0= no, 1 = yes) are dummy variables. Women, racial and ethnic minorities, and disabled people are more likely to work in temporary and part-time jobs (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016). Controlling for these variables will isolate that effect. I also controlled for workplace sector, coded into three categories: private for profit, private not for profit, and state and local government worker, and federal government worker. I used private for profit as the reference category. Research has found that Black women are less likely than white women to work in the private sector (Higginbotham 1994). I controlled for residence in a metropolitan area (0 = no, 1 = yes).

Finally, I controlled for family variables by using marital status, and presence of children under the age of 18 in the household. These family variables may account for some of the gender differences in workplace outcomes (Budig 2002). For example, women experience a motherhood penalty in their wages compared to men (Budig and England 2001). I coded marital status into three categories: married, previously married, and never married. Never married is the reference

category. Number of children under the age of 18 was coded into a three category variable: no children, 1-2 children, 3 or more children. I used no children as the reference category.

## **Chapter 5: Results**

### **Descriptive statistics**

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables used in this study. These data include only those people ages 18 to 65 who were employed in the reference month. The average age of disabled people in the study was 48 compared to 40 for non-disabled people. The proportions and Ns of all variables are displayed for disabled and non-disabled people.

Comparing gender of occupation for disabled people, 36.6 percent of disabled people work in female-dominated occupations, 25.2 percent work in male-dominated occupations, and 38.3 work in mixed-gender occupations. Among non-disabled people, 28.4 percent work in female-dominated occupations while, 31 percent work in male-dominated occupations and 40.6 percent work in mixed-gender occupations. Thus, a higher proportion of non-disabled people work in male-dominated occupations compared to female-dominated occupations while a higher proportion of disabled people work in female-dominated occupations than male-dominated occupations. Disabled people earn an average monthly wage of \$2,498.42, compared to \$3,144.88 for non-disabled people. Thus disabled people earn less than non-disabled people from paid work. Given the generally lower incomes experienced by those who work in female-dominated occupations (Hegewisch and Williams-Baron 2017), these differences in earnings between disabled and non-disabled people are likely at least partly a result of occupational placement.

### *Control variables*

The proportions of the control variables are very similar between disabled and non-disabled people, though there are a few exceptions. In terms of education, 8.9 percent of disabled people have less than a high school education, 25.5 percent of disabled people have a high school diploma, 39.1 percent of disabled people have some college or an associate’s degree, 15.3 percent have a bachelor’s degree and 11.3 percent have a master’s degree or above. For education among non-disabled people, 7.5 percent have less than a high school diploma, 23.5 percent have a high school diploma, 35.7 percent have some college or an associate’s degree, 21.5 percent have a bachelor’s degree and 11.7 have a master’s degree or above.

For other work variables likely to limit income in addition to occupational segregation, 39.4 percent of disabled people work part time, compared to 27.3 percent of non-disabled people. Also, as can be expected, more than five percent of disabled people receive disability income while not even one percent of non-disabled people receive SSDI or SSI.

In looking at family factors, we see differences between disabled and non-disabled respondents. The majority of both disabled and non-disabled people are married. However, among non-disabled people, a higher proportion of people had never been married than previously married while the reverse was true for disabled people. The highest proportion of disabled people had no children under the age of 18, while the highest proportion of non-disabled people had 1-2 kids under the age of 18. These differences in marital status and children are likely due to age, as non-disabled people tend to be younger than disabled people.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Unweighted Ns for Study Variables, by Disability**

|                        | <i>Range</i> | Disabled                        |     | Non-Disabled                     |       |
|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-------|
|                        |              | <i>Proportion/<br/>Mean(SE)</i> | N   | <i>Proportion/<br/>Mean (SE)</i> | N     |
| Racial/Ethnic Identity |              |                                 |     |                                  |       |
| Black                  | 0,1          | 12.46***                        | 377 | 10.20***                         | 3,337 |

|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
|----------------------------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|--------|
| Hispanic                         |       | 11.56      | 284   | 14.62      | 3,948  |
| White                            |       | 69.30      | 2142  | 68.92      | 23,191 |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Gender                           |       |            |       |            |        |
| Male                             | 0,1   | 39.99***   | 1166  | 54.38***   | 17,488 |
| Female                           |       | 60.01      | 1875  | 45.62      | 15,354 |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Occupation Type                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Female-dominated                 | 0,1   | 36.57***   | 991   | 28.43***   | 8,454  |
| Male-dominated                   |       | 25.18      | 627   | 31.01      | 9,116  |
| Mixed-gender                     |       | 38.25      | 1029  | 40.56      | 11,891 |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Income from paid work            |       | 2498.42*** | 3,041 | 3144.88*** | 32,842 |
|                                  |       | (51.81)    |       | (21.62)    |        |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Control Variables                |       |            |       |            |        |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Lives in metro Area              | 0,1   | 82.55*     | 2310  | 84.07*     | 25,576 |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Education                        |       |            |       |            |        |
| Less than high school            | 0,1   | 8.89***    | 287   | 7.53***    | 2,474  |
| High school diploma              |       | 25.46      | 782   | 23.53      | 7,931  |
| Some college                     |       | 39.09      | 1203  | 35.74      | 11,657 |
| Bachelor's degree                |       | 15.29      | 445   | 21.54      | 6,998  |
| Master's and above               |       | 11.27      | 324   | 11.66      | 3,792  |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Works part-time                  | 0,1   | 39.44***   | 1239  | 27.26***   | 9,016  |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | 0,1   | 5.3***     | 167   | .8***      | 145    |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Sector                           |       |            |       |            |        |
| Private, for profit employee     | 0,1   | 67.5***    | 1,757 | 74.66***   | 21,730 |
| Private, not for profit employee |       | 9.37       | 262   | 7.64       | 2,299  |
| State or local government worker |       | 17.53      | 471   | 13.86      | 4,113  |
| Federal government worker        |       | 5.61       | 146   | 3.84       | 1,174  |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Managerial and professional jobs | 0,1   | 34.06      | 873   | 36.12      | 10,631 |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |
| Age                              | 18-65 | 48.20***   | 3,041 | 40.40***   | 32,842 |
|                                  |       | (.24)      |       | (.08)      |        |
|                                  |       |            |       |            |        |

|   |     |          |       |          |        |
|---|-----|----------|-------|----------|--------|
| Marital Status                                |     |          |       |          |        |
| Married                                       | 0,1 | 54.8***  | 1,677 | 56.93*** | 19,263 |
| Previously married                            |     | 25.18    | 800   | 14.59    | 4,588  |
| Never married                                 |     | 20.02    | 564   | 29.21    | 8,991  |
|   |     |          |       |          |        |
| Children under the age of 18                  |     |          |       |          |        |
| No kids                                       | 0,1 | 54.27*** | 1616  | 42.22*** | 13,554 |
| 1-2 kids under age 18                         |     | 37.43    | 1172  | 45.07    | 14,942 |
| 3 or more kids under age 18                   |     | 8.31     | 253   | 12.71    | 4,346  |
| * $p < .05$ . ** $p < .01$ . *** $p < .001$ . |     |          |       |          |        |

### **Multinomial Logistic Regressions: Gender of Occupation**

Multinomial logistic regression models tested the likelihood of disabled people working in male-dominated, female-dominated, or mixed-gender professions. These regressions also tested for intersectional effects of disability, race, and gender. The dependent variable, gendered occupations, has three categories. Each regression compares one category to a comparison category. There are three comparisons: female-dominated vs. mixed-gender occupations, male-dominated vs. mixed-gender occupations, and female-dominated vs male-dominated occupations. I ran the regressions twice, first with mixed-gender occupation as the reference category and then with male-dominated occupation as the reference category, in order to observe all possible comparisons. The coefficients for the multinomial logistic regressions are reported as odds ratios, which measure how many times higher the odds of an occurrence versus a non-occurrence are for one unit in the independent variable (Sweet and Grace-Martin 2008). An odds ratio greater than one demonstrates a positive relationship, and an odds ratio less than one indicates a negative relationship.

#### *Disability, Race, and Gender*

Table 2 shows the effect of disability, race, and gender on the likelihood of working in female-dominated, mixed-gender and male-dominated occupations. Looking only at significant findings, in the comparison of female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, disabled people were slightly more likely than non-disabled people to work in female-dominated occupations rather than mixed-gender occupations. Women are more than five times more likely to work in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. In the comparison of male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, Hispanics are more likely than whites to work in male-dominated occupations, and women are less likely than men to work in male-dominated occupations. Finally, in the comparison between female-dominated and male-dominated occupations, Hispanics are less likely than whites to work in female-dominated occupations. Women are more than 33 times more likely to work in female-dominated occupations. Note that these results for gender remain the same in all future multinomial regression tables, so I do not discuss gender again unless it interacts with disability or race/ethnicity.

**Table 2: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations without Control Variables**

|                             | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                    | 1.13*                           | 1.08                          | 1.04                           |
|                             |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black                       | 1.01                            | .99                           | 1.02                           |
| Hispanic                    | .94                             | 1.29***                       | .73***                         |
|                             |                                 |                               |                                |
| Female                      | 5.46***                         | .16***                        | 33.55***                       |
|                             |                                 |                               |                                |
| Intercept                   | 1.23***                         | .20***                        | 6.18***                        |
|                             |                                 |                               |                                |
| N= 32,108                   |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 504.39***                 |                                 |                               |                                |
| df 12, 20639                |                                 |                               |                                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                                 |                               |                                |

Table 3 expands the analysis, and shows the effects of gender, race and disability on occupation type controlling for marital status, children under the age of 18, sector of work, education, part-time work, and living in a metropolitan area. Disability no longer affects the likelihood of working in a female-dominated versus a mixed-gender occupation. Race was also no longer significant. However, gender remained significant.

In terms of other significant results, respondents living in a metropolitan area were less likely to work in a male-dominated occupation compared to a mixed-gender occupation and more likely to work in a female-dominated versus male-dominated occupation. Education also significantly affected placement into occupations. Respondents with an associate's degree or some college were more likely than those with less than a high school diploma to work in female-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations. Respondents with a Master's degree or above were less likely than those with less than a high school diploma to work in female-dominated occupations versus a mixed-gender occupation. Respondents with a high school diploma, some college or associate's degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree and above were all less likely than those with less than a high school diploma to work in male-dominated compared to mixed-gender occupations and more likely to work in female-dominated occupations compared to male-dominated occupations.

Among the control variables related to work, part-time workers were significantly more likely to work in female-dominated occupations than in mixed-gender occupations or in male-dominated occupations. People working part-time also were less likely to work in male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. In terms of work place sectors, workers in private, not-for-profit sectors, and workers in state or local government are more

likely than respondents working in private, for-profit sectors to work in female-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations. On the other hand, federal government workers are less likely than those in private for-profit sectors to work in female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations. Respondents in private not-for-profit, local and state government, and federal government sector jobs were all less likely than those in private for-profits sectors to work in male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations and more likely than those in private for profit jobs to work in female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations.

Turning to the family variables, respondents who are married or previously married were less likely than never-married respondents to work in female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations and male-dominated occupations. They were also more likely than never-married respondents to work in male-dominated versus mixed occupations. Respondents who have one to two children under the age of 18 are more likely than respondents with no children under the age of 18 to work in female-dominated versus mixed occupations and male-dominated occupations.

Thus, the findings displayed in Table 3 indicate that the effects of race and disability on gender of occupation can be explained, in part, by the control variables. Specifically, the effects of race disappear for Hispanics when level of education, workplace factors such as part-time status and sector of work, are controlled. Similarly, the results for disability disappear when these workplace controls are added to the analysis. Therefore, according to this analysis, it would appear that gender is the only one of the main independent variables to have an effect on gender of occupation.

**Table 3: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.11                            | 1.04                          | 1.06                           |
| Black                            | .94                             | .99                           | .95                            |
| Hispanic                         | .94                             | 1.00                          | .93                            |
| Female                           | 5.22***                         | .16***                        | 32.32***                       |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .95                             | .77***                        | 1.23***                        |
| High school diploma              | 1.08                            | .66***                        | 1.62***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.43***                         | .70***                        | 2.04***                        |
| Bachelor's degree                | .95                             | .41***                        | 2.34***                        |
| Master's and above               | .66***                          | .23***                        | 2.85***                        |
| Works part-time                  | 1.31***                         | .69***                        | 1.90***                        |
| Private, not for profit employee | 1.83***                         | .49***                        | 3.70***                        |
| State or local government worker | 2.11***                         | .87**                         | 2.41***                        |
| Federal government worker        | .61***                          | .38***                        | 1.60***                        |
| Married                          | .84***                          | 1.56***                       | .53***                         |
| Previously married               | .81***                          | 1.47***                       | .55***                         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | 1.15***                         | .93                           | 1.24***                        |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | 1.10                            | .99                           | 1.12                           |
| Intercept                        | .18***                          | 2.51***                       | .07***                         |
| N= 32,515                        |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 173.03***                      |                                 |                               |                                |
| df 38, 19677                     |                                 |                               |                                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |                                 |                               |                                |

Finally, to get a sense of how class influences these relationships, professional occupation was entered into the analysis as an additional control variable. The results, seen in Table 4, show that, with the addition of professional occupation into the model, Hispanics are slightly less likely than whites to work in female-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations. Hispanics are much more likely to work in non-professional jobs. A descriptive table (Appendix table A1) found that 16 percent of Hispanics work in professional jobs while 84 percent of Hispanics work in non-professional jobs. Therefore, to the extent that professional jobs reflect placement into a higher social class, it appears that Hispanics are clustered into lower class occupations.

In addition, people who work in professional or managerial occupations are about half as likely to work in female-dominated or male-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations than people in non-professional jobs. No significant results emerged for professional occupations in the comparison between female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations. Thus, people in professional occupation types are much more likely to work in mixed-gender occupations. Workers in female-dominated or male-dominated occupations have a higher odds of employment in non-professional jobs than those who work in mixed-gender occupations. A descriptive statistics model (Appendix table A2) demonstrates that 44.77 percent of mixed-gender occupations are professional compared to 35.45 percent of female-dominated occupations, and 24.81 percent of male-dominated jobs. Examples of female-dominated professional occupations include meeting and convention planners, social workers, and registered nurses. Non-professional female-dominated occupations were occupations such as cashiers, office clerks, and personal and home care aids. Examples of male-dominated professional occupations are nuclear engineers, clergy, and construction managers. Non-

professional male-dominated occupations include bailiffs and corrections officers, dishwashers, and construction laborers.

In sum, disability appears to have no impact on gender of occupation. Race does not impact gender of occupation for blacks. However, there is some effect of race on gender of occupations for Hispanics in non-professional occupations. Finally, we find that workers in male-dominated or female-dominated occupations are more likely to work in non-professional occupations.

**Table 4: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.10                            | 1.04                          | 1.06                           |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black                            | .91                             | .95                           | .95                            |
| Hispanic                         | .89*                            | .95                           | .94                            |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Female                           | 5.38***                         | .17***                        | 32.40***                       |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .97                             | .79***                        | 1.22***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| High school diploma              | 1.11                            | .68***                        | 1.63***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.59***                         | .77***                        | 2.05***                        |
| Bachelor's degree                | 1.27**                          | .55***                        | 2.30***                        |
| Master's and above               | .99                             | .36***                        | 2.77***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Works part-time                  | 1.26***                         | .67***                        | 1.89***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Private, not for profit employee | 2.07***                         | .56***                        | 3.71***                        |
| State or local government worker | 2.32***                         | .92                           | 2.51***                        |
| Federal government worker        | .60***                          | .36***                        | 1.65***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |

|                             |         |         |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Professional occupation     | .55***  | .54***  | 1.01    |
|                             |         |         |         |
| Married                     | .88**   | 1.64*** | .53***  |
| Previously married          | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***  |
|                             |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | 1.10    | .97     | 1.12    |
|                             |         |         |         |
| Intercept                   | .19***  | 2.56*** | .07***  |
| N = 32,515                  |         |         |         |
| F 171.44***                 |         |         |         |
| dF 40, 19675                |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |         |         |         |

*Gender and Disability Intersection*

Table 5 shows intersections between sex and disability with all control variables included. The multinomial logistic regressions testing for intersections were run without controls and appear in the appendix (See Tables A5, A6, A7). Because the gender and disability do not intersect in a significant way, I only show one model with all of the control variables for quick reference. As can be seen, disability did not interact with sex to predict any of the occupation comparison groups. Therefore, the effects of gender do not change depending on disability.

**Table 5: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Gender and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                   | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled          | 1.20                            | 1.10                          | 1.10                           |
|                   |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black             | .91                             | .95                           | .95                            |
| Hispanic          | .89*                            | .95                           | .94                            |
|                   |                                 |                               |                                |
| Female            | 5.42***                         | .17***                        | 32.33***                       |
|                   |                                 |                               |                                |
| Disabled x female | .90                             | .89                           | 1.01                           |

|                                     |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Control Variables                   |         |         |         |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Lives in metro area                 | .97     | .79***  | 1.22*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| High school diploma                 | 1.11    | .68***  | 1.63*** |
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.59*** | .77***  | 2.06*** |
| Bachelor's degree                   | 1.27**  | .55***  | 2.30*** |
| Master's and above                  | .99     | .36***  | 2.77*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                     | 1.26*** | .67***  | 1.89*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 2.07*** | .56***  | 3.71*** |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.32*** | .93     | 2.51*** |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.65*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Professional<br>occupation          | .55***  | .54***  | 1.02    |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Married                             | .88**   | 1.64*** | .53***  |
| Previously married                  | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***  |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.10    | .97     | 1.12    |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Intercept                           | .19***  | 2.56*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                          |         |         |         |
| F 163.22***                         |         |         |         |
| dF 42, 19673                        |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |         |         |         |

### *Race and Disability*

Table 6 shows the results of race and disability intersections with all of the control variables included. This model demonstrates the importance of race and disability on occupation type for Hispanics. In the comparison between female-dominated versus mixed-gender

occupations, non-disabled Hispanics are less likely to work in female-dominated occupations than non-disabled whites. In the comparison between male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, there is a unique effect for disabled Hispanics in this model, as they are 1.57 times more likely to work in male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations. In order to make the comparison with non-disabled whites, the unique effect for disabled Hispanics of 1.57 is multiplied by the odds ratio for Hispanics of .93 and disabled, .95. Disabled Hispanic people thus are 1.38 times more likely than non-disabled whites to work in male-dominated versus mixed occupations. This effect appears after controlling for professional occupation. Therefore, the unique effect for disabled Hispanics may be due in part to the class of jobs worked by Hispanics in male-dominated occupations, and the increased risk and injury and disability associated with those jobs. However, it could also show that disabled Hispanics are sorted into the lowest grade jobs within male-dominated occupations by virtue of both their race and disability.

**Table 6: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Race and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.12                            | .95                           | 1.18                           |
| Black                            | .93                             | .94                           | .99                            |
| Hispanic                         | .88*                            | .93                           | .95                            |
| Female                           | 5.38***                         | .17***                        | 32.48***                       |
| Disabled x black                 | .80                             | 1.27                          | .63                            |
| Disabled x Hispanic              | 1.17                            | 1.57*                         | .74                            |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .97                             | .79***                        | 1.22***                        |
| High school diploma              | 1.11                            | .68***                        | 1.63***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.58***                         | .77***                        | 2.05***                        |

|                                  |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Bachelor's degree                | 1.27**  | .55***  | 2.30*** |
| Master's and above               | .98     | .36***  | 2.77*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                  | 1.26*** | .67***  | 1.89*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit employee | 2.07*** | .56***  | 3.71*** |
| State or local government worker | 2.33*** | .93     | 2.51*** |
| Federal government worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.65*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Professional occupation          | .55***  | .54***  | 1.02    |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Married                          | .88**   | 1.65*** | .53***  |
| Previously married               | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | 1.10    | .97     | 1.13    |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Intercept                        | .19***  | 2.58*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                       |         |         |         |
| F 143.27***                      |         |         |         |
| dF 48, 19667                     |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |         |         |         |

### *Gender and Race Intersections*

Table 7 tests the intersection of gender and race on occupation type without control variables. The race and gender intersections are the strongest of the two-way intersections in this study; therefore, I show the effects with and without control variables. In the comparison of female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, disabled people are more likely than non-disabled people to work in female-dominated occupations. This model tests whether the effect of gender on occupation changes with the effect of race. The reference group for this model is white men. In the comparison between female-dominated and mixed-gender occupations, black men

are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations. Black women have a lower likelihood of working in female-dominated occupations, .72. Thus, overall, the odds of black women working in female-dominated occupations rather than mixed-gender occupations compared to white men is 5.63 (.72x5.88x1.33); compared to white women whose odds of working in female dominated occupations is 5.88. While black men are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations, black women have lower odds than white women of working in female-dominated occupations.

