

The presence of ethnic minority and disabled men in feminised work: Intersectionality, vertical segregation and the glass escalator

Professor Carol Woodhams

University of Exeter Business School

Rennes Drive

Exeter

United Kingdom

EX4 4PU

c.woodhams@exeter.ac.uk

44 (0) 1392722137

Dr Ben Lupton

Manchester Metropolitan University

Business School

Oxford Road

Manchester

United Kingdom

M15 6BG

b.lupton@mmu.ac.uk

44 (0) 161 247 6460

Professor Marc Cowling

Brighton University Business School

Mithras House

Lewes Road

Brighton

United Kingdom

BN2 4AT

M.Cowling2@brighton.ac.uk

44 (0) 1392726115

Abstract

This article examines whether men in female-dominated areas of work are disproportionately drawn from disadvantaged groups – specifically in relation to minority ethnicity and disability. Whilst there is a developing literature on the experiences of men in female-dominated work much less is known about who they are. Using intersectionality as a framework, it is theorised that men with disadvantaged identities may be less able to realise their gender advantage and avoid – or move out of – low-level and part-time feminised work. These expectations are tested with a quantitative analysis of personnel records for a large organisation with a workforce across the UK (n=1,114,308). Analysis is based in consecutive years of data collection in the decade to 2006. Statistical analysis based on chi square tests show that not only are men with disadvantaged identities disproportionately *more* likely than other men to be found in female-dominated low-status work, but that they are relatively *more* likely to be so than are their female counterparts. Men from ethnic minorities, but not those with a disability, are also disproportionately *more* likely to be found in feminised part-time work. Both men from ethnic minorities and men with disabilities are disproportionately *less* likely than other men to ride the glass escalator to higher-level work. The article concludes that the intersectional effects of gender, ethnicity and disability sort disadvantaged men into lower-level and part-time work alongside women, and considers the implications for the study of men in female-dominated occupations, and of intersectionalities.

Key Words: *Men, Female-dominated occupations, Glass escalator, Intersectionality, Ethnicity, Disability.*

The presence of ethnic minority and disabled men in feminised work: Intersectionality, vertical segregation and the glass escalator

Introduction

This article is concerned with the identities of men who work in low-level and/or part-time work, which in the UK is predominantly undertaken by women (ONS, 2013a). In particular, it seeks to establish – in the UK context – whether men in these work areas come disproportionately from traditionally disadvantaged groups in the labour market – specifically people of minority ethnicity and those with a disability – and whether they are more likely to do so than their female counterparts. The article also examines whether men from disadvantaged groups are less likely than other men to be promoted from low-level work, that is, less likely to ride the glass escalator (Williams, 1995).

In offering this analysis the article contributes to an understanding of men's position in female-dominated occupations in three main ways. Firstly, it examines the issue in the context of *vertical* gender segregation *across* labour markets, in contrast to the dominant approach in the literature which considers *horizontal* occupational segregation by gender or vertical segregation by gender *within* occupations. These studies have mainly investigated the presence of men in specific (contra-) gender-typed occupations and examined their progress through such occupations (e.g. Allan, 1993; Harvey Wingfield, 2009; Williams, 1993, 1995 in the US; Cross and Bagilhole, 2002; Lupton, 2000; Simpson, 2004 in the UK; Pringle, 1993 in Australia). The present study, by starting from the observation that women in the UK are generally found in lower-level/-paid work (ONS, 2013b; Platt, 2011) asks why it is that some men should find themselves there. Secondly, it addresses the question of the identity of these men. The existing UK and US literature has tended to focus more on men's experience within female-dominated occupations (Cross & Bagilhole, 2003; Simpson, 2004;

Williams, 1995) than on the question of who they are, and where the latter question is addressed it has often been framed in relation to the men's occupational choice or preferences (e.g. Jome & Tokar, 1998). In this study, the question is framed in relation to identity rather than choice – which men end up in low-level feminised work? This is not to suggest that all feminised work is low status and poorly paid, nor that where it is it is necessarily without attractions, for example in relation to the type of work. Nor is it to deny that the possibility that people may actively choose it. Rather it is to shift the focus onto the issue of whether the identity (in relation to minority status) of people in such work differs from those in higher level work, and to offer a specific analysis of the position of men in that context. Finally, the study develops a recent theme in the literature (Harvey Wingfield, 2009; Price-Glynn & Rakowski, 2012; Smith, 2012 in the US; Karlsen, 2012 in Norway) in approaching the question of men's presence of female-concentrated occupations from the theoretical perspective of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991). The article examines whether, and with what effect, gender interacts with other identities to account for these men's occupational outcomes. In exploring the position of men with disabilities in this context, as well as those from ethnic minorities, the article makes an additional novel contribution. In short, the paper explores the operation of intersectional effects that sort men into the low-level and/or part-time work usually undertaken by women, and also prevent their exit from it.