In the comparison of male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, Hispanic men are more likely than white men to work in male-dominated occupations. All women are less likely than white men to work in male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. Hispanic women have a higher odds of working in male-dominated occupations than white women with an overall odds ratio of .17 compared to white men. Black women, also, have a higher odds of working in male-dominated occupations than white women with an overall odds ratio of .20 compared to white men.

In the comparison of female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations, black men are 1.39 times more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations while black women have a lower odds than white women of working in female-dominated occupations, with an overall odds ratio of 29.38 compared to white men's odds of 37.08. Hispanic men are less likely than white men to work in female dominated occupations.

The results shown in Table 7, below, demonstrate the importance of an intersectional approach. For blacks in particular, the effect of race cannot be separated from the effect of gender. Table 2 shows no effect of race on gender of occupation for Blacks. Based on that, a researcher may conclude that race has no effect on gender of occupation. However, race does

have an effect on gender of occupation but that effect depends on a person's gender. The addition of the race and gender interaction demonstrates that the effect of race on occupation type is different for black men than it is for black women. For black men it results in higher odds of working in female-dominated occupations, and for black women, a higher odds of working in male-dominated occupations. While race pulled black men and women in opposite directions from white men and women, race seemed to amplify the effect of gender on occupation type for Hispanic men; Hispanic men were even more likely than white men to work in male-dominated occupations compared to both mixed-gender occupations and female-dominated occupations.

**Table 7: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Race and Gender Intersections without Control Variables**

|                             | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                    | 1.13*                           | 1.09                          | 1.04                           |
| Black                       | 1.33**                          | .96                           | 1.39**                         |
| Hispanic                    | 1.07                            | 1.37***                       | .78*                           |
| Female                      | 5.88***                         | .16***                        | 37.08***                       |
| Black x female              | .72**                           | 1.27*                         | .57***                         |
| Hispanic x female           | .82                             | .78*                          | 1.06                           |
| Intercept                   | .21***                          | 1.23***                       | .17***                         |
| N = 32,108                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 306.29***                 |                                 |                               |                                |
| df 20,20631                 |                                 |                               |                                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                                 |                               |                                |

Table 8 tests the effects of race and gender intersections with all the control variables included. In this model, all of the effects for Hispanics that were observed in the previous model have disappeared with the addition of other variables related to work and the class of job, thereby affirming the importance of class with regard to Hispanic people's occupations. In the

comparison between female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, there is no longer a significant effect for black men. Black women still have a lower odds than white women of working female dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations. Black women have higher odds than white women of working in male-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations. In the comparison between female-dominated and male-dominated occupations, black men are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations while black women are much less likely than white women to work in female dominated occupations. These results show that gender interacts with race such that black men and women are more likely than whites to work in gender atypical jobs. Therefore, in terms of occupations, gender operates differently for blacks than it does for whites.

**Table 8: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Race and Gender Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.10                            | 1.04                          | 1.06                           |
| Black                            | 1.16                            | .91                           | 1.28*                          |
| Hispanic                         | 1.03                            | 1.01                          | 1.02                           |
| Female                           | 5.84***                         | .16***                        | 36.12***                       |
| Black x female                   | .74*                            | 1.31*                         | .57***                         |
| Hispanic x female                | .80                             | .80                           | 1.01                           |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .97                             | .79***                        | 1.22***                        |
| High school diploma              | 1.11                            | .68***                        | 1.63***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.59***                         | .77***                        | 2.06***                        |
| Bachelor's degree                | 1.27**                          | .55***                        | 2.30***                        |
| Master's and above               | .99                             | .36***                        | 2.77***                        |
| Works part-time                  | 1.26***                         | .67***                        | 1.89***                        |

|                                  |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Private, not for profit employee | 2.07*** | .56***  | 3.70*** |
| State or local government worker | 2.32*** | .93     | 2.51*** |
| Federal government worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.65*** |
| Professional occupation          | .55***  | .54***  | 1.01    |
| Married                          | .88**   | 1.65*** | .53***  |
| Previously married               | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***  |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.25*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | 1.10    | .97     | 1.13    |
| Intercept                        | .18***  | 2.55*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                       |         |         |         |
| F 144.24***                      |         |         |         |
| dF 48, 19667                     |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |         |         |         |

### *Three-way Intersections*

Table 9, below, shows the findings from the three-way intersections, of race, gender, and disability through every combination of the independent variables. This is a full factorial analysis; the reference category for this model is non-disabled white men.

In the two-way intersections between gender and disability, there was no effect of disability on gender. However, when disability and gender intersect with race we see significant findings, because gender and disability operate differently for blacks compared to whites. In the comparison between female-dominated and mixed-gender occupations, disabled white men are almost one and a half times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated jobs. Although disabled white women have a negative coefficient of .7, when

combined with the effects of gender (6.04) and disability (1.48) they are 6.26 times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female dominated occupations, meaning that they have higher odds of working in female-dominated occupations than non-disabled white women, who have an odds ratio of 6.04.

Disability interacts differently with race and gender for black men and women. Disabled black men have a lower odds ( $.21 \times 1.48 \times 1.43 = .44$ ) of working in female-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men. At the same time, the odds of working in a female-dominated occupations versus a mixed-gender occupation increase 5.47 times for disabled black women who overall are 72.36 times more likely to work in female-dominated occupations than mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men. The opposite trends emerge for non-disabled blacks. Non-disabled black men are 1.43 times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. Black women have a .66 times lower odds of working in female-dominated occupations. This means that when combined with the effects of gender and race, they are 5.7 times more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations, which is a lower odds than non-disabled white women and a much lower odds than disabled black women. Similarly, Non-disabled Hispanic women are overall 5.13 times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations which is the lowest odds of all non-disabled women.

In the comparison between male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations, there is no effect for disabled white men. However, disabled white women have a .70 lower odds of working in male-dominated occupations with an overall odds ratio of .18 ( $.70 \times .16 \times 1.64$ ) which gives them a slightly higher odds compared to non-disabled white women to work in male-

dominated versus mixed-gender occupations. There is no effect of disability for black or Hispanic men. However, black disabled women have a 2.61 higher odds of working in male-dominated occupations. With the combined effects of gender (.16), disability (1.64), and race (.98), disabled black women have an odds ratio .67 meaning that they have a higher odds than disabled and non-disabled white women of working in male-dominated occupations. Race influenced occupation for Hispanics such that non-disabled Hispanic men are 1.36 times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in male-dominated occupations, while Hispanic women were less likely to work in male-dominated occupations with an overall odds ratio equal to that of white women ( $.72 \times 1.36 \times .16 = .16$ ). Finally, in the comparison of female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations, disability has no impact on the occupation type for disabled whites. However, disability affected disabled black men's occupation type such that they are almost half as likely as non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations ( $.31 \times 1.46 \times 1.27 = .57$ ). The opposite is true for non-disabled black men, who are almost one and a half times (1.46) more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female dominated occupations. Non-disabled black women have lower odds of working in female-dominated occupations compared to male-dominated occupations, and overall, they are 30.23 times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to non-disabled white women who are 36.97 times more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations. While there is no significant effect for non-disabled Hispanic women in this comparison, non-disabled Hispanic men are less likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to male-dominated occupations. Therefore, this model shows us that disability does interact with gender to impact occupation

types. However, the effect is different for white disabled men and women than for racial minority disabled men and women.

**Table 9: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Three-way Intersections without Control Variables**

|                             | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                    | 1.48**                          | 1.64                          | 1.27                           |
| Black                       | 1.43**                          | .98                           | 1.46**                         |
| Hispanic                    | 1.09                            | 1.36***                       | .80*                           |
| Female                      | 6.04***                         | .16***                        | 36.97***                       |
| Disabled x female           | .70*                            | .70*                          | .99                            |
| Black x female              | .66**                           | 1.17                          | .56***                         |
| Hispanic x female           | .78*                            | .72**                         | 1.08                           |
| Disabled x black            | .21**                           | .66                           | .31*                           |
| Disabled x Hispanic         | .67                             | 1.14                          | .59                            |
| Black x disabled x female   | 5.47**                          | 2.61*                         | 2.09                           |
| Hispanic x disabled x male  | 2.02                            | 1.93                          | 1.04                           |
| Intercept                   | .21***                          | 1.23***                       | .82***                         |
| N = 32,108                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 161.31***                 |                                 |                               |                                |
| df 38, 20613                |                                 |                               |                                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                                 |                               |                                |

Table 10, below, shows the results for the three-way intersections with control variables included in the model. With the introductions of these variables, only a few changes from the previous model emerge. Non-disabled black men are no longer more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated versus mixed gender occupations. Any significant effects for non-disabled Hispanic men from the previous model also have disappeared in this

model while the effects for Hispanic women remain. Thus, class works differently for Hispanic men and women in that any significant differences between Hispanic men compared to white and black men are explained by factors other than their race, notably level of education and professional occupations. However, for Hispanic women, race affects the way that they are sorted into occupations regardless of other factors related to class of job. With control variables, non-disabled Hispanic women are more likely than white women to work in mixed-gender occupations compared to either male-dominated or female-dominated occupations.

With the control variables added, disabled white men are now more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated versus male dominated occupations. In addition, although disabled white women were previously demonstrated to have a higher odds than non-disabled white women of working in male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations, in this model they are less likely than non-disabled white women to work in male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, disability does have an impact on gender of occupation but that impact varies depending on race and gender. In sum, when disability intersects with race and gender we find expected and unexpected results. As predicted, we found that disabled white men are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to both mixed-gender and male-dominated occupations. We also found that non-disabled black men are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to male-dominated occupations. However, for black men, disability and race do not combine in an additive way, making disabled black men even more likely to work in female-dominated occupations based on the effects of both disability and race. Indeed, disabled black men are actually *less* likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender and male-

dominated occupations. Thus, we now know that disabled black men occupy a unique position compared to disabled white men and non-disabled black men. At the same time, disabled black women are have the highest odds of all women of working in female-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations, and they also have the highest odds of all women of working in male dominated-occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, disabled black women are the least likely to work in mixed-gender occupations, and may be sorted into lower grade jobs in both female-dominated and male-dominated occupations by virtue of their gender, disability and race. Again, this is a unique effect that differs from that of disabled white women, non-disabled black men, and disabled black men. This is also unique from non-disabled black women who have lower odds compared to white women of working in female-dominated occupations compared to both mixed-gender and male-dominated occupations. Disabled black women also have higher odds than white women of working in male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, disability matters with regard to how people are sorted into occupations but that effect varies based on race, and then varies again based on gender.

I also found that class has an impact on how people are sorted into occupations. For Hispanic men, class has the strongest effect on how they are sorted into occupations. Unlike black men, Hispanic men were more likely than white men to work in male-dominated occupations. However, this effect disappeared when professional occupations and education were added into the model, meaning that Hispanic men are sorted into male-dominated occupations primarily by the class of jobs they work in those occupations. Examples of non-professional male-dominated occupations include construction laborers, dishwashers, and parking lot attendants. Yet, non-disabled Hispanic women have a higher odds compared to white

women of working in mixed gender occupations compared to both female-dominated and male-dominated occupations. This result was unaffected by variables related to class, which indicates that gender and race have a stronger impact on how Hispanic women are sorted into occupations than Hispanic men. See table 22 for a summary of all the results. It is important to note that the Hispanic variable was separate from the race variable until they were merged. Before merging the variables, 16 percent of whites identified as Hispanic compared to 5 percent of blacks. Class may impact who identifies as Hispanic rather than white, meaning that the unique class effects for Hispanics may arise from the fact that class may also impact whether someone identifies as Hispanic to begin with.

**Table 10: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Three-way Intersections with Control Variables for Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                              | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                     | 1.51**                          | 1.11                          | 1.36*                          |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black                        | 1.25                            | .92                           | 1.36**                         |
| Hispanic                     | 1.06                            | 1.00                          | 1.06                           |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Female                       | 6.01***                         | .17***                        | 35.91***                       |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Disabled x female            | .69*                            | .66*                          | 1.02                           |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black x female               | .69**                           | 1.20                          | .57***                         |
| Hispanic x female            | .76*                            | .74*                          | 1.02                           |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Disabled x black             | .22**                           | .76                           | .28*                           |
| Disabled x Hispanic          | .64                             | 1.30                          | .49                            |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black x disabled x female    | 4.92**                          | 2.56*                         | 1.91                           |
| Hispanic x disabled x female | 2.23                            | 1.79                          | .124                           |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |
| Control Variables            |                                 |                               |                                |
|                              |                                 |                               |                                |

|                                     |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Lives in metro area                 | .97     | .79***  | 1.22*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| High school diploma                 | 1.12    | .68***  | 1.62*** |
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.59*** | .78***  | 2.05*** |
| Bachelor's degree                   | 1.27**  | .55***  | 2.31*** |
| Master's and above                  | .99     | .36***  | 2.77*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                     | 1.26*** | .67***  | 1.89*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 2.07*** | .56***  | 3.71*** |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.32*** | .93     | 2.51*** |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.66*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Professional<br>occupation          | .55***  | .54***  | 1.01    |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Married                             | .88**   | 1.65*** | .53***  |
| Previously married                  | .83***  | 1.52*** | .55***  |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.16*** | .93*    | 1.25*** |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.10    | .97     | 1.13    |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Intercept                           | .17***  | 2.53*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                          |         |         |         |
| F 105.03***                         |         |         |         |
| dF 66, 19649                        |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |         |         |         |

### Linear Regressions: Monthly Earnings from Paid Work

To explore outcomes within occupations, I ran linear regression models that examine income differences based on race, gender and disability. The dependent variable for the linear regressions is a log of monthly earnings from paid work for the reference month. The coefficients are interpreted as the percentage change (when multiplied by 100) in wages

associated with a one unit change in the independent variable (see Budig 2002). The regressions were run for each gender occupation category (female-dominated, male-dominated, mixed-gender occupation) and without any occupational category in order to compare wage inequality across occupations. Occupational segregation itself may explain some of the wage differences that we saw in the descriptive table. Particularly, female-dominated occupations pay much less than male-dominated jobs even if they are at the same level of education and training (Hegewisch and Williams-Baron 2017). Therefore, we can expect to find more variability in all occupations than within female-dominated occupations.

### *Disability, Race, and Gender*

Table 11 shows the results for disability, race, and gender separately without control variables. Looking at significant differences only, we see that, within female occupations, Blacks earn 12 percent less than whites; Hispanics earn 22 percent less than whites. Women earn 7 percent less than men. Within male-dominated occupations, disabled people earn 13 percent less than non-disabled people, blacks earn 27 percent less than whites, and Hispanics earn 41 percent less than whites. Women earn 8 percent less than men. Within mixed-gender occupations, disabled people earn 20 percent less than non-disabled people. Blacks earn 27 percent less, and Hispanics earn 40 percent less than whites. Women earn 21 percent less than men. Within all occupations, disabled people earn 13 percent less than non-disabled people. Blacks earn 35 percent less than whites and Hispanics earn 22 percent less than whites. Men earn 30 percent more than women. Thus, within and across all occupations, marginalization based on gender, disability, or race leads to lower earnings.

### **Table 11: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings without Control Variables**

|                             | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Sub population n            | 8,661                     | 9,427                   | 12,529                   | 31,099          |
| Disabled                    | -.03                      | -.13***                 | -.20***                  | -.13***         |
|                             |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black                       | -.12***                   | -.27***                 | -.27***                  | -.35***         |
| Hispanic                    | -.22***                   | -.41***                 | -.40***                  | -.22***         |
|                             |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Female                      | -.07*                     | -.08**                  | -.21***                  | -.30***         |
|                             |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Intercept                   | 7.67***                   | 8.13***                 | 8.07***                  | 8.05***         |
| F                           | 12.39***                  | 60.75***                | 82.48***                 | 243.51***       |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .0090                     | 0.0483                  | 0.0423                   | 0.0503          |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                           |                         |                          |                 |

Table 12, below, introduces controls for workplace and family factors, but not professional jobs, disability income, and age. Within female-dominated occupations, men earn 7 percent more than women, the same result as found in the model without controls. That no other significant results emerge within female-dominated occupations indicates that other factors related to work and family contribute to pay inequality within female-dominated occupations. Within male-dominated occupations, Blacks earn 18 percent less than whites, and Hispanics earn 15 percent less than whites. Men earn 12 percent more than women. Within mixed-gender occupations, disabled people earn 8 percent less than non-disabled people. Blacks earn 12 percent less than whites, and Hispanics earn 14 percent less than whites. Men earn 14 percent more than women. Within all occupations, disabled people earn 6 percent less than non-disabled people. Blacks and Hispanics both earn 11 percent less than whites. Men earn 24 percent more than women. The racial disadvantage in this model decreased from the previous model, which suggests that racial disadvantage in earnings can be explained in part, but not completely, by the control variables. Unlike the other variables, the male advantage in earnings changed very little with the addition of the control variables.

In terms of the control variables, living in a metropolitan area is associated with an earnings increase between 13 and 19 percent across job types. Education is shown to have a positive impact on earnings. Compared to people without a high school diploma: people with a high school diploma earn between 20 and 30 percent more within and across all occupations; people with some college or an associate's degree earn between 35 and 45 percent more within and across all occupations; people with a bachelor's degree earn between 74 and 79 percent more; and finally, people with a master's degree or more earn more than 100 percent more.

Among the control variables for work, part-time workers earn between 68 and 76 percent less across occupation types compared to full-time workers. Working for a private, nonprofit is associated with a 7 percent earnings advantage over people who work in private, for-profit sectors in female-dominated occupations. In male-dominated occupations, people who work in the private, nonprofit sector earn almost 20 percent less than people in the private for-profit sector. In all other occupations, people who work in private nonprofit sector earn 6 to 7 percent less than people in private for profit sector. State and local government workers earn 5 to 7 percent more in female-dominated and male-dominated occupations compared to people who work in private for profit sectors. In mixed-gender occupations and all occupations, people in state and local government earn less than people who work in private for profit sector. People who work in the federal government earn between 22 and 26 percent more in every occupational categories.

For variables related to family, being married or previously married is associated with earnings advantages between 25 and 41 percent across job types compared to people who have never been married. Having children under the age of 18 is associated with earnings

disadvantages between 5 and 18 percent across job categories compared to people with no children under the age of 18.

**Table 12 Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings with Control Variables for Work, Family, and Education**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.02                      | -.06                    | -.08**                   | -.06***         |
| Black                            | -.05                      | -.18***                 | -.12***                  | -.11***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.04                      | -.15***                 | -.14***                  | -.11***         |
| Female                           | -.07**                    | -.12***                 | -.14***                  | -.24***         |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .16***                  | .19***                   | .16***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .21***                  | .20***                   | .21***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .45***                    | .37***                  | .35***                   | .36***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .74***                    | .78***                  | .79***                   | .74***          |
| Master's and above               | 1.04***                   | 1.05***                 | 1.14***                  | 1.06***         |
| Works part-time                  | -.68***                   | -.56***                 | -.76***                  | -.71***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | .07**                     | -.19***                 | -.07*                    | -.06***         |
| State or local government worker | .05*                      | .07**                   | -.11***                  | -.04**          |
| Federal government worker        | .24***                    | .22***                  | .26***                   | .24***          |
| Married                          | .29***                    | .41***                  | .39***                   | .39***          |
| Previously married               | .25***                    | .30***                  | .33***                   | .32***          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.11***                   | -.07***                 | -.05**                   | -.08***         |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.18***                   | -.08**                  | -.07**                   | -.10***         |
| Intercept                        | 7.10***                   | 7.40***                 | 7.26***                  | 7.36***         |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| F                           | 196.32*** | 178.94*** | 340.63*** | 697.66*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | 0.3419    | 0.3313    | .4066     | .3771     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

Table 13 adds professional occupation as a control variable to the model. There is very little change in the variable effects from the previous model except that the racial disadvantage decreased within male-dominated occupations, mixed-gender occupations and across all occupations while the male advantage increased slightly across all job type categories. If male advantage increases at the same time that racial disadvantage decreases, an intersectional approach is suggested to further understand the dynamics at work. At the very least, these shifts are associated with the addition with the variable for class of jobs which demonstrates the importance of class in racial disadvantage. Professional occupations was associated with a nearly 40 percent increase in earnings across all occupations.

**Table 13: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Controls for Education, Work, and Family, Including Professional Occupation**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.02                      | -.06                    | -.08**                   | -.06***         |
| Black                            | -.03                      | -.15***                 | -.09***                  | -.09***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.01                      | -.11***                 | -.10***                  | -.08***         |
| Female                           | -.07**                    | -.14***                 | -.16***                  | -.26***         |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .17***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .17***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .39***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .58***                    | .60***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .82***                    | .80***                  | .87***                   | .80***          |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Works part-time                  | -.66***   | -.55***   | -.73***   | -.69***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.01      | -.29***   | -.15***   | -.13***   |
| State or local government worker | -.05*     | .11***    | -.17***   | -.08***   |
| Federal government worker        | .21***    | .22***    | .29***    | .25***    |
| Professional                     | .38***    | .38***    | .39***    | .37***    |
| Married                          | .26***    | .38***    | .36***    | .36***    |
| Previously married               | .23***    | .29***    | .32***    | .30***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.18***   | -.07**    | -.05*     | -.09***   |
| Intercept                        | 7.10***   | 7.39***   | 7.25***   | 7.35***   |
| F                                | 217.75*** | 205.64*** | 369.10*** | 764.74*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3729     | .3602     | .4352     | .4037     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

Table 14 demonstrates the effect of disability, race, and gender on monthly earnings with control variables, including the receipt of disability income. Disability is no longer significant in association with earnings. Disability income has strict eligibility requirements regarding earned income for its recipients, with the result that recipients of disability benefits who work have to limit their income not only to maintain the monetary benefits but also the health insurance which accompanies the cash benefits. Disability income did not affect the variables for gender and race. Disability income had the largest effect on earnings in the male-dominated occupations with recipients predicted to earn 97 percent less than people who do not receive SSDI or SSI. The smallest impact was in female-dominated occupations with SSDI/SSI recipients earning 69 percent less in those jobs. This could be due in part to the fact that, as previous models have demonstrated, people who work part-time have a higher odds of working in female-dominated

occupations already. People who receive disability income are likely to work part-time; thus the earnings limitations of disability income would have a smaller impact in female-dominated occupations which have more part-time workers. In addition, female-dominated occupations already have lower pay, a fact that decreases the impact that disability income might have in those occupations. In mixed-gender occupations and all occupations, people who receive SSDI or SSI earn 82 and 83 percent less, respectively, than do non-recipients.

**Table 14: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, and Disability Income**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .01                       | .03                     | -.04                     | -.03            |
| Black                            | -.03                      | -.16***                 | -.09***                  | -.09***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.02                      | -.12***                 | -.11***                  | -.09***         |
| Female                           | -.08**                    | -.14***                 | -.16***                  | -.27***         |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .18***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .38***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .57***                    | .59***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .81***                    | .80***                  | .86**                    | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.65***                   | -.53***                 | -.71***                  | -.67***         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.69***                   | -.97***                 | -.82***                  | -.83***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.005                     | -.29***                 | -.13***                  | -.12***         |
| Local or state government worker | -.04*                     | .11***                  | -.16***                  | -.08***         |
| Federal government               | .21***                    | .22***                  | .29***                   | .25***          |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| worker                      |           |           |           |           |
| Professional                | .38***    | .38***    | .39***    | .37***    |
| Married                     | .26***    | .37***    | .35***    | .36***    |
| Previously married          | .24***    | .28***    | .31***    | .30***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.19***   | -.07**    | -.06*     | -.10***   |
| Intercept                   | 7.10***   | 7.40***   | 7.25***   | 7.36***   |
| F                           | 210.49*** | 202.81*** | 362.94*** | 748.11*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3772     | .3683     | .4412     | .4095     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

Because age generally is positively related to wages, as it represents more years of work and experience, the model was run again with age as a control variable. Table 15 shows that, with the addition of age, disability is now associated with 8-10 percent lower earnings in male-dominated, mixed-gender and all occupations. There is no effect of disability in female-dominated occupations. Disabled people tend to be older than non-disabled people; therefore, the effect of disability was hidden by the effect of age in disabled people. After controlling for age, we find that disabled people do have an earnings disadvantage that cannot be explained by other factors likely to affect their income such as, disability income, profession, and education. Therefore, disabled people face real disadvantage in earnings beyond the effects of social security earnings thresholds. Age is positively related to earnings and is associated with a one percent increase in earnings with each year of age across every occupation category.

**Table 15: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, Disability Income, and Age**

|                 | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Disabled                         | -.05      | -.08*     | -.10***   | -.08***   |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Black                            | -.04      | -.16***   | -.10***   | -.10***   |
| Hispanic                         | -.01      | -.10***   | -.09***   | -.07***   |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Female                           | -.08**    | -.15***   | -.17***   | -.27***   |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Control Variables                |           |           |           |           |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***    | .13***    | .16***    | .14***    |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| High school diploma              | .30***    | .22***    | .19***    | .22***    |
| Some college, associate's degree | .41***    | .33***    | .28***    | .32***    |
| Bachelor's degree                | .60***    | .61***    | .61***    | .58***    |
| Master's and above               | .83***    | .79***    | .86***    | .80***    |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Works part-time                  | -.63***   | -.51***   | -.69***   | -.65***   |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.74***   | -.99***   | -.87***   | -.87***   |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.02      | -.30***   | -.15***   | -.14***   |
| Local or state government worker | -.07**    | .10***    | -.19***   | -.10***   |
| Federal government worker        | .18***    | .21***    | .28***    | .23***    |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Professional                     | .37***    | .38***    | .38***    | .36***    |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Age                              | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Married                          | .13***    | .25***    | .21***    | .22***    |
| Previously married               | ..09**    | .16***    | .15***    | .15***    |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.07***   | -.01      | .00       | -.03*     |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.12***   | .00       | .02       | -.02      |
|                                  |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                        | 6.80***   | 7.08***   | 6.89***   | 7.01***   |
| F                                | 203.99*** | 202.61*** | 367.82*** | 749.88*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3892     | .3799     | .4546     | .4225     |

\*p <.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### *Gender and Disability Intersections*

Now, I turn to the two-way intersections. For these models, I only show the tables with all the control variables for quick reference before more in-depth analysis in the three way intersections. Table 16 demonstrates that the effect of disability on earnings is only an effect for disabled men. There is no unique effect for disabled women, while disabled men make 7 percent less than non-disabled men in male-dominated occupations and 8 percent less than non-disabled men in all occupations. Disability likely has less of an effect on the earnings of women because they already start at an earnings disadvantage due to their gender.

**Table 16: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Gender and Disability intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income, and Age**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .00                       | -.07*                   | -.08                     | -.08**          |
| Black                            | -.04                      | -.16***                 | -.10***                  | -.10***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.01                      | -.10***                 | -.09***                  | -.07***         |
| Female                           | -.08**                    | -.15***                 | -.16***                  | -.27***         |
| Female x disabled                | -.05                      | -.02                    | -.04                     | -.01            |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .13***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .22***                  | .19***                   | .22***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .41***                    | .33***                  | .28***                   | .32***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .60***                    | .61***                  | .61***                   | .58***          |
| Master's and above               | .83***                    | .79***                  | .86**                    | .80***          |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Works part-time                  | -.63***   | -.51***   | -.69***   | -.65***   |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.74***   | -.99***   | -.87***   | -.87***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.02      | -.30***   | -.15***   | -.14***   |
| Local or state government worker | -.07**    | .10***    | -.19***   | -.10***   |
| Federal government worker        | .18***    | .21***    | .28***    | .23***    |
| Professional                     | .37***    | .38***    | .38***    | .37***    |
| Age                              | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    |
| Married                          | .13***    | .25***    | .21***    | .22***    |
| Previously married               | .09**     | .16***    | .15***    | .15***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.12***   | -.01      | .01       | -.03*     |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.19***   | .00       | .02       | -.02      |
| Intercept                        | 6.79***   | 7.08***   | 6.88***   | 7.01***   |
| F                                | 195.18*** | 193.80*** | 352.25*** | 717.77*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3892     | .3799     | .4546     | .4225     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

### *Race and Disability Intersections*

Table 17 shows the results of disability and race intersections. In this table we find that disability only has an impact on the earnings of disabled whites. There is no unique effect on earnings for disabled blacks or Hispanics. However, disabled whites earn 11 percent less than non-disabled whites within male-dominated occupations and 10 percent less than non-disabled whites within mixed-gender occupations and across all occupations. This is likely due to the fact that racial/ethnic minorities are already at an earnings disadvantage and are thus less likely to be impacted by disability.

**Table 17: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Race and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, Disability Income, and Age**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.06                      | -.11**                  | -.10**                   | -.10***         |
| Black                            | -.04                      | -.17***                 | -.09***                  | -.10***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.01                      | -.11***                 | -.09***                  | -.07***         |
| Female                           | -.08**                    | -.15***                 | -.16***                  | -.27***         |
| Black x disabled                 | -.02                      | .03                     | -.03                     | .02             |
| Hispanic x disabled              | -.07                      | .12                     | -.06                     | .07             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .13***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .22***                  | .19***                   | .22***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .41***                    | .33***                  | .28***                   | .32***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .60***                    | .61***                  | .61***                   | .58***          |
| Master's and above               | .83***                    | .79***                  | .86***                   | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.63***                   | -.51***                 | -.69***                  | -.65***         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.69***                   | -.98***                 | -.87***                  | -.87***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.02                      | -.31***                 | -.15***                  | -.14***         |
| Local or state government worker | -.07**                    | .10***                  | -.19***                  | -.10***         |
| Federal government worker        | .18***                    | .21***                  | .28***                   | .23***          |
| Professional                     | .37***                    | .38***                  | .38***                   | .36***          |
| Age                              | .01***                    | .01***                  | .01***                   | .01***          |
| Married                          | .26***                    | .25***                  | .21***                   | .22***          |
| Previously married               | .24***                    | .16***                  | .15***                   | .15***          |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.07***   | -.01      | .01       | -.03*     |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.12***   | -.07      | .02       | -.02      |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                   | 6.80***   | 7.09***   | 6.89***   | 7.36***   |
| F                           | 172.60*** | 172.12*** | 311.69*** | 628.72*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3893     | .3803     | .4547     | .4097     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

### *Race and Gender Intersections*

Next, I turn to race and gender intersections. Table 18 shows the effects of race and gender intersections on monthly earnings from paid work. There is a lot of importance differences in the race and gender intersection thus; I show this analysis without control variables and again with control variables. The reference category is white men. Within female-dominated occupations, black men earn 23 percent less than white men and Hispanic men earn 28 percent less than white men. White women earn 10 percent less than white men.

Within male-dominated occupations, disabled people earn 14 percent less than non-disabled people. Race influences earnings for men such that black men earn 27 percent less than white men, and Hispanic men earn 42 percent less than white men. White women earn 9 percent less than white men.

The largest impact on earnings can be found in mixed-gender occupations. In these occupations, disabled people earn 20 percent less than non-disabled people. White women earn 20 percent less than white men. The intersection of race and gender demonstrate differences among racial minority men and women. Black men earn 40 percent less than white men. However, black women have a unique 25 percent boost in earnings which mitigates the additive

effects race and gender so that when combined with the effect of race (-.40) and gender (-.26) black women make 41 percent less than white men. Simply adding the effects for race and gender together without the intersectional effect would falsely show that black women earn 66 percent less than white men. Hispanic women have the same intersectional effect of race and gender as black women and make a total of 56 percent less than white men compared to Hispanic men who make 47 percent less than white men. These dramatic differences in mixed-gender occupations may be due, in part, to the fact that the majority of professional jobs are in mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, some of these differences may be accounted for by the differences between people in professional and non-professional occupations. Similar trends are found when all occupations are put together. Disabled people earn 13 percent less than non-disabled people. White women earn 34 percent less than white men. Black men earn 33 percent less than white men while black women earn 47 percent less than white men. Hispanic men earn 42 percent less than white men and Hispanic women earn 59 percent less than white men.

Taken together, these findings show that race and gender impact earnings across all occupations. The effect of race is strongest among black and Hispanic men, who have markedly lower earnings than white men. Black and Hispanic women also have a wage gap compared to white men. However, their wages track more closely with those of white women who also face disadvantage compared to white men.

**Table 18: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings: Race and gender intersection no control variables**

|                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Sub population n | 9,143                     | 9,427                   | 12,529                   | 31,099          |
| Disabled         | -.03                      | -.14***                 | -.20***                  | -.13***         |
| Black            | -.23*                     | -.27***                 | -.40***                  | -.33***         |

|                             |         |          |          |           |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Hispanic                    | -.28*** | -.42***  | -.47***  | -.42***   |
|                             |         |          |          |           |
| Female                      | -.10*   | -.09**   | -.26***  | -.34***   |
|                             |         |          |          |           |
| Black x female              | .14     | -.01     | .25***   | .20***    |
| Hispanic x female           | .07     | .08      | .17***   | .17***    |
|                             |         |          |          |           |
| Intercept                   | 7.70*** | 8.***    | 8.09***  | 8.07***   |
| F                           | 7.59*** | 36.83*** | 50.48*** | 148.03*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .0094   | 0.0485   | 0.0447   | 0.0524    |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |         |          |          |           |

Table 19 shows the results for the race and gender intersections with all of the control variables included. Within female-dominated occupations, there is no effect of disability on earnings. White men earn 11 percent more than white women. There is no longer an effect on earnings for black and Hispanic men compared to white men. This means that the disadvantage in earnings reported in the previous model is explained by the control variables. Therefore, among men in female-dominated occupations, racial minority men would be less likely than white men to work in professional occupations thus their disadvantage disappears once professional occupation is controlled for. Female-dominated occupations already have lower pay so there is less room for variability and people who work in female-dominated occupations are more likely to work part-time and more likely to work in non-professional jobs. That said, there is still a wage gap between white men and women in these occupations and white men are the only men who appear to have the glass escalator effect in these occupations.

Within male-dominated occupations, disabled people earn 8 percent less than non-disabled people. White women earn 16 percent less than white men. Black men earn 17 percent less than white men and Hispanic men earn 11 percent less than white men. Within mixed-

gender occupations, disabled people earn 10 percent less than non-disabled people, white women earn 20 percent less than white men. Black men earn 17 percent less than white men, while Hispanic men earn 11 percent less than white men. While without control variables, Hispanic men had greater disadvantage than black men compared to white men, the addition of the control variables reversed that finding such that now, black men face greater disadvantage in earnings than Hispanic men within male-dominated occupations. Thus, Hispanic men's disadvantage can be explained by other factors related to class such as professional occupation, and education. As has already been noted, Hispanics are much more likely to work in non-professional jobs. This trend continues in mixed-gender occupations. As in the model without controls, Hispanic women have a lower coefficient compared to black women. However, overall they face slightly less disadvantage in earnings than black women. Thus compared to white men, we find that Hispanic men earn 14 percent less in mixed-gender occupations, Black men earn 17 percent less, white women earn 20 percent less, Hispanic women earn 22 percent less, and black women earn 23 percent less. Similarly, in all occupations, we find that Hispanic men earn 11 percent less than white men, black men earn 18 percent less than white men, white women earn 30 percent less than white men while Hispanic and black women both earn 32 percent less than white men. In the all occupations category the large gender wage gap is due in part to the lower earnings in female-dominated occupations. Race has very little impact on this disadvantage.

These findings suggests that the impact of race on earnings is stronger for racial minority men than it is on racial minority women. This does not mean that racial minority women are more advantaged than racial minority men, but that race influences racial minority men's earnings in a stronger ways; racial minority men are demonstrated to have substantially lower male advantage than white men. The racial disadvantage is not as strong among women because

women already face earnings disadvantages; black and Hispanic men lose male privilege by virtue of their race.

**Table 19: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Race and Gender Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income, and Age**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.05                      | -.08*                   | -.10***                  | -.08***         |
| Black                            | -.13                      | -.17***                 | -.17***                  | -.18***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.05                      | -.11***                 | -.14***                  | -.11***         |
| Female                           | -.11***                   | -.16***                 | -.20***                  | -.30***         |
| Black x female                   | .10                       | -.02                    | .14**                    | .16***          |
| Hispanic x female                | .05                       | .07                     | .12**                    | .09***          |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .13***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .22***                  | .20***                   | .22***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .40***                    | .33***                  | .28***                   | .32***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .60***                    | .61***                  | .61***                   | .58***          |
| Master's and above               | .82***                    | .79***                  | .86***                   | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.63***                   | -.51***                 | -.69***                  | -.65***         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.74***                   | -.99***                 | -.87***                  | -.87***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.03                      | -.30***                 | -.15***                  | -.14***         |
| Local or state government worker | -.07**                    | .10***                  | -.19***                  | -.10***         |
| Federal government worker        | .18***                    | .21***                  | .28***                   | .23***          |
| Professional                     | .37***                    | .38***                  | .38***                   | .36***          |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Age                         | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Married                     | .13***    | .25***    | .21***    | .22***    |
| Previously married          | ..09**    | .16***    | .15***    | .15***    |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.07***   | -.01      | .00       | -.03****  |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.12***   | -.00      | .01       | -.02      |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                   | 6.82***   | 7.09***   | 6.91***   | 7.03***   |
| F                           | 174.14*** | 171.33*** | 315.94*** | 640.06*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3894     | .3801     | .4557     | .4235     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

### *Three-way intersections*

Table 20 shows the results for three-way intersections without controls. The reference category is non-disabled white men. Within female-dominated occupations, non-disabled black men earn 23 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled Hispanic men earn 26 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled white men earn 8 percent more than non-disabled white women. Within male-dominated occupations, disabled white men earn 17 percent less than non-disabled white men, non-disabled black men earn 28 percent less than non-disabled white men and non-disabled Hispanic men earn 42 percent less than non-disabled white men.

Within mixed-gender occupations, disabled white men earn 19 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled Hispanic women earn 31 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled white men earn 26 percent more than non-disabled white women. Non-disabled black men earn 41 percent less than non-disabled white men and non-disabled Hispanic men earn 48 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled black women earn 42

percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled Hispanic women earn 57 percent less than non-disabled white men.

Within all occupations, disabled white men earn 15 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled black men earn 34 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled Hispanic men earn 42 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled white men earn 35 percent more than non-disabled white women. Non-disabled black women earn 48 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled Hispanic women earn 60 percent less than non-disabled white men. Race and disability do not combine in a unique way in the effect on earnings. The only differences in race on earnings is in comparisons within non-disabled people.