The data analysed come from a single large private sector organisation in the UK. The sample consists of 1,114,308 observations of employee profile data drawn from the organisation's human resource management information system. The variables include each employee's gender, ethnicity and disability status, age, vertical grade, mode of work, length of service and region of employment. Variables under investigation are analysed for patterns of significant difference whilst the effects of others are controlled. The results will be of interest to those who seek to understand the position of men in female-dominated occupations and those whose interest is in the intersection of gender with other identities to impact on employment outcomes.

Men in female-dominated occupations

In the context of labour markets that are segregated by gender, the movement of women into male-dominated work domains has been extensively researched in a range of western contexts (Bagilhole, 2003; Marshall, 1984 in the UK; Denissen, 2010; Germain et al., 2012; Kanter, 1977 in the US). Rather less attention has been paid to the movement of men into female-dominated occupations. However, there is a considerable body of evidence to suggest that men's experience differs from women's when they are in a minority. Researchers, mainly in the US (e.g. Allan, 1993; Williams, 1995), have identified the processes by which men are able to realise their gender advantages in such contexts, often reaping the benefits of their token status to reach higher levels in female-dominated work – riding the glass escalator (Williams, 1995) – in contrast to the experience of women in typically male domains (see Hultin's Swedish study, 2003; but also Budig, 2002, in the US).

However, not all the experiences of men in female-dominated occupations are positive. There is evidence from, for example, the US and the Netherlands that they are, on average, paid less than those in traditionally male areas of work (see, respectively, Budig, 2002; England & Herbert, 1993 and de Ruijter & Huffman, 2003), congregate in particular specialisms (Allan, 1993; Sargent, 2000; Snyder & Green, 2008; Williams, 1993, 1995 in the US; Long, 1984 in the UK) which may not meet their preferences, and may in some cases ride the glass escalator reluctantly (Williams, 1995). Other researchers have examined the difficulties and challenges that men face in female-dominated occupations (Cross & Bagilhole, 2002; Lupton, 2000; Simpson, 2004; Williams, 1995). This work often centres on a discussion of masculinities (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985; Collinson & Hearn, 1994), exploring the challenges to masculine identities arising from working alongside women or in gender-typed jobs, and considering their implications (Allan, 1993; Lupton, 2000; Pringle, 1993; Sargent, 2000; Williams, 1995).

There has been much less research on the question of who these men are and why they work in female-dominated occupations. This is perhaps surprising given that there are disadvantages, as noted above, for men in working in such areas – the glass escalator notwithstanding. To be sure, women

experience difficulties and barriers when moving into male domains, but at least they have the compensation of higher pay, relative to female-dominated occupations – men entering female-dominated work do not even have this incentive, in fact the opposite applies (de Ruijter & Huffman, 2003). Some writers have explored the idea that there may be physiological differences between men in female occupations and other men and that these may underpin their choice to be there (Dabbs et al., 1990). Other US studies (Galbraith, 1991; Jome & Tokar, 1998) have suggested that men with a lower attachment to traditional gender roles may be drawn to, or be comfortable with, work in female-dominated areas. Choice and preference, underpinned by individual difference, are clearly significant in determining occupational outcomes, and accordingly this line of enquiry offers important insights into the presence of men in female-dominated occupations. However, whatever its merits as an approach, seeking to explain occupational destinations in terms of choice and difference could not offer a complete account unless it were certain that preferences can be reliably translated in outcomes. On the contrary, it is well-established in the UK context of this study that not all people have equal access to occupations with different levels of reward and status (Anderson, 1998; Erikson & Goldthorpe, 2010; Goldthorpe & Jackson, 2007). It is therefore possible that constraint may be as important a factor as choice in determining occupational outcomes. In the context of the present study, given the relatively lower status and rewards for “women’s work”, it is plausible that at least some of the men who work there do so not because they have chosen to, but because other avenues are closed to them (Lupton, 2006; Williams & Villemez, 1993), or not open to them yet (Jacobs, 1993).