**Table 20: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Three-way Intersections without Control Variables**

|                              | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n              | 9,143                     | 9,427                   | 12,529                   | 31,099          |
| Disabled                     | .15                       | -.17**                  | -.19**                   | -.15***         |
| Black                        | -.23*                     | -.28***                 | -.41***                  | -.34***         |
| Hispanic                     | -.26**                    | -.42***                 | -.48***                  | -.42***         |
| Female                       | -.08*                     | -.08*                   | -.26***                  | -.35***         |
| Disabled x female            | -.18                      | -.04                    | -.04                     | .20             |
| Disabled x black             | .33                       | .24                     | .12                      | .18             |
| Disabled x Hispanic          | -.29                      | .07                     | .09                      | .06             |
| Black x female               | .14                       | .02                     | .25***                   | .21***          |
| Hispanic x female            | .06                       | .03                     | .17**                    | .17***          |
| Disabled x black x female    | -.36                      | -.31                    | -.07                     | -.18            |
| Disabled x Hispanic x female | .25                       | .35                     | -.10                     | -.02            |
| Intercept                    | 7.69***                   | 8.13***                 | 8.09***                  | 8.08***         |

|                             |         |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| F                           | 4.46*** | 20.44*** | 27.30*** | 78.23*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .0101   | 0.0499   | .0449    | .0526    |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |         |          |          |          |

Table 21 shows the results of the three-way intersections with all of the control variables included. The reference category is non-disabled white men. Looking only at significant results, this table is almost identical to the findings from table 19, which showed results for the race and gender intersections. Disability evidently has no unique or additional impact on the earnings of racial minority men and women. However, disability does impact the earnings of white disabled men such that they earn 10 percent less than non-disabled white men in male-dominated occupations and 9 percent less than non-disabled white men in all occupations. As already demonstrated, much of the disadvantage among Hispanic men is explained by the control variables related to class. There is very little variability among women compared to white men as they already start at a disadvantage. Therefore, among women there is less variability than among men who have higher income and greater range to start with. Among women, gender has the strongest impact on their earnings with race leading to slight difference and virtually no impact of disability. The greatest variability in earnings is seen in the all occupations category. Because all occupations are combined, this category would include the effects that gender of occupation has on earnings. For example, black men are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations; there are no significant differences in their wages within female-occupations. However, when we examine earnings within all occupations, we see that black men earn much less than white men. This wage gap can be explained, in part, by the fact that black men are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations, which have lower pay. The findings from this table demonstrate that the glass escalator is not only racialized, meaning that black and Hispanic men don't have male advantage in female-dominated

occupations in the same way as white men, but it is also able-bodied. We have seen that disabled white men are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations. As a result, disabled white men have an earnings disadvantage across occupations, which is likely due in part to their earnings in female-dominated occupations.

**Table 21: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings. Three Way Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income and Age**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .01                       | -.10*                   | -.06                     | -.09**          |
| Black                            | -.12                      | -.17***                 | -.16***                  | -.18***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.04                      | -.11***                 | -.14***                  | -.11***         |
| Female                           | -.10**                    | -.16***                 | -.20***                  | -.30***         |
| Disabled x female                | -.07                      | -.07                    | -.05                     | -.01            |
| Disabled x black                 | -.13                      | .12                     | -.15                     | -.00            |
| Disabled x Hispanic              | -.05                      | .04                     | -.09                     | .06             |
| Black x female                   | .10                       | .05                     | .13*                     | .16***          |
| Hispanic x female                | .04                       | .03                     | .12**                    | .09**           |
| Disabled x black x female        | .11                       | -.19                    | .16                      | .00             |
| Disabled x Hispanic x female     | .13                       | .35                     | .01                      | .06             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .13***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .22***                  | .19***                   | .22***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .41***                    | .33***                  | .28***                   | .32***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .60***                    | .61***                  | .60***                   | .58***          |
| Master's and above               | .83***                    | .79***                  | .85***                   | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.63***                   | -.51***                 | -.69***                  | -.65***         |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.73***   | -.98***   | -.88***   | -.87***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.03      | -.31***   | -.15***   | -.14***   |
| Local or state government worker | -.07**    | .10***    | -.19***   | -.10***   |
| Federal government worker        | .17***    | .21***    | .28***    | .23***    |
| Professional                     | .37***    | .38***    | .38***    | .36***    |
| Age                              | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    | .01***    |
| Married                          | .13***    | .25***    | .21***    | .22***    |
| Previously married               | .09***    | .16***    | .15***    | .15***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.08***   | -.01      | .00       | -.03**    |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.12***   | -.00      | .01       | -.03      |
| Intercept                        | 6.81***   | 7.09***   | 6.91***   | 6.72***   |
| F                                | 130.17*** | 128.18*** | 235.74*** | 476.33*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3896     | .3808     | .4559     | .4236     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

Table 21 summarizes the results of the multinomial and linear regressions side by side for reference.

**Table 22: Summary of Results**

|                    | Occupation type   | Income   |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Men                |   |  |
| Disabled white men | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More likely than non-disabled white men to work in female dominated occupations than mixed-gender occupations.</li> <li>• More likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated compared to male-dominated occupations.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earn 10 percent less than non-disabled white men in male-dominated occupations</li> <li>• Earn 9 percent less in all occupations</li> </ul> |

|                           |   |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Non-disabled Black men    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to male-dominated occupations.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earn 17 percent less than non-disabled white men in male-dominated occupations</li> <li>• Earn 16 percent less in mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• Earn 18 percent less in all occupations</li> </ul>  |
| Disabled Black men        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations.</li> <li>• Less likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant earnings outcome</li> </ul>  |
| Non-disabled Hispanic men | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant occupation difference after controlling for variables related to class and education</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earn 11 percent less than non-disabled white men in male-dominated occupations.</li> <li>• Earn 14 percent less than white men in mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• Earn 11 percent less in all occupations</li> </ul>  |
| Disabled Hispanic men     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant occupation difference</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant earnings outcome</li> </ul>  |
| Women                     |   |  |
| Non-disabled white women  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• Less likely than non-disabled white men to work in male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• More likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earn 10 percent less than non-disabled white men in female-dominated occupations</li> <li>• Earn 16 percent less than non-disabled white men in male-dominated occupations</li> <li>• Earn 20 percent less than non-disabled white men in mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• Earn 30 percent less than white men in all occupations</li> </ul> |

|                                    |  |   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Disabled white women</p>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher odds than non-disabled white women of working in female-dominated occupations than mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men</li> <li>• Lower odds than non-disabled white women of working in male-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant earnings outcome</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Non-disabled black women</p>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower odds than non-disabled white women of working in female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men</li> <li>• Higher odds than non-disabled white women of working in male-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations compared to white men</li> <li>• Lower odds than non-disabled white women of working in female-dominated versus male-dominated occupations compared to non-disabled white men</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earn 23 percent less than non-disabled white men in mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• Earn 32 percent less than non-disabled white men in all occupations</li> </ul> |
| <p>Disabled black women</p>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much higher odds than non-disabled white women of working in female-dominated occupations than mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men</li> <li>• Higher odds than non-disabled and disabled white women of working in male-dominated occupations versus mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant earnings outcome</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Non-disabled Hispanic women</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower odds than non-disabled white women of working in female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations compared to non-disabled white men</li> <li>• Lower odds than non-disabled white women of working in male-dominated occupations versus</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earn 22 percent less than non-disabled white men in mixed-gender occupations</li> <li>• Earn 32 percent less than non-disabled white men in all occupations</li> </ul> |

|                         |  |   |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | mixed-gender occupations   |   |
| Disabled Hispanic women | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant occupation difference</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant earnings outcome</li> </ul> |

**Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions**

This research examined how disability intersects with gender and race in influencing workplace outcomes, specifically placement into different occupational types and overall earnings. Acker (1990) argues that male bodies are the implicit norm in workplaces, resulting in men’s bodies and their relationships to procreation being the image of the ideal worker. Organizational policies, workplace processes, notions of productivity, and performance evaluations, among other things, flow from this male bodily standard. Women are disadvantaged in workplaces because their bodies are outside of those norms. Women’s bodies and their relationship to sexuality, procreation, and emotions are (thought to be) disruptive to the functioning of organizations built upon male bodies.

Organizations are structured in ways that assume implicit able-bodied and race biases that disadvantage disabled and racial minority workers (Cockburn 1991). Class, gender and racial inequalities are maintained within organizations through inequality regimes (Acker 2006). Class hierarchies are maintained in organizations through such organizational controls as job rankings, wage-setting processes, and supervision. The male advantage in workplaces extends across all occupations, including those that are female-dominated (Williams 1995; Budig 2002). However, this advantage is racialized (Winfield 2009) in that black men do not experience the same advantages as white men. It is also able-bodied (Woodhams, Lupton, and Cowling 2014) and

classed (Yavorsky, Cohen, and Qian 2016) to the extent that disabled men and racial minority men with lower educational backgrounds are more likely to be sorted into lower grade, female-dominated occupations. For disabled people, the ADA challenges the neutrality of workplaces by mandating reasonable accommodations for disabled workers (O'Brien 2005). However, research has found that employers resist accommodations and reinforce disabling work environments (Harlan and Roberts 1998), thereby upholding inequality regimes and creating an additional class disadvantage for disabled people.

Building on this literature, and using an intersectional analysis, this project examined workplace outcomes for disabled people with varying gender and racial statuses. Specifically, it focused on placement within gender types of occupations, and overall earnings from work. Mixed-gender occupations have the highest proportion of professional workers. Therefore, female-dominated and male-dominated occupations are both associated with lower income and non-professional occupations. Analyses revealed how marginalization and advantage sorts workers into occupations, demonstrating the implicit male, able-bodied and white biases in workplaces. I then examined how disability intersects with race and gender to predict gender of occupation. Building on previous research on how people are sorted in certain occupations based on these categorical statuses (Woodhams, Lupton, and Cowling 2014; Yavorsky, Cohen and Qian 2016), I ran multinomial logistic regressions to examine the likelihood of people with disabilities working in male-dominated, female-dominated, and mixed-gender occupations. In order to compare categorical disadvantage in earnings from paid work, I ran linear regressions testing income from paid work within male-dominated, female-dominated, mixed-gender occupations and across all occupations. I used only respondents between the ages of 18-65 who were employed in the reference month. I controlled for human capital factors and class by

controlling for education (Budig 2002) and for professional occupations. In addition, I controlled for factors which are likely to contribute to gender, disability, and racial differences in occupation, such as part-time employment and sector of work. Women, racial and ethnic minorities, and disabled people are more likely to work in temporary and part-time jobs (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016). Controlling for these variables isolated that effect. I coded workplace sector into three categories: private for-profit, private not-for-profit, state and local government worker, and federal government worker. I used private for-profit as the reference category. Black women are less likely than white women to work in the private sector (Higginbotham 1994) which may account for some occupational variability among women. I controlled for family variables that can also contribute to workplace outcomes for women, such as marital status and the presence of children under the age of 18 in the household (Budig and England 2001). Finally, I controlled for whether someone lives in a metropolitan area. Prior research has shown that Hispanic and black men are overrepresented in female-dominated occupations compared to white men (Duffy 2007; Wingfield 2009), and that disabled men are also more likely than non-disabled men to work in female-dominated occupations (Woodhams, Lupton, and Cowling 2014). Black and Hispanic men are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations at all education levels though this is exacerbated at the lower level of the class spectrum (Yavorsky Cohen and Qian 2016). To my knowledge, no study has examined how the effect of race may vary based on disability.

Thus, my first research question asked, “Do race, gender, and physical disability influence the likelihood of placement in male-dominated, female-dominated or mixed-gender occupations?” Findings from this question indicate whether disability impacts the gender of occupation for disabled men and women. A positive finding shows that workplaces are not only

gendered but that people are also sorted into occupations based on their disability status. Further, if race and disability intersect to influence gender of occupation, it shows that the effect of disability on gender of occupation depends on gender and race. To address that broad question, I asked, “Are disabled men and women more likely to work in female-dominated occupations or male-dominated occupations than are non-disabled men and women?” The descriptive statistics suggested that there is some occupational difference between disabled and non-disabled people. While the highest proportion of both disabled and non-disabled people worked in mixed-gender occupations, among disabled people, more people worked in female-dominated jobs than in male-dominated jobs. At the same time, the reverse was true for non-disabled people.

While the descriptive statistics showed the trends in gender of occupation for survey respondents, the multinomial logistic regressions tested the odds of all physically disabled people working in particular gender-typed occupations. I ran the multinomial regression first with only the independent variables of disability, race, and gender. In that regression, gender was the only variable that had a significant effect on gendered occupation. Women were more likely than men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to both male-dominated and mixed-gender occupations. Compared to men, women are also more likely to work in mixed-gender occupations than male-dominated occupations. I ran the regression again with control variables related to work factors, professional occupations, and with controls related to family, such as marital status and the presence of young children in the household. I found that, absent any intersections, disability alone did not have an impact on the odds of placement into particular occupations. This suggests that the differences shown in the descriptive statistics may be due to factors other than disability. Disabled people’s placement into occupations may depend on other factors which were controlled for and other factors that are not included in this study such as the

industry of the occupation. Without intersections, the multinomial regression did not show an effect of disability on gender of occupation, with or without control variables. Therefore, in answer to the above question, while there may be higher proportion of disabled people in female-dominated occupations than in male-dominated occupations, they do not seem to have increased odds of working in those occupations due to their disability. Therefore, disability by itself does not appear to affect how people are sorted into occupations. However, disability may have an effect on occupation to the extent that disability influences education. If someone is born with a disability or becomes disabled early in life then they will begin to experience disadvantage much sooner in ways which will affect their education and ultimately, their employment outcomes. In addition, the effects of disability are different depending on gender and race therefore, the intersectional analysis is important to reveal the ways in which disability overlaps with other categories.

### *Research Question 2*

Because the impacts of different statuses may intersect in particular ways, in this study, I used an inter-categorical approach to study intersectional effects of placement into gendered occupations (McCall 2005). This approach makes comparisons across multiple categories in order to simultaneously examine both advantage and disadvantage (McCall 2005). To examine the intersectional effects, I asked, “do racial minority disabled and non-disabled men and women work in different types of occupations from disabled and non-disabled white men and women?” I compare the following categories against the reference category of non-disabled white men: non-disabled white women, disabled white women, disabled white men, non-disabled black women, disabled black women, nondisabled black men, disabled black men, non-disabled Hispanic women, disabled Hispanic women, non-disabled Hispanic men, and disabled Hispanic men. As

above, I ran the regression first without control variables and again with control variables related to work, and family. The question asked whether racial minority disabled and non-disabled men and women work in different occupations than white disabled and non-disabled men and women. To answer that question, I start with findings from the comparison among disabled people with non-disabled white men as the reference category. Disabled white men are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations when compared to both mixed-gender and male-dominated occupations. On the other hand, disabled black men are less likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations, compared to both mixed-gender and male-dominated occupations. There were no significant effects for disabled Hispanic men. Therefore, there are racial differences in occupation type among disabled men with white disabled men being more likely to work in female-dominated occupations while disabled black men are not. The literature showed that disabled men and black men are both more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female dominated occupations. An additive approach would suggest that disabled black men would be even more likely than non-disabled white to work in female-dominated occupations based on both their gender and disability. However, using an intersectional approach, we find that disabled black men are actually even *less* likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations. Research on gender and disability suggest disabled men are perceived as more feminine and therefore may be steered into more feminized jobs (Gerschick 1994; Mik-Meyer 2015). At the same time, other research suggested that black men are steered into female-dominated occupations because they are blocked from male-dominated occupations by white men (Yavorsky, Cohen and Qian 2016). From my study, we now know that not all disabled men have the same occupational outcomes, and that this variation depends on race. A reason for this difference may be that black and white

men are gendered differently. That is, white disabled men may be perceived as more feminine based on their physical impairments. Within female-dominated occupations there are clerical jobs as well as more physical care work and so-called “dirty work” (Duffy 2007). White men in female-dominated occupations have been shown to work in more administrative jobs within female dominated occupations (Williams 1995) while black men are steered into more physical jobs (Wingfield 2009; Duffy 2007). Therefore, disabled white men may then be steered into clerical jobs which don’t require physical labor. However, if black men are perceived to be less competent than white men in workplaces and better suited to more physically demanding jobs (Wingfield 2009), then the perception of their ability to work would be strongly influenced by their physical disability. This means that, while disabled white men may be presumed competent to perform non-physical tasks within female-dominated occupations, black disabled men may be presumed to have less value in female-dominated occupations in the absence of physical ability. These findings are quantitative evidence that gender and disability intersect in unique ways for men with physical disabilities. Disability has unique effect on the occupations of disabled white men. White disabled men are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations than non-disabled white men. Their physical disability blocks their ability to access hegemonic masculinity and the associated privilege. In addition, the findings for disabled black men cannot be explained based solely on their race or their disability because these findings are opposite those of disabled white men and non-disabled black men. Disability has a unique effect on black disabled white men that cannot be explained by their race or disability.

Among disabled women, the differences are not as clear cut as among men. In comparison to non-disabled white men, we find that all of the women are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. When ranking their odds

ratios, disabled black women have the highest odds of working female-dominated versus mixed-gender occupations followed by disabled white women and non-disabled white women.

Therefore disability intensifies the likelihood of working in female-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations for white and black disabled women. Similarly, in the comparison between male-dominated and mixed-gender occupations, all categories of women are less likely than non-disabled white men to work in male-dominated occupations. Disabled white women have the lowest odds of working male-dominated compared to mixed-gender occupations followed by non-disabled white women, and finally disabled black women. When this regression was run with non-disabled white women as the reference category, these differences among women were significant, including the finding that disabled black and Hispanic women were both more likely than non-disabled white women to work in male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations (Table A15). Therefore, disability does not always intensify the effect of gender for disabled women of color as black disabled women are more likely than non-disabled white women to work in occupations dominated by men. This also means that disabled black women are less likely than non-disabled white men to work in mixed-gender occupations compared to both female-dominated and male-dominated occupations. Female-dominated and male-dominated occupations both have lower pay and less professional occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. The literature suggested that all disabled women would have a higher odds of working female-dominated occupations. However, there was an unexpected result for disabled black women who had a higher odds of working in male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, as was the case among disabled men, black and white disabled women are gendered differently in ways that are not predicted by the literature. Female-dominated occupations are

less likely than mixed-gender occupations to have professional occupations and have lower pay. The same is true for male-dominated occupations compared to mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, the finding that disabled black women are less likely to work in mixed-gender occupations compared to both male-dominated and female-dominated occupations indicates that black disabled women tend to be sorted toward non-professional occupations. There are no significant differences for disabled Hispanic women when compared to non-disabled white men. These findings demonstrate that disability intensifies the effects of gender for disabled white women. Researchers have described this effect as a double disadvantage but when we intersect gender and disability with race we find that disability does not have the same effect for disabled black women as it does for disabled white women. Therefore, this is evidence that the additive approach used by researchers studying gender and disability is in fact, and intersectional effect meaning that disability has unique effects on disabled black women compared to disabled white women.

In terms of differences between non-disabled people, my findings confirm those of other studies which show that black men are more likely than white men to work in female-dominated occupations when compared to male-dominated occupations. What this study finds that other research has not is that this only applies to non-disabled black men. The categorical approach to intersectionality employed in this study allows us to see that the previous findings regarding the higher odds of black men and disabled men working in female-dominated occupations does not apply to *all* disabled men or *all* black men. For non-disabled Hispanic men, no significant occupational differences compared to non-disabled white men emerged after controlling for other variables related to class such as education and professional occupation. This is important because 84 percent of Hispanics work in non-professional jobs. Thus, for Hispanic men, this

study demonstrated that class, measured by education and professional occupation, has a stronger impact on how they are sorted into occupations than race.

Among non-disabled women, white women are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to both mixed-gender occupations and male-dominated occupations. They are less likely to work in male-dominated occupations than mixed-gender occupations. In contrast to white women, we find that black women have lower odds of working in female-dominated occupations compared to both mixed-gender occupations and male-dominated occupations. They have higher odds of working in male-dominated occupations versus mixed gender occupations. Non-disabled Hispanic women have higher odds than white women of working in mixed-gender occupations compared to both male-dominated and female-dominated occupations. Therefore, these findings demonstrate that for women, the effect of gender on occupation varies depending on race.

These findings suggest a number of things. First, present theories about gender and disability more accurately describe the experiences of white people with disabilities. Theories about disabled women focus on the frailty of disabled women's bodies. By contrast, Sojourner Truth flexes her muscle and asks, "Ain't I a woman?" (Guy-Shetfall 1995) While Sojourner Truth was not disabled, it is clear that, like disability, blackness is a departure from traditional ideals of femininity (Shaw 2006). As Gerschick (2000) argued, gender is made visible and is recognized through the body, meaning that the bodies of physically disabled people may not be recognized as being appropriately gendered. Taking this argument further, we can see that bodily standards of gender are based on white gendered norms. Black women, like disabled men and women, have bodily traits that are different from the white gendered norms and thus are also not recognized as being appropriately gendered (Shaw 2006). Disabled black women are not

feminized in the same way as disabled white men and women because black women were already set outside the norms of traditional white femininity. In particular, black women's labor has been exploited as black women themselves are treated as "mules or, living machines" (Collins 1990). While white women are viewed as frail, black women have worked alongside black men since slavery thus, are not subjected to the same standards of femininity as white women. Therefore a black feminist theory of gender and disability is needed to examine the ways that black women experience physical disability in ways that are different from both white disabled women and black disabled men,

Second, race and gender intersect in important ways among non-disabled people to predict placement into occupational types. The findings for non-disabled black men demonstrate unique effects compared to non-disabled white men. Non-disabled black men are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations compared to both mixed-gender occupations and male-dominated occupations. This is opposite to the effect found for non-disabled black women, who are more likely to work in male-dominated occupations than female-dominated occupations. Thus, for black men and women, race predicts that they have higher odds of working in gender atypical jobs. Again, this suggests that black men and women are not gendered in the same way as white men and women, thus influencing the kinds of jobs that they are likely to occupy. Due to the history of slavery, black women and white women are gendered differently and are not viewed to occupy the same place in society. Modern stereotypes of black women as single mothers also impact the way they are viewed by employers in the job market (Kennelly 1999). This study found that gender, race and disability all intersect in ways that cannot be separated when examining placement into gendered occupations. When intersections were not considered, this research revealed nothing of note regarding how people

are sorted into occupation type. However, when race and gender intersections were analyzed, we find that black men and black women are sorted into different occupation types from each other in ways which cancelled each other out in the model where race was not intersected with gender. Similarly, there were no significant intersection between gender and disability until the third prong of race was added to the intersection demonstrating that black disabled men and women have different occupational outcomes than white disabled men and women. Finally, we find that Hispanic men are primarily sorted into occupations based on class.

Taking these findings together, and in relation to my research question, it is clear that racial minority disabled and non-disabled men and women work in different types of occupations from disabled and non-disabled white men and women. Gender, race, and disability all impact placement into certain gendered occupations such that the effects cannot be separated. The findings that people are sorted into occupations based on gender, race, and disability reveal how privilege and disadvantage operate in relation to occupation. Starting from Acker's (1990) perspective of the disembodied male worker, women are already at a disadvantage in workplaces. But gender has a race; and thus we see different outcomes among men and women of different races. These findings demonstrate that the disembodied worker on which norms in organizations are built is not only a man, but an able-bodied, white man. The categorical approach utilized in this project demonstrated not only how the overlapping categories of race, gender and disability impact disadvantage but also how they impact privilege. This project demonstrated that men lose the status and privileges of the disembodied male worker when their bodies are marked by disability and/or race.

### *Research Question 3*

The previous question demonstrated that gender, disability and race all impact how workers are sorted into occupations. Now, we turn to an analysis of income in order to examine how advantage and disadvantage operate within occupations. Disability is strongly associated with low socio-economic class (Stapleton et. al. 2006; Maroto, Pettiniccio and Patterson 2018). Disabled people who rely on disability income from SSI or SSDI are penalized if they earn too much money. For instance, they risk loss of health insurance benefits from Medicare or Medicaid. This creates a poverty trap for disabled people (Stapleton et al 2006). While disabled people who receive disability benefits may intentionally limit their income they also face structural disadvantages in the workplace. Disabled people who are actively working or looking for work face much higher rates of unemployment and lower wages compared to non-disabled people (Schur et. al. 2017; Brault 2012; Pettinicchio and Maroto 2017). Disabled people are also more likely to work in part-time, contingent jobs (Schur 2003) and jobs where they have less job security (Schur et. al. 2017; Maroto and Pettinicchio 2014). They also tend to be employed in jobs where they have little power to negotiate reasonable accommodations, something that might be necessary for their success at work (Robert and Harlan 2006). All of these factors influence disabled people's earnings from paid work and indicate that they are likely to earn less than non-disabled people. However, researchers have not compared the effects of gender and race on disabled people's earnings in paid work in different gendered occupations.

This analysis examines wage inequality within occupation types. Because of the gendered nature of organizations and gendered segregation of jobs, research finds that men earn more than women and further, that men maintain their advantage in workplaces even when they are tokens, as is the case in female-dominated occupations (Williams 1995). However, racial and ethnic minority men do not have that same advantage; they do not necessarily reap the benefits of male

privilege in workplaces (Wingfield 2009; Woodhans et al 2015). Such findings extend to earnings; race and gender impact men's and women's workplace experiences such that that women and people of color face disadvantages in earnings regardless of the gender of occupation (Hegewisch and Williams-Baron 2017). Researchers have demonstrated that the effects of race and gender cannot be separated with regard to wage inequality (Greenman and Xie 2008). Racial minority women experience a smaller race and gender penalty in wages in comparison to both racial minority men and white women. This does not mean that they are more advantaged, but rather that the intersection of race and gender position them in a unique position relative to racial minority men and white women. Gender does not affect racial minority women's earnings as much because they are already disadvantaged due to race, and thus their earnings, and the range of income, is smaller. Similarly, race has a smaller impact on racial minority women's earnings because they are already disadvantaged by gender. The same is true for gender and disability where researchers have found that men's earnings are impacted more strongly by disability than women, and that highly educated white men are impacted the most by disability (Pettinicchio and Maroto 2017; Maroto and Pettinicchio 2018). Physical disability impacts the ability of men to access roles associated with hegemonic masculinity (Gerschick 1998). This will have a particular impact on the most privileged men. Therefore, this project intersects disability with race and gender in order to demonstrate the effect of what Maroto and colleagues (2018) call, "hierarchies of categorical disadvantage" in different occupation types.

Thus, my third research question asked, "Do race, gender and disability intersect to influence earnings within female-dominated, male-dominated and mixed-gender occupations?" To answer that broad question, I asked, "Do disabled men and women differ from non-disabled men and women in terms of earnings in gendered occupations?" And, "are there unique

differences in earnings for disabled men and women of different races?” To answer these questions, I ran linear regressions with a dependent variable of the natural log of monthly earnings. I ran the regressions within every occupation type, and also across all occupations in order to capture the inequality between occupations. Female-dominated occupations have lower wages compared to male-dominated occupations. Therefore, it is unlikely that there will be very much variability within female-dominated occupations. So, by adding an analysis of all occupations in the model I examined how wage inequality operates between occupations and how that affects disadvantaged groups who are more likely to work in lower-paying occupations.

I used control variables likely to influence earnings, such as disability income, age, professional occupation, education, sector of work, and part-time status. I used intersections of race, gender, and disability in order to examine how male privilege may be affected by race and disability. The reference category for the three-way intersections is non-disabled white men. Based on the literature, I expected to find that non-disabled white men will have higher earnings than non-disabled white women in all occupational categories. The results show how men may lose privilege based on race and disability and whether those results extend across all occupational types.

After all the control variables were included, no differences emerged among men and women in female-dominated occupations. However, non-disabled white women earn 10 percent less than non-disabled white men in female-dominated occupations. This confirms the glass escalator effect that refers to the fact that even within occupations dominated by women, non-disabled white men are advantaged. The wages in female-dominated occupations are already lower than male-dominated and mixed-gender occupations. Therefore, women have an added disadvantage in making 10 percent less than men in an occupation type with already low wages.

Also, due to the lower wages in female-dominated occupations, there is less variability among men and women based on race and disability.

Within male-dominated occupations, non-disabled white men earn 16 percent more than non-disabled white women. There are no significant results among women in male-dominated occupations. In male-dominated occupations, we do find differences among men. Disability leads to disadvantage in male-dominated occupations as disabled white men earn 10 percent less than non-disabled white men. Race also has an impact on earnings as non-disabled black men earn 17 percent less than non-disabled white men. Non-disabled Hispanic men earn 11 percent less than non-disabled white men. The earnings disadvantage for non-disabled Hispanic men decreased substantially after controlling for class variables such as education, and professional occupation. Therefore, while Hispanic men face disadvantage based on race, they also have a stronger class disadvantage than other men. Disability had no impact on the earnings of women and racial minority men.

Within mixed-gender occupations, we find variability among both men and women. There is no effect of disability among men. However, non-disabled black men earn 16 percent less than non-disabled white men and non-disabled Hispanic men earn 14 percent less than non-disabled white men. Again, Hispanic men's income was affected by class more than any other category, including Hispanic women. Non-disabled white women earn 20 percent less than non-disabled white men within mixed-gender occupations. Non-disabled Hispanic women earn 22 percent less than non-disabled white men and non-disabled black women earn 23 percent less. Therefore, race makes less of a difference in wages among women because their wages are already much lower than non-disabled white men's. When the regression was run with non-disabled white women as the reference category there were no significant racial differences in

earnings among women (see appendix table A31). However, compared to non-disabled white women, disabled white women earned 11 percent less in male-dominated occupations demonstrating again that disability has the most impact on more privileged groups. However, this effect is not significant in comparison to non-disabled white men due to the already steep gender disadvantage. In addition, the male advantage in earnings among racial minorities is much lower among racial minority men and women. White men earn as much as 20 percent more than white women. Black men earn about 7 percent more than black women and Hispanic men earn 8 percent more than Hispanic women compared to white men.

Finally, in the category of all occupations, we can see the effects of wage inequality across the different occupation types. Disability, gender, and race all have a significant impact on earnings. Starting with men, we find that disabled white men earn 9 percent less than non-disabled white men. This can be due to the fact that they are more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations which have lower wages. Also, as we have seen, disabled white men earn 10 percent less than non-disabled white men in male-dominated occupations which also is reflected in this number. Black men are also more likely than non-disabled white men to work in female-dominated occupations and we find that across occupations they earn a total of 18 percent less in all occupations. Non-disabled Hispanic men earn 11 percent less than white men in all occupations. Among women, we find that non-disabled white women earn 30 percent less than non-disabled white men across all occupations. This large number is likely due to occupational segregation and the low wages in female-dominated occupations. Similarly, we find that both non-disabled black and Hispanic women earn 32 percent less than white men in all occupations. Therefore, all women face a large gender disadvantage in earnings in wages compared to white men, likely due to both gender inequality

and occupational segregation. Race leads to very little variability among women; however, all women seemed to be affected by occupational segregation. In fact, when the regression was run with non-disabled white women as the reference category, there were no significant differences between women (table A31). However, disabled white women earned 10 percent less than non-disabled white women. Age has an impact on earnings as well. Within occupations and across all occupations, age leads to a one percent increase in earnings for each year. This had the greatest impact on disabled people because they tend to be older than non-disabled people. Only after controlling for age we find that disabled people do in fact face disadvantage based on disability.

The findings for earnings confirm the importance of using an intersectional approach to study income inequality. Greenman and Xie (2008) explored the effects of gender and race on earnings and demonstrated that those effects cannot be examined separately. Indeed, this study found that the effect of race on income in occupations was much stronger for racial minority men than for racial minority women. This dovetails with Greenman and Xie's finding that the race penalty in wages is smaller among women than men because women start at a disadvantage. However, these comparisons are further complicated by the addition of class. Hispanic men had disproportionately high earnings disadvantages that were ultimately explained by class. Furthermore, if disabled people enter the workplace at a class disadvantage, then they are likely to face barriers to receiving needed accommodations at work thus maintaining that class disadvantage (Harlan and Roberts 1998; Schur et al 2009). The disadvantage experienced by disabled people could also be influenced by when they become disabled. If someone was born disabled or became disabled early in life, they may face barriers in education and other opportunities that may cause them to enter the labor market at a disadvantage.

Maroto, Pettinicchio, and Patterson (2018) found hierarchies of disadvantage based the overlapping statuses of race, gender, and disability. Their analysis went further than the current study by examining poverty and total income from all sources. Their measure of total income included income from employment, government, savings, and other areas. Similar to this study, they found that disability had the greatest effect on total income for more advantaged groups. In particular, the group most effected by disability was men with higher levels of education. Less educated women with disabilities earned the least. In contrast to the measure of total income, when they measured poverty rates they found that the effects of disability were stronger for women and racial minorities. They refer to this effect as “Hierarchies of categorical disadvantage” demonstrating that overlapping oppressions of race, gender and disability are embedded and reproduced in larger social structures (Maroto, Pettinicchio, and Patterson 2018). This project dovetails with Maroto and colleagues (2018) work by demonstrating similar hierarchies with regard to income from employment. This project demonstrated that women and racial/ethnic minorities have the most disadvantage in earnings from paid work. For racial minorities, disability does not have an additional impact on that disadvantage. However, compared to non-disabled white men, disability does lead to disadvantage in earnings for disabled white men. Similarly when the comparison category is non-disabled white women, disability only impacts the earnings of disabled white women. Therefore, gender, disability and race intersect to create and maintain these hierarchies of disadvantage in earnings from paid work where women earn less than men, racial minority men earn less than white men, and disabled white men and women earn less than non-disabled white men and women.

Finally, we find that the glass escalator is not only racialized, meaning that racial minority men do not reap the male advantage in female-dominated occupations, but the glass

escalator may also be inaccessible to men with physical disabilities. Racial minority men had a significant earnings disadvantage compared to white men in female-dominated occupations, which disappeared after controlling for professional occupation and education. Therefore, racial minority men face disadvantages in female-dominated occupations by working in lower-class jobs within these occupations than white men do. Black men are more likely than white men to work in low paying female-dominated occupations, and the impact of this is reflected in the fact that they earn 18 percent less than white men across occupations. Disabled white men are also more likely than non-disabled white men to work female-dominated occupations; this may explain why they earn 9 percent less than non-disabled white men across all occupations. This effect is not as strong as the disadvantage experienced by black men; more research is needed to confirm whether the glass escalator is indeed inaccessible to men with physical disabilities.

### *Conclusion*

This research contributes to the literature on gendered organizations by demonstrating that the ideal worker in organizations is an able-bodied white man. Those who are outside of that norm may be sorted into occupations based on the intersections of their race, disability and gender. Using a large nationally representative data set, I was able to explore these relationships in a way that is generalization to the entire population. This study confirmed that men have an income advantage across all occupation types and that this advantage does not extend to racial/ethnic minority or disabled men (Williams 1995; Budig 2002). It also dovetails with Greenman and Xie's finding regarding the importance of an intersectional approach to examining income inequality, and that the race penalty in wages is higher for men than for women. This study also found that black men and disabled white men are likely to work in female-dominated jobs. Finally, this study gives new evidence to Maroto and colleague's (2018)

theory of hierarchies of disadvantage by demonstrating that disabled whites feel the impact of disability the strongest while racial minority men and women face the greatest disadvantage compared to non-disabled white men in occupational outcomes.

This research contributes to the literature on men in female-dominated occupations by providing quantitative evidence that only non-disabled Black men and disabled white men are more likely to work in female-dominated occupations. Previous research suggests that both disabled men and racial/ethnic minority men are more likely to work female-dominated occupations due to their marginalized status in society. An additive approach would suggest that disabled racial/ethnic minority men are even more likely to work in female-dominated occupations. However, this was not the case in this study, as disabled black men had *lower* odds of working in female-dominated occupations. Uncovering a unique effect for disabled racial/ethnic minority people in occupations is new in the research on gendered occupations, and it underlines the importance of Erevelles and Minear's (2010) suggestion that intersectionality studies must fully integrate disability as a minority group in research. White disabled men and women were sorted into occupations in expected ways based on the literature. However, black disabled men and women were sorted into different occupations from white disabled men and women. This highlights the importance of fully integrating race into theories and studies about disability.

Thus, this study contributes to intersectionality research by showing that disability and gender intersect in unique ways. In particular, that there are unique effects on occupational outcomes for both black and white disabled men. For white men, disability intersects with gender such that they cannot access the roles of hegemonic masculinity. This results in disabled white men being more likely to work in female-dominated occupations, and earning less in male

dominated occupations and all occupations compared to non-disabled white men. When intersected with race, disability has the opposite effect on the occupations of black men and no additional impact on their earnings. For white women, disability intensifies the effects of gender making them even more likely to work in female-dominated occupations; disability leads to an additional disadvantage in earnings for disabled white women only when compared to non-disabled white women. However, disability has different effects on the occupation type and no additional effect on earnings of black women who are already outside of the gendered norms impacting white women. Therefore, it is clear that disability is an important axis of inequality for intersectional studies. This project demonstrated that disability only has an additive effect on employment outcomes of disabled white women. When intersected with other categories such as disabled white men and disabled black women, disability leads to unique outcomes that cannot be explained in any other way.

Finally, this research highlights the importance of class for Hispanics. Class was measured by non-professional occupations and education. In this project, eighty-four percent of Hispanics worked in non-professional jobs. Thus, we find that the gender of occupation for Hispanic men is explained by their class. In addition, class led to large earnings disadvantages for Hispanic men. However, after education and professional occupation were controlled, Hispanic men still had an earnings disadvantage based on race. Hispanic women were not affected by class in the same way as Hispanic men. This is likely due to the fact that they are already at a large disadvantage based on gender. However, Hispanic women differed from other women in that they had higher odds of working in mixed-gender occupations versus both male-dominated and female-dominated occupations. Examples of non-professional mixed-gender occupations are textile workers, food preparation workers, laundry and dry cleaning workers. In

addition, Hispanic women's earnings were less affected by class than Hispanic men. Therefore, while class mattered to for all categories in the analysis, the effects were felt the strongest by Hispanic men. While this is an important finding, it must be understood in the context of how the data were collected. Hispanic ethnicity was asked as a separate category from racial identity and thus the groups were not mutually exclusive. Although the variable was recoded into mutually exclusive categories, the method of data collection may nevertheless effect the patterns of racial difference in the project. Notably, research has found that black Hispanics have more similar labor market outcomes with blacks than with white Hispanics. Comparing non-Hispanic whites to blacks and Hispanics would increase the differences between whites and Hispanics may have the effect of reducing the difference between blacks and whites (Williams 1996). This doesn't mean that these findings are unreliable simply that using Hispanic as a racial category has some complexity that should be acknowledged.

### *Limitations*

This project is limited by several factors. First, although the data used have a large sample of disabled people, an even larger sample size—or one that oversamples racial and ethnic minorities—could measure racial minority disabled people more accurately. For instance, being able to disaggregate Hispanics could help us to understand how and for which groups class matters. Second, because this is the first project to conduct a quantitative analysis of how disabled people are sorted into gendered occupations, it is limited by the lack of previous, proven measures. Most prior research cited in this study utilized qualitative measures that may not necessarily apply to quantitative findings. Third, a more accurate measure of class may have been effective in revealing the background effects of class that influenced how people are sorted into occupations and the wage inequality they face. Finally, this study is limited by the fact that I

did not measure when people became disabled. People who become disabled earlier in life will likely have different workplace experiences than people who become disabled after they enter the workforce.

### *Recommendations for future research*

This study points to important avenues for future research. First, more research is needed concerning the experiences of black and Hispanic disabled people in the workplace. As noted above, disability studies and disability culture had been focused mainly on white disabled people (Devlieger and Albrecht 2000; Bell 2010). Thus, while quantitative studies like this one, may uncover trends among disabled people of color, it is difficult to interpret these results using theoretical frameworks that may not apply to their experiences. Furthermore, disability should be incorporated into intersectional studies. Too often disability is either left out of such studies or treated as a medical impairment rather than a marginalized identity. Disability is more than a medical condition. More research is needed to explore how disadvantages based on disability intersects with other marginalized categorical statuses. This study demonstrated that disability leads to disadvantage and inequality in society. In addition, disability, particularly physical disability, can be heavily influenced by environments. Therefore, future sociological studies of disability should move away using a medical model of disability and instead use the social model of disability. In order to best examine the social model of disability, researchers should use multi-level analyses which account for the ways in which disability is constructed by environments.

As well, this study only focused on disabled people with physical impairments. future research should examine these trends for disabled people who have other kinds of impairments. Sensory impairments such as vision and hearing loss, and non-visible cognitive and mental

health conditions will likely lead to different occupational outcomes than those of physical disabilities.

Finally, in order to better understand how gender operates differently for disabled people compared to non-disabled people future studies should examine difference among parents of children under the age of 18. Researchers have argued that disabled people are not gendered in the same way as non-disabled people. Parenthood may have a positive impact on the perception of disabled people as being appropriately gendered.

#### *Recommendations for disability advocacy groups*

This study highlights the importance of an intersectional approach to understanding workplace inequality. Disabled people of color may not conceptualize their disadvantages in terms of disability rights; they may see their disadvantage as more strongly associated with their race. Disability advocacy groups should conduct focused research on disabled people of color and find out how they view themselves in relation to workplace inequality. Disability rights organizations should not limit themselves to advocating in situations where the barrier is specific to disability. For disabled people of color, disability is often not their first issue; often, other barriers related to their race contribute to their inequality. In the comparison of wage inequality among employed people, disability only impacted the earnings of white men. Other groups are at a disadvantage but disability has the greatest impact on the most privileged group. An intersectional approach to advocacy would recognize that even systemic action which intervenes to address barriers on the single axis of disability is not enough to address the issues faced by disabled people of racial ethnic minority status. In addition, white, black, Hispanic, and other racial/ethnic minority disabled people may have very different experiences from each other in the workplace.



## References

- Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4:139-158.
- . 2006. "Inequality Regimes Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender and Society* 20:441-464.
- Asch, A. and Fine, M., 1992. Beyond pedestals: Revisiting the lives of women with disabilities. *Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research*: 139-174.
- Barnes, Colin. 2000. "A Working Social Model? Disability, Work and Disability Politics in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." *Critical Social Policy*. 20: 441-
- Barnes, Colin, and Geof Mercer. 2005. "Disability, work, and welfare: challenging the social exclusion of disabled people." *Work, Employment, and Society*. 19(3): 527–545
- Barnes, Colin, Geof Mercer, and Tom Shakespeare. 1999. *Exploring Disability: A Sociological Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Barton, L., 1996. Sociology and disability: some emerging issues. *Disability and society: Emerging issues and insights*: 3-17.
- Befort, Stephen F. 2013. "An Empirical Examination of Case Outcomes Under the ADA Amendments Act." *Washington and Lee Law Review* 70 (4): 2027-2071.
- Bell, Chris. 2010. "Is Disability Studies Actually White Disability Studies?" pp. 374-382 in *The Disability Studies Reader*. Edited by Lennard J. Davis. New York: Routledge.
- Bobbitt-Zeher, Donna. "Gender Discrimination at Work: Connecting Gender Stereotypes, Institutional Policies, and Gender Composition of Workplace." 2011. *Gender and Society* 25(3): 764-86.
- Bowen, Mary Elizabeth and Hector González M. 2010. "Childhood Socioeconomic Position and Disability in Later Life: Results of the Health and Retirement Study." *American Journal of Public Health* 100: S197-203.
- Brault, Matthew W. 2012. "Americans with Disabilities, 2010." *Current Population Reports*. US Census Bureau: 70-131
- Browne, Irene, and Joya Misra. 2003. "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 487-513.
- Budig, Michelle. 2002. "Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator?" *Social Problems*. 49(2): 258-277
- Budig, Michelle, and Paula England. 2001. "The Wage Penalty for Motherhood." *American Sociological Review* 66:204–25.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2016. "Persons With A Disability: Labor Force Characteristics — 2015." *News Release: June 21, 2016*.

- Byron, Reginald A. and Vincent Roscigno. 2014. "Relational Power, Legitimation, and Pregnancy Discrimination." *Gender and Society*. 28(3): 435–462.
- Choo, H.Y. and Ferree, M.M., 2010. Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological theory*. 28(2):129-149.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. 1993. *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. New York: ILR Press.
- Colker, Ruth. 1999. "The Americans With Disabilities Act: A Windfall for Defendants." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 34:99-162.
- Collins, P.H., 2002. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Correll, Shelley J., Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty?." *American journal of sociology* 112(5): 1297-1338.
- Conrad, P. and Barker, K.K., 2010. The social construction of illness: Key insights and policy implications. *Journal of health and social behavior*. 51(1\_suppl):S67 -S79.
- Clarke, Averil Y. and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Intersectionality and Social Explanation In Social Science Research." *DuBois Review*. 10(2): 349–363.
- Crenshaw, K., 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *U. Chi. Legal F.*:139.
- Deegan, Mary Jo and Nancy A . Brooks. 1985. *Women and disability : the double handicap*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.
- Devlieger, P.J. and Albrecht, G.L., 2000. "Your experience is not my experience: the concept and experience of disability on Chicago's near west side." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 11(1):51-60.
- Dick-Mosher, J. 2015. "Bodies in Contempt: Gender, Class and Disability Intersections in Workplace Discrimination Claims." *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 35(3).
- Donelson, Baker. 2017. "Federal Court Declines to Overturn \$780,000 Jury Verdict in Favor of Employer's Argument that Application for SSDI Trumps the ADA." *JDSupra*.
- Duffy, Mignon. 2007. "Doing the Dirty Work: Gender, race, and reproductive labor in historical perspective. *Gender & Society* 21:313-36.
- Erevelles, Nirmala, and Andrea Minear. 2010. "Unspeakable Offenses: Untangling Race and Disability in Discourses of Intersectionality." *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*. 4(2): 127-146.
- Fine, Michelle and Adrienne Asch. 1988. *Disabled women: Essays in Psychology, Culture and Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Garland Thomson, Rosemarie. 2011. "Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory" Pages 13-47 in *Feminist Disability Studies* edited by Kim Q. Hall. Indiana UP.
- Gerschick, Thomas J. 1998. "Sisyphus in a Wheelchair: Men with Physical Disabilities Face Gender Domination." Pp. 189-211 in *Everyday Inequalities: Critical Inquiries*. Edited by, Jodi O'Brien and Judith Howard. Wiley.
- Gerschick, Thomas J. 2000. "Toward a theory of disability and gender." *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society* 25\*(4): 1263-1268.
- Gerschick, Thomas J., and A.S. Miller. 1994 "Gender Identities at a Crossroads of Masculinity and Physical Disability." *Masculinities*. 2(1):34-55.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Greenman, E., & Xie, Y. 2008. "Double Jeopardy? The Interaction of Gender and Race on Earnings in the United States." *Social Forces*. 86(3), 1217-1244.
- Gregory, Stevens R. 2004. "Disability: Federal Service Definitions, Measurements, and Estimates." *AARP Public Policy Institute*. Data Digest No. 98.
- Guy-Shetfall, Beverly. 1995. *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African American Feminist Thought*. New York: The New Press
- Haber, Lawrence D. and Richard T. Smith. 1971. "Disability and Deviance: Normative Adaptations of Role Behavior." *American Sociological Review* 36:87-97.
- Hahn, Harlan. 1988. "The Politics of Physical Differences: Disability and Discrimination." *Journal of Social Issues* 44:39-47.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S., and Jeff E. Biddle. 1993. *Beauty and the labor market*. No. 4518. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hanna, W.J. and Rogovsky, B., 1991. Women with disabilities: Two handicaps plus. *Disability, Handicap & Society*. 6(1):49-63.
- Harlan, Sharon L. and Pamela M. Robert. 1998. "The Social Construction of Disability in Organizations: Why Employers Resist Reasonable Accommodation." *Work and Occupations* 25:397-435.
- Hegewisch, A.; Williams-Baron, E. 2017. The gender wage gap and work-family supports: Women's choices or policy choices. *Saint Louis University Public Law Review* 36(1): 5-18.
- Higginbotham, Elizabeth. 1994. "Black professional women: Job ceilings and employment sectors." *Women of color in US society*: 113-131.
- Hipple, Steven. 2001. "Contingent Work in the Late 1990s." *Monthly Labor Review*. March 2001: 3-27.
- Jaccard, James, Robert Turrissi, and Jim Jaccard. 2003. *Interaction effects in multiple regression*. No. 72. Sage.

- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York : Basic Books, c1977
- Kennelly, Ivy. 1999. "'THAT SINGLE-MOTHER ELEMENT' How White Employers Typify Black Women." *Gender & Society* 13(2): 168-192.
- King, Deborah K. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of Black Feminist Ideology." *Signs*. 41(1)
- Konur, Ozcan. 2007. "A Judicial Outcome Analysis of the Disability Discrimination Act: A windfall for employers?" *Disability & Society* 22:187-204.
- Kruse, D., & Schur, L.2003. Employment of people with disabilities following the ADA. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*. 42(1): 31-66.
- Livermore, Gina, Denise Whalen, and David C. Stapleton. 2011. Executive Summary from *Assessing the Need for a National Disability Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Document No. PR11-65.
- Maroto, Michelle, and David Pettinicchio. 2014. "Disability, structural inequality, and work: The influence of occupational segregation on earnings for people with different disabilities." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 38: 76-92.
- Maroto, Michelle, David Pettinicchio, and Andrew C. Patterson. 2018. "Hierarchies of Categorical Disadvantage: Economic Insecurity at the Intersection of Disability, Gender, and Race." *Gender & Society*.
- McCall, L., 2008. The complexity of intersectionality. In *Intersectionality and Beyond* (pp. 65-92). Routledge-Cavendish.
- Mik-Meyer, Nanna. 2015. "Gender and Disability: Feminizing Male Employees with Visible Impairments in Danish Work Organizations." *Gender, Work and Organizations*. 22(6):579-595.
- Morris, J., 1991. *Pride against prejudice: A personal politics of disability*. Womens Pr Ltd.
- O'Hara, B., 2004. Twice penalized: Employment discrimination against women with disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*. 15(1):27-34.
- O'Brien, Ruth. 2001. *Crippled Justice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 2005. "Other Voices at the Workplace: Gender, Disability and an Alternative Ethic of Care." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 30(2):1529-1555.
- Oliver, M. 1990. *The Politics of Disablement*. London: Macmillan.
- Oliver, M., 1996. A sociology of disability or a disablist sociology. *Disability and society: Emerging issues and insights*:18-42.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. New York: Free Press.
- Pettinicchio, David, and Michelle Maroto. 2017. "Employment Outcomes Among Men and Women with Disabilities: How the Intersection of Gender and Disability Status Shapes

- Labor Market Inequality." In *Factors in Studying Employment for Persons with Disability: How the Picture Can Change*, pp. 3-33. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Randolph, Diane Smith. 2005. "The Meaning of Workplace Discrimination for disabled women." *Work* 24:369-380.
- Robert, Pamela M. and Sharon L. Harlan. 2006. "Mechanisms of Disability Discrimination in Large Bureaucratic Organizations: Ascriptive Inequalities in the Workplace." *Sociological quarterly* 47:599-630.
- Salter-Roth, Roberta and Heidi Hartmann. 1998. "Gauging the Consequences for Gender Relations. Pay Equity, and the Public Purse." in *Contingent Work*, edited by Kathleen Burke and Kathleen Christensen. New York: ILR Press.
- Sang, Katherine J.C., James Richards and Abigail Marks. 2016. "Gender and Disability in Male-Dominated Occupations: A Social Relational Model." *Gender, Work and Organizations*. 23(6):566-581.
- Schur, L., 2002. The difference a job makes: The effects of employment among people with disabilities. *Journal of Economic Issues*. 36(2):339-347.
- Schur, Lisa. 2003. "Barriers or Opportunities? The Causes of Contingent and Part-Time Work Among Disabled people." *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 42:589-622.
- Schur, L., D. Kruse, J. Blasi, and P. Blanck. 2009. Is disability disabling in all workplaces? workplace disparities and corporate culture. *Industrial Relations* 48(3): 381-410.
- Schur, Lisa, Kyongji Han, Andrea Kim, Mason Ameri, Peter Blanck, and Douglas Kruse. 2017. Disability at work: A look back and forward. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 27 (4): 482-97.
- Shaw, Andrea Elizabeth. 2006. *The embodiment of disobedience: Fat black women's unruly political bodies*. Lexington Books.
- Shakespeare, Tom. 2010. "The Social Model of Disability." In *The disability studies reader*. Edited by Lennard J. Davis. New York: Routeledge.
- Shuttleworth, Russell, Nikki Wedgwood, and Nathan J. Wilson. 2012. "The dilemma of disabled masculinity." *Men and masculinities* 15(2): 174-194.
- Salter-Roth, Roberta and Heidi Hartmann. 1998. "Gauging the Consequences for Gender Relations. Pay Equity, and the Public Purse." in *Contingent Work*, edited by Kathleen Burke and Kathleen Christensen. New York: ILR Press.
- Stapleton, David C., Bonnie L. O'day, Gina A. Livermore, and Andrew J. Imparato. 2006. "Dismantling the poverty trap: Disability policy for the twenty- first century." *The Milbank Quarterly* 84(4): 701-732.
- Stoddard, S., Jans, L., Ripple, J.M. and Kraus, L.,. 1998. *Chartbook on Work and Disability in the United States, 1998*.

- Sweet, Stephen and Karen Grace-Martin. 2008. *Data Analysis with SPSS*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Vandekinderen, Caroline, Griet Roets , Michel Vandebroek , Wouter Vanderplasschen and Geert Van Hove. 2012. "One size fits all? The social construction of disemploy-abled women." *Disability & Society*. 27(5): 703-716
- Fiduccia, B.F.W., 1999. Sexual Imagery of Physically Disabled Women: Erotic? Perverse? Sexist?. *Sexuality and disability*. 17(3):277-282.
- Wendell, Susan. 1996. *The Rejected Body: feminist philosophical reflections on disability*. New York: Routledge.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society*. 9(1): 8-37.
- Wilkinson, Wendy and Lex Frieden. 2000. "Glass-Ceiling Issues in Employment of Disabled people." in *Employment, Disability and the Americans with Disabilities Act: Issues in law public policy and research*, edited by P. D. Blanck. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.
- Williams, D R. 1996. "Race/Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status: Measurement and Methodological Issues." *International Journal Of Health Services: Planning, Administration, Evaluation*. 26 (3): 483–505.
- Williams, Christine. 1995. *Still a Man's World: Men who do Women's Work*. London: University of California Press.
- Williams, Christine. 2015. "Crossing Over: Interdisciplinary Research on 'Men who do Women's Work'." *Sex Roles*. 72:390–395.
- Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. "Racializing The Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender and Society*. 23(1): 5-26
- Wingfield, Adia Harvey and Ranell L. Myles. 2014. "Still a Man's World? Revisiting Men Who Do Women's Work." *Sociology Compass*. 8/10: 1206–1215
- Wittenburg, David, and Sandi Nelson. 2006. (2006). "A guide to disability statistics from the survey of income and program participation." *Cornell University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Demographics and Statistics*. Ithaca, NY.
- Woodhams, Carol, Ben Lupton and, Marc Cowling. 2014. "The Presence of Ethnic Minority and Disabled men in Feminised Work: Intersectionality, Vertical Segregation and the Glass Escalator." *Sex Roles*. 72:277–293
- World Health Organization. 2010. "The ICF: An Overview."
- 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: Man up, man down. *The Sociological Quarterly* 57 (4): 733-58.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Zola, Irving Kenneth. 1982. *Missing pieces: A chronicle of living with a disability*. Temple University Press.

## Appendix

**Table A1: Frequencies of professional and non-professional occupations by race**

|                  | White    | Black    | Hispanic |
|------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Professional     | 40.89*** | 28.39*** | 16.28*** |
| Non-professional | 59.11    | 71.61    | 83.72    |

**Table A2: Frequencies of professional and non-professional occupations by gender of occupation**

|                  | Female-dominated | Male-dominated | Mixed-gender |
|------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Professional     | 35.45***         | 24.81***       | 44.77***     |
| Non-professional | 64.55            | 75.19          | 55.23        |

**Table A3: Frequency of Hispanics by race**

|              | White    | Black   |
|--------------|----------|---------|
| Hispanic     | 16.07*** | 5.25*** |
| Not-Hispanic | 83.93    | 94.75   |

**Table A4: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation and Disability Income**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.13*                           | 1.05                          | 1.07                           |
| Black                            | .91                             | .95                           | .95                            |
| Hispanic                         | .89*                            | .95                           | .93                            |
| Female                           | 5.37***                         | .17***                        | 32.35***                       |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .96                             | .79***                        | 1.22***                        |
| High school diploma              | 1.11                            | .68***                        | 1.63***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.59***                         | .77***                        | 2.05***                        |
| Bachelor's degree                | 1.26**                          | .55***                        | 2.30***                        |
| Master's and above               | .98                             | .36***                        | 2.76***                        |
| Works part-time                  | 1.27***                         | .67***                        | 1.90***                        |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | .58***                          | .83                           | .70                            |
| Private, not for profit employee | 2.09***                         | .56***                        | 3.72***                        |

|                                  |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| State or local government worker | 2.33*** | .93     | 2.51*** |
| Federal government worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.64*** |
| Professional occupation          | .55***  | .54***  | 1.01    |
| Married                          | .87**   | 1.64*** | .53***  |
| Previously married               | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***  |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | 1.09    | .97     | 1.12    |
| Intercept                        | .19***  | 2.57*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                       |         |         |         |
| F 163.52***                      |         |         |         |
| dF 42, 19673                     |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |         |         |         |

**Table A5: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Gender and Disability Intersections without Control Variables**

|                             | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                    | 1.19                            | 1.11                          | 1.07                           |
| Black                       | 1.01                            | 1.00                          | 1.01                           |
| Hispanic                    | .94                             | 1.29***                       | .73***                         |
| Female                      | 5.49***                         | .16***                        | 33.55***                       |
| Disabled x female           | .93                             | .94                           | .99                            |
| Intercept                   | .23***                          | 1.23***                       | .18***                         |
| N= 32,108                   |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 432.38***                 |                                 |                               |                                |
| df 14, 20637                |                                 |                               |                                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                                 |                               |                                |

**Table A6: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Gender and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|

|                                     |          |         |          |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|
| Disabled                            | 1.20     | 1.09    | 1.10     |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Black                               | .94      | .99     | .95      |
| Hispanic                            | .94      | 1.00    | .93      |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Female                              | .5.26*** | .16***  | 32.25*** |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Disabled x female                   | .90      | 1.12    | 1.01     |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Control Variables                   |          |         |          |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Lives in metro area                 | .95      | .77***  | 1.23***  |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| High school diploma                 | 1.08     | .66***  | 1.62***  |
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.43***  | .70***  | 2.05***  |
| Bachelor's degree                   | .95      | .41***  | 2.34***  |
| Master's and above                  | .66***   | .23***  | 2.85***  |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Works part-time                     | 1.31***  | .69***  | 1.90***  |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 1.83***  | .49***  | 3.70***  |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.11***  | .88**   | 2.41***  |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .61***   | .38***  | 1.60***  |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Married                             | .84***   | 1.56*** | .53***   |
| Previously married                  | .81***   | 1.47*** | .55***   |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.15***  | .93     | 1.24***  |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.10     | .99     | 1.12     |
|                                     |          |         |          |
| Intercept                           | ..18***  | 2.51*** | .07***   |
| N = 30,515                          |          |         |          |
| F 164.34***                         |          |         |          |
| df 40, 19675                        |          |         |          |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |          |         |          |

**Table A7: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Gender and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, and Disability Income**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.09                            | 1.10                          | 1.12                           |
| Black                            | .91                             | .95                           | .95                            |
| Hispanic                         | .89*                            | .95                           | .93                            |
| Female                           | 5.41***                         | .17***                        | 32.30***                       |
| Disabled x female                | .88                             | .88                           | 1.00                           |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .96                             | .79***                        | 1.22***                        |
| High school diploma              | 1.11                            | .68***                        | 1.63***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.58***                         | .77***                        | 2.05***                        |
| Bachelor's degree                | 1.26**                          | .55***                        | 2.30***                        |
| Master's and above               | .98                             | .36***                        | 2.76***                        |
| Works part-time                  | 1.27***                         | .67***                        | 1.90***                        |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | .58**                           | .83                           | .70                            |
| Private, not for profit employee | 2.09***                         | .56***                        | 3.72***                        |
| State or local government worker | 2.33***                         | .93                           | 2.51***                        |
| Federal government worker        | .60***                          | .36***                        | 1.64***                        |
| Professional occupation          | .55***                          | .54***                        | 1.01                           |
| Married                          | .87**                           | 1.64***                       | .53***                         |
| Previously married               | .83***                          | 1.51***                       | .55***                         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | 1.15***                         | .93*                          | 1.24***                        |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | 1.09                            | .97                           | 1.12                           |
| Intercept                        | .19***                          | .256***                       | .07***                         |
| N = 30,515                       |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 156.03***                      |                                 |                               |                                |

|                             |
|-----------------------------|
| dF 44, 19671                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |

**Table A8: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Race and Disability Intersections without Control Variables**

|                             | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                    | 1.13                            | 1.02                          | 1.10                           |
| Black                       | 1.03                            | .99                           | 1.05                           |
| Hispanic                    | .93                             | 1.27***                       | .74***                         |
| Female                      | 5.46***                         | .16***                        | 33.60***                       |
| Black x disabled            | .85                             | 1.12                          | .76                            |
| Hispanic x disabled         | 1.12                            | 1.39                          | .81                            |
| Intercept                   | .23***                          | 1.24***                       | .18***                         |
| N = 32,108                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| F 303.80***                 |                                 |                               |                                |
| df 20, 20631                |                                 |                               |                                |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                                 |                               |                                |

**Table A9: Multinomial Regression Gendered Occupations, Race and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family**

|                     | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled            | 1.12                            | .95                           | 1.18                           |
| Black               | .96                             | .97                           | .99                            |
| Hispanic            | .93                             | .98                           | .95                            |
| Female              | 5.22***                         | .16***                        | 32.40***                       |
| Disabled x black    | .79                             | 1.24                          | .64                            |
| Disabled x Hispanic | 1.18                            | 1.57*                         | .75                            |
| Control Variables   |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area | .95                             | .77***                        | 1.23***                        |
| High school diploma | 1.08                            | .66***                        | 1.62***                        |

|                                     |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.43*** | .70***  | 2.04*** |
| Bachelor's degree                   | .95     | .41***  | 2.34*** |
| Master's and above                  | .66***  | .23***  | 2.85*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                     | 1.31*** | .69***  | 1.90*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 1.83*** | .49***  | 3.70*** |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.11*** | .88*    | 2.41*** |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .61***  | .38***  | 1.61*** |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Married                             | .84***  | 1.57*** | .53***  |
| Previously married                  | .81***  | 1.47*** | .55***  |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.15*** | .93     | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.11    | .98     | 1.12    |
|                                     |         |         |         |
| Intercept                           | .18***  | 2.53*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                          |         |         |         |
| F 143.48***                         |         |         |         |
| df 46, 19669                        |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |         |         |         |

**Table A10: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Race and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, and Disability Income**

|                     | Female versus Mixed<br>Occupations | Male Versus Mixed<br>Occupations | Female Versus Male<br>Occupations |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Disabled            | 1.15                               | .96                              | 1.20*                             |
|                     |                                    |                                  |                                   |
| Black               | .93                                | .93                              | .99                               |
| Hispanic            | .88*                               | .94                              | .95                               |
|                     |                                    |                                  |                                   |
| Female              | 5.37***                            | .17***                           | 32.42***                          |
|                     |                                    |                                  |                                   |
| Disabled x black    | .81                                | 1.27                             | .64                               |
| Disabled x Hispanic | 1.15                               | 1.57*                            | .73                               |
|                     |                                    |                                  |                                   |
| Control Variables   |                                    |                                  |                                   |
|                     |                                    |                                  |                                   |

|                                     |         |          |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|----------|---------|
| Lives in metro area                 | .96     | .79***   | 1.22*** |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| High school diploma                 | 1.11    | .68***   | 1.63*** |
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.58*** | .77***   | 2.05*** |
| Bachelor's degree                   | 1.26**  | .55***   | 2.30*** |
| Master's and above                  | .98     | .36***   | 2.76*** |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| Works part-time                     | 1.27*** | .67***   | 1.90*** |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI                | .59**   | .84      | .70     |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 2.09*** | .56***   | 3.73*** |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.33*** | .93      | 2.52*** |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .60***  | .35***   | 1.65*** |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| Professional<br>occupation          | .55***  | .54***   | 1.02    |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| Married                             | .87**   | 1.65***  | .53***  |
| Previously married                  | .83***  | 1.51***  | .55***  |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.15*** | .93*     | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.09    | .97      | 1.12    |
|                                     |         |          |         |
| Intercept                           | .19***  | 2.58 *** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                          |         |          |         |
| F 137.73***                         |         |          |         |
| dF 50, 19665                        |         |          |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |         |          |         |

**Table A11: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Race and Gender Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|          | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled | 1.11                            | 1.04                          | 1.06                           |
|          |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black    | 1.20                            | .94                           | 1.28*                          |
| Hispanic | 1.08                            | 1.06                          | 1.01                           |
|          |                                 |                               |                                |

|                                     |         |         |          |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| Female                              | 5.64*** | .16***  | 35.99*** |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Black x female                      | .74*    | 1.31*   | .57***   |
| Hispanic x female                   | .81     | .80     | 1.00     |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Control Variables                   |         |         |          |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Lives in metro area                 | .95     | .77***  | 1.23***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| High school diploma                 | 1.08    | .67***  | 1.62***  |
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.43*** | .70***  | 2.04***  |
| Bachelor's degree                   | .95     | .41***  | 2.34***  |
| Master's and above                  | .67***  | .23***  | 2.84***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Works part-time                     | 1.31*** | .69***  | 1.90***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 1.83*** | .49***  | 3.70***  |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.11*** | .88*    | 2.40***  |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .61***  | .38***  | 1.60***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Married                             | .83***  | 1.57*** | .53***   |
| Previously married                  | .81***  | 1.47*** | .55***   |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.16*** | .93     | 1.24***  |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.11    | .98     | 1.13     |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Intercept                           | .17***  | 2.51*** | .07***   |
| N = 30,515                          |         |         |          |
| F 144.42***                         |         |         |          |
| df 46, 19669                        |         |         |          |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |         |         |          |

**Table A12: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Race and Gender Intersection with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, and Disability Income**

|          | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled | 1.13*                           | 1.05                          | 1.08                           |
|          |                                 |                               |                                |

|                                     |         |         |          |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| Black                               | 1.16    | .91     | 1.28*    |
| Hispanic                            | 1.02    | 1.01    | 1.02     |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Female                              | 5.82*** | .16***  | 36.04*** |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Black x female                      | .75*    | 1.32*   | .57***   |
| Hispanic x female                   | .80     | .80     | 1.01     |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Control Variables                   |         |         |          |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Lives in metro area                 | .96     | .79***  | 1.22***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| High school diploma                 | 1.12    | .68***  | 1.63***  |
| Some college,<br>associate's degree | 1.58*** | .77***  | 2.05***  |
| Bachelor's degree                   | 1.27**  | .55***  | 2.30***  |
| Master's and above                  | .98     | .36***  | 2.76***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Works part-time                     | 1.27*** | .67***  | 1.90***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Receives SSDI or SSI                | .59**   | .83     | .70      |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Private, not for profit<br>employee | 2.08*** | .56***  | 3.71***  |
| State or local<br>government worker | 2.33*** | .93     | 2.51***  |
| Federal government<br>worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.65***  |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Professional<br>occupation          | .54***  | .54***  | 1.01     |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Married                             | .87**   | 1.65*** | .53***   |
| Previously married                  | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***   |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18               | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.24***  |
| 3 or more kids under<br>age 18      | 1.10    | .97     | 1.13     |
|                                     |         |         |          |
| Intercept                           | .18***  | 2.56*** | .07***   |
| N = 32,515                          |         |         |          |
| F 138.69***                         |         |         |          |
| dF 50, 19665                        |         |         |          |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001         |         |         |          |

**Table A13: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Three-way Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.52**                          | 1.12                          | 1.36*                          |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black                            | 1.30*                           | .96                           | 1.35*                          |
| Hispanic                         | 1.10                            | 1.05                          | 1.05                           |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Female                           | 5.81***                         | .16***                        | 35.79***                       |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Disabled x female                | .67*                            | .66*                          | 1.02                           |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black x female                   | .69**                           | 1.20                          | .57***                         |
| Hispanic x female                | .76*                            | .75*                          | 1.02                           |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Disabled x black                 | .21**                           | .74                           | .29*                           |
| Disabled x Hispanic              | .64                             | 1.30                          | .49                            |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Black x disabled x female        | 4.94**                          | 2.59*                         | .191                           |
| Hispanic x disabled x female     | 2.24                            | 1.79                          | .126                           |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .95                             | .77***                        | 1.23***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| High school diploma              | 1.08                            | .67***                        | 1.62***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.43***                         | .70***                        | 2.04***                        |
| Bachelor's degree                | .96                             | .41***                        | 2.34***                        |
| Master's and above               | .67***                          | .23***                        | 2.85***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Works part-time                  | 1.31***                         | .69                           | 1.90***                        |
|                                  |                                 |                               |                                |
| Private, not for profit employee | 1.83***                         | .49***                        | 3.70***                        |
| State or local government worker | 2.11***                         | .88*                          | 2.41***                        |

|                             |         |         |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Federal government worker   | .61***  | .38***  | 1.61*** |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | 1.16*** | .93     | 1.24*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | 1.11    | .99     | 1.13    |
| Intercept                   | .17***  | 2.49*** | .07***  |
| N = 30,515                  |         |         |         |
| F 104.01***                 |         |         |         |
| df 64, 19651                |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |         |         |         |

**Table A14: Multinomial Regression of Gendered Occupations, Three way Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, and Disability Income**

|                                  | Female versus Mixed Occupations | Male Versus Mixed Occupations | Female Versus Male Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Disabled                         | 1.57**                          | 1.13                          | 1.39*                          |
| Black                            | 1.25                            | .92                           | 1.36**                         |
| Hispanic                         | 1.05                            | 1.00                          | 1.06                           |
| Female                           | 6.00***                         | .17***                        | 35.87***                       |
| Disabled x female                | .66*                            | .65*                          | 1.00                           |
| Black x female                   | .69**                           | 1.20                          | .57***                         |
| Hispanic x female                | .76*                            | .75*                          | 1.02                           |
| Disabled x black                 | .21**                           | .75                           | .28*                           |
| Disabled x Hispanic              | .63                             | 1.30                          | .48                            |
| Black x disabled x female        | 5.06**                          | 2.59*                         | 1.95                           |
| Hispanic x disabled x female     | 2.22                            | 1.79                          | 1.24                           |
| Control Variables                |                                 |                               |                                |
| Lives in metro area              | .97                             | .79***                        | 1.22***                        |
| High school diploma              | 1.12                            | .69***                        | 1.63***                        |
| Some college, associate's degree | 1.59***                         | .77***                        | 2.05***                        |

|                                  |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Bachelor's degree                | 1.27**  | .55***  | 2.30*** |
| Master's and above               | .98     | .36***  | 2.76*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                  | 1.27*** | .67***  | 1.90*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | .59**   | .83     | .70     |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit employee | 2.09*** | .56***  | 3.73*** |
| State or local government worker | 2.33*** | .93     | 2.52*** |
| Federal government worker        | .60***  | .36***  | 1.66*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Professional occupation          | .54***  | .54***  | 1.01    |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Married                          | .87**   | 1.65*** | .53***  |
| Previously married               | .83***  | 1.51*** | .55***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | 1.15*** | .93*    | 1.25*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | 1.10    | .97     | 1.13    |
|                                  |         |         |         |
| Intercept                        | .17***  | 2.54*** | .07     |
| N = 30,515                       |         |         |         |
| F 102.12***                      |         |         |         |
| dF 68, 19647                     |         |         |         |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |         |         |         |

**Table A15: Multinomial Regressions of Gendered Occupations, Three-way Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation (Reference Category: Nondisabled white women)**

|                 | <u>Female versus Mixed Occupations</u> | <u>Male Versus Mixed Occupations</u> | <u>Female Versus Male Occupations</u> |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>Disabled</u> | <u>1.01</u>                            | <u>.73*</u>                          | <u>1.38*</u>                          |
|                 |  |                                      |                                       |
| <u>Black</u>    | <u>.86*</u>                            | <u>1.11</u>                          | <u>.78*</u>                           |
| <u>Hispanic</u> | <u>.80***</u>                          | <u>.74**</u>                         | <u>1.08</u>                           |
|                 |  |                                      |                                       |

|   |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Male</u>                             | <u>.17***</u>  | <u>5.98***</u> | <u>.03***</u>  |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Disabled x male</u>                  | <u>1.50*</u>   | <u>1.52*</u>   | <u>.98</u>     |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Black x male</u>                     | <u>1.46**</u>  | <u>.83</u>     | <u>1.74***</u> |
| <u>Hispanic x male</u>                  | <u>1.32*</u>   | <u>1.34*</u>   | <u>.98</u>     |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Disabled x black</u>                 | <u>1.06</u>    | <u>1.95*</u>   | <u>.55*</u>    |
| <u>Disabled x Hispanic</u>              | <u>1.42</u>    | <u>2.33*</u>   | <u>.61</u>     |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Black x disabled x male</u>          | <u>.20**</u>   | <u>.39*</u>    | <u>.52</u>     |
| <u>Hispanic x disabled x male</u>       | <u>.45</u>     | <u>.56</u>     | <u>.80</u>     |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Control Variables</u>                |                |                |                |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Lives in metro area</u>              | <u>.97</u>     | <u>.79***</u>  | <u>1.22***</u> |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>High school diploma</u>              | <u>1.12</u>    | <u>.68***</u>  | <u>1.62***</u> |
| <u>Some college, associate's degree</u> | <u>1.59***</u> | <u>.78***</u>  | <u>2.05***</u> |
| <u>Bachelor's degree</u>                | <u>1.27**</u>  | <u>.55***</u>  | <u>2.31***</u> |
| <u>Master's and above</u>               | <u>.99</u>     | <u>.36***</u>  | <u>2.77***</u> |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Works part-time</u>                  | <u>1.26***</u> | <u>.67***</u>  | <u>1.89***</u> |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Private, not for profit employee</u> | <u>2.07***</u> | <u>.56***</u>  | <u>3.71***</u> |

|   |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>State or local government worker</u>     | <u>2.32***</u> | <u>.93</u>     | <u>2.51***</u> |
| <u>Federal government worker</u>            | <u>.60***</u>  | <u>.36***</u>  | <u>1.66***</u> |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Professional occupation</u>              | <u>.55***</u>  | <u>.54***</u>  | <u>1.01</u>    |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Married</u>                              | <u>.88**</u>   | <u>1.65***</u> | <u>.53***</u>  |
| <u>Previously married</u>                   | <u>.83***</u>  | <u>1.52***</u> | <u>.55***</u>  |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>1-2 kids under age 18</u>                | <u>1.16***</u> | <u>.93*</u>    | <u>1.25***</u> |
| <u>3 or more kids under age 18</u>          | <u>1.10</u>    | <u>.97</u>     | <u>1.13</u>    |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>Intercept</u>                            | <u>1.03</u>    | <u>.42***</u>  | <u>2.42***</u> |
|   |                |                |                |
| <u>F 105.03***</u>                          |                |                |                |
| <u>dF 66, 19649</u>                         |                |                |                |
| <u>*p &lt;.05, **p&lt;.01, ***p&lt;.001</u> |                |                |                |

**Table A16: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings. Race and Gender Intersections without Control Variables**

|                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Sub population n | 9,143                     | 9,427                   | 12,529                   | 31,099          |
| Disabled         | -.03                      | -.14***                 | -.20***                  | -.13***         |
|                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black            | -.23*                     | -.27***                 | -.40***                  | -.33***         |
| Hispanic         | -.28***                   | -.42***                 | -.47***                  | -.42***         |
|                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Female           | -.10*                     | -.09**                  | -.26***                  | -.34***         |

|                             |         |          |          |           |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|
|                             |         |          |          |           |
| Black x female              | .14     | -.01     | .25***   | .20***    |
| Hispanic x female           | .07     | .08      | .17***   | .17***    |
|                             |         |          |          |           |
| Intercept                   | 7.70*** | 8.***    | 8.09***  | 8.07***   |
| F                           | 7.59*** | 36.83*** | 50.48*** | 148.03*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .0094   | 0.0485   | 0.0447   | 0.0524    |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |         |          |          |           |

**Table A17: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Race and Gender Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.03                      | -.06                    | -.08**                   | -.06***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black                            | -.10                      | -.18***                 | -.21***                  | -.20***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.08                      | -.16***                 | -.19***                  | -.15***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Female                           | -.08**                    | -.13***                 | -.18***                  | -.28***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black x female                   | .07                       | .02                     | .17**                    | .17***          |
| Hispanic x female                | .05                       | .05                     | .11**                    | .09***          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .16***                  | .19***                   | .16***          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .21***                  | .20***                   | .21***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .45***                    | .37***                  | .35***                   | .36***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .74***                    | .78***                  | .79***                   | .74***          |
| Master's and above               | 1.05***                   | 1.05***                 | 1.14***                  | 1.06***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Works part-time                  | -.68***                   | -.56***                 | -.76***                  | -.71***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Private, not for profit employee | .07**                     | -.20***                 | -.07*                    | -.06***         |
| State or local government worker | .05*                      | .07**                   | -.11***                  | -.04**          |
| Federal government worker        | .24***                    | .22***                  | .26***                   | .24***          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Married                     | .29***    | .41***    | .39***    | .39***    |
| Previously married          | .25***    | .30***    | .33***    | .32***    |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.11***   | -.07***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.18***   | -.08**    | -.07**    | -.10***   |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                   | 7.12***   | 7.40***   | 7.28***   | 7.38***   |
| F                           | 163.67*** | 148.02*** | 285.31*** | 580.55*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | 0.3420    | 0.3314    | .4079     | .3782     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A18: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Race and Gender Intersections With Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupations**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.02                      | -.06                    | -.08**                   | -.06**          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black                            | -.11                      | -.16***                 | -.18***                  | -.18***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.06                      | -.12***                 | -.16***                  | -.12***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Female                           | -.10**                    | -.15***                 | -.20***                  | -.30***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black x female                   | .09                       | .03                     | .16**                    | .16***          |
| Hispanic x female                | .06                       | .08                     | .12**                    | .10***          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .17***                   | .14***          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .17***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .39***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .58***                    | .60***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .82***                    | .80***                  | .87***                   | .80***          |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Works part-time                  | -.66***                   | -.55***                 | -.73***                  | -.69***         |
|                                  |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.01                      | -.29***                 | -.15***                  | -.13***         |
| State or local government worker | -.05*                     | .11***                  | -.17***                  | -.08***         |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Federal government worker   | .21***    | .22***    | .29***    | .25***    |
| Professional                | .38***    | .38***    | .39***    | .37***    |
| Married                     | .26***    | .38***    | .36***    | .36***    |
| Previously married          | .23***    | .29***    | .32***    | .30***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.18***   | -.07**    | -.05*     | -.09***   |
| Intercept                   | 7.12***   | 7.39***   | 7.26***   | 7.37***   |
| F                           | 182.89*** | 171.42*** | 312.19*** | 643.05*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3731     | .3604     | .4364     | .4048     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A19: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Race and Gender Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, and Disability Income**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .01                       | -.03                    | -.04                     | -.03            |
| Black                            | -.12                      | -.16***                 | -.17***                  | -.18***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.06                      | -.13***                 | -.16***                  | -.13***         |
| Female                           | -.10**                    | -.15***                 | -.20***                  | -.30***         |
| Black x female                   | .10                       | .02                     | .16**                    | .17***          |
| Hispanic x female                | .06                       | .07                     | .12**                    | .10***          |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .18***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .38***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .57***                    | .59***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .81***                    | .80***                  | .86**                    | .80***          |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Works part-time                  | -.65***   | -.53***   | -.71***   | -.67***   |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.69***   | -.97***   | -.82***   | -.83***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.005     | -.29***   | -.13***   | -.12***   |
| Local or state government worker | -.04*     | .11***    | -.16***   | -.08***   |
| Federal government worker        | .21***    | .22***    | .29***    | .25***    |
| Professional                     | .38***    | .38***    | .39***    | .37***    |
| Married                          | .26***    | .37***    | .35***    | .36***    |
| Previously married               | .24***    | .28***    | .31***    | .30***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.19***   | -.07**    | -.06*     | -.10***   |
| Intercept                        | 7.13***   | 7.40***   | 7.28***   | 7.38***   |
| F                                | 178.14*** | 170.35*** | 309.55*** | 633.68*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3774     | .3685     | .4424     | .40107    |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

**Table A20: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Race and Disability Intersections without Control Variables**

|                     | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Sub population n    | 9,143                     | 9,427                   | 12,529                   | 31,099          |
| Disabled            | -.013                     | -.18***                 | -.23***                  | -.15***         |
| Black               | -.12***                   | -.28***                 | -.28***                  | -.23***         |
| Hispanic            | -.22***                   | -.42***                 | -.40***                  | -.35***         |
| Female              | -.07*                     | -.08**                  | -.21***                  | -.30***         |
| Black x disabled    | -.02                      | .10                     | .10                      | .09             |
| Hispanic x disabled | -.05                      | .15                     | .05                      | .08             |
| Intercept           | 7.67***                   | 8.13***                 | 8.07***                  | 8.06***         |
| F                   | 12.39***                  | 60.75***                | 50.29***                 | 146.91***       |
| R <sup>2</sup>      | .0092                     | 0.0492                  | 0.0424                   | 0.0505          |

\*p <.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

**Table A21: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Race and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.03                      | -.10*                   | -.08*                    | -.08***         |
| Black                            | -.04                      | -.18***                 | -.11***                  | -.11***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.05                      | -.16***                 | -.14***                  | -.12***         |
| Female                           | -.07**                    | -.12***                 | -.14***                  | -.24***         |
| Black x disabled                 | -.05                      | .08                     | -.02                     | .03             |
| Hispanic x disabled              | -.09                      | .15                     | -.02                     | .09             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .16***                  | .19***                   | .16***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .21***                  | .20***                   | .21***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .45***                    | .37***                  | .35***                   | .36***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .74***                    | .78***                  | .79***                   | .74***          |
| Master's and above               | 1.05***                   | 1.05***                 | 1.14***                  | 1.06***         |
| Works part-time                  | -.68***                   | -.56***                 | -.76***                  | -.71***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | .07**                     | -.20***                 | -.07*                    | -.06***         |
| State or local government worker | .05*                      | .07**                   | -.11***                  | -.04**          |
| Federal government worker        | .24***                    | .22***                  | .26***                   | .24***          |
| Married                          | .29***                    | .41***                  | .39***                   | .39***          |
| Previously married               | .25***                    | .30***                  | .33***                   | .32***          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.11***                   | -.07***                 | -.05**                   | -.08***         |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.18***                   | -.08**                  | -.07**                   | -.10***         |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                   | 7.10***   | 7.40***   | 7.26***   | 7.36***   |
| F                           | 162.20*** | 149.13*** | 340.63*** | 577.08*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | 0.3421    | 0.3317    | .4067     | .3772     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A22: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Race and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.03                      | -.10*                   | -.08*                    | -.08***         |
| Black                            | -.03                      | -.16***                 | -.09***                  | -.09***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.02                      | -.12***                 | -.10***                  | -.09***         |
| Female                           | -.07**                    | -.14***                 | -.16***                  | -.26***         |
| Black x disabled                 | -.04                      | .05                     | -.06                     | .01             |
| Hispanic x disabled              | -.09                      | .16                     | -.02                     | .10             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .17***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .17***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .39***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .58***                    | .60***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .82***                    | .80***                  | .87***                   | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.66***                   | -.55***                 | -.73***                  | -.69***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.01                      | -.29***                 | -.15***                  | -.13***         |
| State or local government worker | -.05*                     | .11***                  | -.17***                  | -.08***         |
| Federal government worker        | .21***                    | .22***                  | .29***                   | .25***          |
| Professional                     | .38***                    | .38***                  | .39***                   | .37***          |
| Married                          | .26***                    | .38***                  | .36***                   | .36***          |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Previously married          | .23***    | .29***    | .32***    | .30***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.18***   | -.07**    | -.05*     | -.09***   |
| Intercept                   | 7.10***   | 7.40***   | 7.25***   | 7.35***   |
| F                           | 181.40*** | 172.62*** | 308.55*** | 764.74*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3732     | .3606     | .4353     | .4037     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A23: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Race and Disability Intersection with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupations, and Disability Income**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .001                      | .06                     | -.04                     | -.05*           |
| Black                            | -.03                      | -.16***                 | -.08***                  | -.09***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.02                      | -.13***                 | -.10***                  | -.09***         |
| Female                           | -.08**                    | -.14***                 | -.16***                  | -.27***         |
| Black x disabled                 | -.03                      | .01                     | -.04                     | .02             |
| Hispanic x disabled              | -.08                      | .122                    | -.05                     | .07             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .18***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .38***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .57***                    | .59***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .81***                    | .80***                  | .86**                    | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.65***                   | -.53***                 | -.71***                  | -.67***         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.69***                   | -.97***                 | -.82***                  | -.83***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.005                     | -.29***                 | -.13***                  | -.12***         |
| Local or state government        | -.04*                     | .11***                  | -.16***                  | -.08***         |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| worker                      |           |           |           |           |
| Federal government worker   | .21***    | .22***    | .29***    | .25***    |
| Professional                | .38***    | .38***    | .39***    | .37***    |
| Married                     | .26***    | .37***    | .35***    | .36***    |
| Previously married          | .24***    | .28***    | .31***    | .30***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.19***   | -.07**    | -.06*     | -.10***   |
| Intercept                   | 7.11***   | 7.40***   | 7.26***   | 7.36***   |
| F                           | 200.99*** | 171.00*** | 335.36*** | 628.72*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3772     | .3686     | .4413     | .4097     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A24: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Gender and Disability Intersections without Control Variables**

|                             | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Sub population n            | 9,143                     | 9,427                   | 12,529                   | 31,099          |
| Disabled                    | .13                       | -.13**                  | -.17**                   | -.12***         |
| Black                       | -.12***                   | -.27***                 | -.27***                  | -.22***         |
| Hispanic                    | -.22***                   | -.41***                 | -.40***                  | -.35***         |
| Female                      | -.05*                     | -.08**                  | -.20***                  | -.30***         |
| Female x disabled           | -.18                      | .00                     | -.06                     | -.004           |
| Intercept                   | 7.66***                   | 8.13***                 | 8.07***                  | 8.05***         |
| F                           | 11.10***                  | 52.07***                | 70.82***                 | 208.72***       |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .0094                     | 0.0483                  | 0.0424                   | 0.0503          |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |                           |                         |                          |                 |

**Table A25: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Gender and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|

| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661     | 8,979     | 11,921    | 29,561    |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Disabled                         | .02       | -.06      | -.08      | -.06*     |
| Black                            | -.05      | -.18***   | -.12***   | -.11***   |
| Hispanic                         | -.04      | -.15***   | -.14***   | -.11***   |
| Female                           | -.06*     | -.12***   | -.14***   | -.24***   |
| Female x disabled                | -.05      | .004      | -.01      | .01       |
| Control Variables                |           |           |           |           |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***    | .16***    | .19***    | .16***    |
| High school diploma              | .30***    | .21***    | .20***    | .21***    |
| Some college, associate's degree | .45***    | .37***    | .35***    | .36***    |
| Bachelor's degree                | .74***    | .78***    | .79***    | .74***    |
| Master's and above               | 1.05***   | 1.05***   | 1.14***   | 1.06***   |
| Works part-time                  | -.68***   | -.56***   | -.76***   | -.71***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | .07**     | -.20***   | -.07*     | -.06***   |
| State or local government worker | .05*      | .07**     | -.11***   | -.04**    |
| Federal government worker        | .24***    | .22***    | .26***    | .24***    |
| Married                          | .29***    | .41***    | .39***    | .39***    |
| Previously married               | .25***    | .30***    | .33***    | .32***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.11***   | -.07***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.18***   | -.08**    | -.07**    | -.10***   |
| Intercept                        | 7.10***   | 7.40***   | 7.26***   | 7.36***   |
| F                                | 186.51*** | 170.03*** | 323.83*** | 663.09*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | 0.3419    | 0.3313    | .4066     | .3771     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

**Table A26: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Gender and Disability Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .01                       | -.06                    | -.06                     | -.06*           |
| Black                            | -.03                      | -.15***                 | -.09***                  | -.09***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.01                      | -.11***                 | -.10***                  | -.08***         |
| Female                           | -.07**                    | -.14***                 | -.16***                  | -.26***         |
| Female x disabled                | -.03                      | .001                    | -.03                     | .01             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .17***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .17***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .39***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .58***                    | .60***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .82***                    | .80***                  | .87***                   | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.66***                   | -.55***                 | -.73***                  | -.69***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.01                      | -.29***                 | -.15***                  | -.13***         |
| State or local government worker | -.05*                     | .11***                  | -.17***                  | -.08***         |
| Federal government worker        | .21***                    | .22***                  | .29***                   | .25***          |
| Professional                     | .38***                    | .38***                  | .39***                   | .37***          |
| Married                          | .26***                    | .38***                  | .36***                   | .36***          |
| Previously married               | .23***                    | .29***                  | .32***                   | .30***          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.12***                   | -.06***                 | -.05**                   | -.08***         |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.18***                   | -.07**                  | -.05*                    | -.09***         |
| Intercept                        | 7.10***                   | 7.39***                 | 7.25***                  | 7.35***         |
| F                                | 207.39***                 | 195.92***               | 351.75***                | 728.48***       |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3729                     | .3602                   | .4352                    | .4037           |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |                           |                         |                          |                 |

**Table A27: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Gender and Disability intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, and Disability Income**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | -.07                      | -.03                    | -.02                     | -.02            |
| Black                            | -.03                      | -.16***                 | -.09***                  | -.09***         |
| Hispanic                         | -.02                      | -.12***                 | -.11***                  | -.09***         |
| Female                           | -.07**                    | -.14***                 | -.16***                  | -.26***         |
| Female x disabled                | -.07                      | -.02                    | -.04                     | -.01            |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***                    | .14***                  | .16***                   | .14***          |
| High school diploma              | .29***                    | .21***                  | .18***                   | .20***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .38***                    | .32***                  | .27***                   | .30***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .57***                    | .59***                  | .59***                   | .56***          |
| Master's and above               | .81***                    | .80***                  | .86**                    | .80***          |
| Works part-time                  | -.65***                   | -.53***                 | -.71***                  | -.67***         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.69***                   | -.98***                 | -.82***                  | -.83***         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.005                     | -.29***                 | -.13***                  | -.12***         |
| Local or state government worker | -.04*                     | .11***                  | -.16***                  | -.08***         |
| Federal government worker        | .21***                    | .22***                  | .29***                   | .25***          |
| Professional                     | .38***                    | .38***                  | .39***                   | .37***          |
| Married                          | .26***                    | .37***                  | .35***                   | .36***          |
| Previously married               | .24***                    | .28***                  | .31***                   | .30***          |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.12***                   | -.06***                 | -.05**                   | -.08***         |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.19***   | -.07**    | -.06*     | -.10***   |
| Intercept                   | 7.10***   | 7.40***   | 7.26***   | 7.36***   |
| F                           | 200.99*** | 193.58*** | 346.80*** | 714.73*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3772     | .3683     | .4412     | .4095     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A28: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings Three-way Intersections with some Controls for Education, Work, and Family**

|                                  | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n                  | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                         | .05                       | -.09*                   | -.07                     | -.08*           |
| Hispanic                         | -.07                      | -.16***                 | -.18***                  | -.15***         |
| Black                            | -.10                      | -.19***                 | -.20***                  | -.20***         |
| Female                           | -.08*                     | -.13***                 | -.18***                  | -.28***         |
| Disabled x female                | -.09                      | .05                     | -.01                     | .01             |
| Disabled x black                 | -.07                      | .20                     | -.11                     | .05             |
| Disabled x Hispanic              | -.29                      | .08                     | -.01                     | .04             |
| Black x female                   | .07                       | .05                     | .16**                    | .17***          |
| Hispanic x female                | .03                       | .00                     | .11*                     | .09**           |
| Disabled x black x female        | -.02                      | -.27                    | .10                      | -.07            |
| Disabled x Hispanic x female     | .41                       | .31                     | -.04                     | .07             |
| Control Variables                |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***                    | .16***                  | .19***                   | .16***          |
| High school diploma              | .30***                    | .21***                  | .20***                   | .21***          |
| Some college, associate's degree | .45***                    | .37***                  | .35***                   | .36***          |
| Bachelor's degree                | .75***                    | .77***                  | .78***                   | .74***          |
| Master's and above               | 1.04***                   | 1.05***                 | 1.13***                  | 1.05***         |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Works part-time                  | -.68***   | -.56***   | -.76***   | -.71***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | .07**     | -.20***   | -.07*     | -.06***   |
| State or local government worker | .05*      | .07**     | -.11***   | -.04**    |
| Federal government worker        | .24***    | .22***    | .26***    | .24***    |
| Married                          | .29***    | .41***    | .39***    | .39***    |
| Previously married               | .25***    | .30***    | .33***    | .32***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.11***   | -.07***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.18***   | -.08**    | -.07**    | -.10***   |
| Intercept                        | 7.11***   | 7.40***   | 7.28***   | 7.38***   |
| F                                | 117.78*** | 107.75*** | 206.58*** | 418.34*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3425     | .3323     | .4080     | .3783     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

**Table A29: Linear Regression of Monthly Earnings, Three-way Intersections with Controls for Education, Work, Family, and Professional Occupation**

|                           | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n           | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                  | .03                       | -.09*                   | -.06                     | -.08*           |
| Hispanic                  | -.05                      | -.17***                 | -.17***                  | -.13***         |
| Black                     | -.10                      | -.13***                 | -.15***                  | -.18***         |
| Female                    | -.09**                    | -.15***                 | -.20***                  | -.30***         |
| Disabled x female         | -.06                      | -.05                    | -.02                     | .01             |
| Disabled x black          | -.07                      | .16                     | -.13                     | .02             |
| Disabled x Hispanic       | -.25                      | .09                     | -.04                     | .04             |
| Black x female            | .09                       | .06                     | .15**                    | .17***          |
| Hispanic x female         | .04                       | .04                     | .12**                    | .09***          |
| Disabled x black x female | .03                       | -.25                    | .08                      | -.06            |
| Disabled x Hispanic x     | .37                       | .32                     | .00                      | .07             |

|                                  |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| female                           |           |           |           |           |
| Control Variables                |           |           |           |           |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***    | .14***    | .17***    | .14***    |
| High school diploma              | .29***    | .20***    | .17***    | .19***    |
| Some college, associate's degree | .39***    | .32***    | .27***    | .30***    |
| Bachelor's degree                | .58***    | .59***    | .59***    | .56***    |
| Master's and above               | .82***    | .80***    | .86***    | .80***    |
| Works part-time                  | -.66***   | -.55***   | -.73***   | -.69***   |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.01      | -.29***   | -.15***   | -.13***   |
| State or local government worker | -.05*     | .11***    | -.17***   | -.08***   |
| Federal government worker        | .21***    | .22***    | .29***    | .24***    |
| Professional                     | .38***    | .38***    | .39***    | .37***    |
| Married                          | .26***    | .38***    | .36***    | .36***    |
| Previously married               | .23***    | .29***    | .32***    | .31***    |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.12***   | -.06***   | -.05**    | -.08***   |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.19***   | -.07**    | -.06*     | -.10***   |
| Intercept                        | 7.11***   | 7.40***   | 7.27***   | 7.37***   |
| F                                | 133.14*** | 126.13*** | 228.41*** | 468.84*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>                   | .3735     | .3613     | .4366     | .4050     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001      |           |           |           |           |

**Table A30: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Three Way Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation and Disability Income**

|                 | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled        | .08                       | -.06                    | -.01                     | -.04            |
| Black           | -.11                      | -.17***                 | -.17***                  | -.18***         |

|                                  |         |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Hispanic                         | -.06    | -.13*** | -.16*** | -.13*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Female                           | -.09**  | -.14*** | -.20*** | -.30*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Disabled x female                | -.10    | -.06    | -.04    | -.01    |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Disabled x black                 | -.12    | .12     | -.12    | -.01    |
| Disabled x Hispanic              | -.12    | .05     | -.07    | .02     |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Black x female                   | .10     | .05     | .16**   | .17***  |
| Hispanic x female                | .04     | .03     | .12**   | .09***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Disabled x black x female        | .09     | -.24    | .11     | -.03    |
| Disabled x Hispanic x female     | .22     | .33     | -.02    | .06     |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Control Variables                |         |         |         |         |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Lives in metro area              | .14***  | .14***  | .16***  | .14***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| High school diploma              | .29***  | .21***  | .18***  | .20***  |
| Some college, associate's degree | .38***  | .32***  | .26***  | .30***  |
| Bachelor's degree                | .57***  | .59***  | .59***  | .56***  |
| Master's and above               | .81***  | .79***  | .86**   | .80***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                  | -.65*** | -.53*** | -.71*** | -.67*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.69*** | -.96*** | -.83*** | -.83*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.01    | -.29*** | -.13*** | -.12*** |
| Local or state government worker | -.04*   | .11***  | -.16*** | -.08*** |
| Federal government worker        | .20***  | .22***  | .29***  | .24***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Professional                     | .38***  | .38***  | .39***  | .37***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Married                          | .26***  | .37***  | .35***  | .36***  |
| Previously married               | .24***  | .28***  | .31***  | .30***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| 1-2 kids under age 18            | -.13*** | -.06*** | -.05**  | -.08*** |
| 3 or more kids under age 18      | -.19*** | -.07**  | -.06*   | -.10*** |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                   | 7.12***   | 7.40***   | 7.28***   | 7.38***   |
| F                           | 132.35*** | 126.17*** | 228.42*** | 466.90*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3777     | .3693     | .4426     | .4108     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

**Table A31: Linear Regressions of Monthly Earnings Three Way Intersections with Control Variables for Education, Work, Family, Professional Occupation, Disability Income and age (Reference Category: non-disabled white woman)**

|                            | Within Female Occupations | Within Male Occupations | Within Mixed Occupations | All Occupations |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Subpopulation n            | 8,661                     | 8,979                   | 11,921                   | 29,561          |
| Disabled                   | -.07                      | -.17                    | -.11**                   | -.10***         |
|                            |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black                      | -.02                      | -.13*                   | -.03                     | -.03            |
| Hispanic                   | -.01                      | -.08                    | -.02                     | -.02            |
|                            |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Male                       | .10**                     | .16***                  | .20***                   | .30***          |
|                            |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Disabled x male            | .07                       | .07                     | .05                      | .01             |
|                            |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Disabled x black           | -.02                      | -.07                    | -.01                     | -.00            |
| Disabled x Hispanic        | .08                       | .39*                    | -.08                     | .08             |
|                            |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Black x male               | -.10                      | -.05                    | -.13*                    | -.16***         |
| Hispanic x male            | -.04                      | -.03                    | -.12**                   | -.09**          |
|                            |                           |                         |                          |                 |
| Disabled x black x male    | -.11                      | .19                     | -.16                     | -.00            |
| Disabled x Hispanic x male | -.13                      | -.35                    | .01                      | -.06            |

|                                  |         |         |         |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Control Variables                |         |         |         |         |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Lives in metro area              | .13***  | .13***  | .16***  | .14***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| High school diploma              | .30***  | .22***  | .19***  | .22***  |
| Some college, associate's degree | .41***  | .33***  | .28***  | .32***  |
| Bachelor's degree                | .60***  | .61***  | .60***  | .58***  |
| Master's and above               | .83***  | .79***  | .85***  | .80***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Works part-time                  | -.63*** | -.51*** | -.69*** | -.65*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Receives SSDI or SSI             | -.73*** | -.98*** | -.88*** | -.87*** |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Private, not for profit employee | -.03    | -.31*** | -.15*** | -.14*** |
| Local or state government worker | -.07**  | .10***  | -.19*** | -.10*** |
| Federal government worker        | .17***  | .21***  | .28***  | .23***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Professional                     | .37***  | .38***  | .38***  | .36***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Age                              | .01***  | .01***  | .01***  | .01***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |
| Married                          | .13***  | .25***  | .21***  | .22***  |
| Previously married               | .09**** | .16***  | .15***  | .15***  |
|                                  |         |         |         |         |

|                             |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1-2 kids under age 18       | -.08***   | -.01      | .00       | -.03**    |
| 3 or more kids under age 18 | -.12***   | -.00      | .01       | -.03      |
|                             |           |           |           |           |
| Intercept                   | 6.71***   | 6.93***   | 6.71***   | 6.72***   |
| F                           | 130.17*** | 128.18*** | 235.74*** | 476.33*** |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .3896     | .3808     | .4559     | .4236     |
| *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 |           |           |           |           |