It is this idea that underpins the current study, and while it has not been extensively explored in the literature, it has not been entirely overlooked. A number of authors have considered the possibility that men with labour market disadvantages, for example in relation to their ethnicity or social class, may be more likely than other men to find themselves in female-dominated work. The evidence, such as it is, is supportive (Williams & Villemez, 1993 in the US; Lupton, 2006 in the UK). More recently, Harvey Wingfield (2009) and Smith (2012) have shown in the US context that, when in female-dominated occupations, not all men are able to ride the glass escalator equally well (with men from

ethnic minorities being less able to realise their gender advantages in female-dominated work), though support was not found for this in recent studies by Karlsen (2012) in Norway, or Price-Glynn & Rakowski (2012) in the US.

The authors in this tradition make an important, if sometimes implicit, connection between intersectionality and men in female-dominated work. The notion of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; Hofman, 2010; McCall, 2005) has played an important role in equality studies generally in overcoming the emphasis on single characteristics of disadvantage – the focus on White women in feminist studies being a paradigm case. It has encouraged researchers to look instead at how different strands of advantage/disadvantage interact to frame people's experience, and also to exacerbate or ameliorate the detriments they suffer in employment. Writers on intersectionality also highlight the fact that single identities may have different effects depending on the other identities with which they co-exist (Greenman & Xie, 2008; McCall, 2005), thus moving beyond the idea that the effects of different identities can be added together towards the realisation that they may interact (Hancock, 2007; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). From this develops the idea that the presence of a minority of men within low-level, female-dominated areas of work might be accounted for – at least in part – by an intersectional effect (Bagilhole, 2010; Hofman, 2010; McCall, 2005) in that these men may be understood to be at the confluence or intersection of vectors of labour market advantage/disadvantage relating to gender, ethnicity, disability and so on. This in turn prompts empirical questions: as to whether the men in female-dominated work differ from those in other work occupations in relation to other identities, for example, ethnicity or disability, and as to whether the men and women in female-dominated work differ from *each other* in relation to *other* identities that they may have.

The Current Study

Drawing together themes from the literature on men in female-dominated occupations and on intersectionality, it is possible to frame some expectations about the identity of men in female-dominated work. The *first expectation* (hypotheses 1 and 2, below) is that, because the work that women do tends to be of lower level than other work, the men who find themselves in such work

would be more likely than other men to be from disadvantaged groups. There are a number of such disadvantaged groups in the UK labour market, for example, in relation to age and social class (Platt, 2011). For reasons of data availability this study focuses on two: minority ethnicity and disability. The sections that follow justify and operationalize this expectation in respect of each of these groups.

The UK labour market is heavily vertically segregated by gender (ECHRC, 2010; Platt, 2011), so the occupational areas occupied by women are on average lower paid (Perfect, 2011). The UK labour market is also characterised by the disadvantaged position of most ethnic minorities (Longhi & Platt, 2008). While there is evidence to suggest that people of Chinese and Indian origin (particularly men) have similar, and in some cases better, labour market outcomes than those of White British origin, most minorities do significantly worse (Metcalf, 2009). The reasons are under-explored and likely to be complex (Metcalf, 2009) and may relate to structural factors, such as educational opportunities (ECHRC, 2010, Rafferty, 2012) and/or discrimination in employment decisions (Wood et al., 2009). While the processes may not be fully understood, the evidence for the outcome is clear: people of minority ethnicity are, on average, sorted into lower level/lower paid work (Platt, 2011). Considering the intersection of these processes, it would be expected that ethnic minority men would be disproportionately found in the lower levels of organisations which are numerically dominated by women – in the case of the study organisation, the lowest grade (Y).

Hypothesis 1a - That ethnic minority men are significantly more likely than White men to be represented in the lowest grade (Y).

Part-time work (30 or fewer hours per week) (ONS, 2011) in the UK labour market tends to be undertaken in low paid work areas, and mostly by women (Connolly & Gregory, 2008; Platt, 2011). This is evidenced in the pay gap for part-time female workers (in comparison with male full-time workers) in the UK, which stands at 38.8% (Perfect, 2011). Women in the UK who work part-time mostly do so in order to combine work with childcare commitments, whereas men in the UK are proportionally much more likely to report that they work part-time because they are unable to find a full-time job (IPPR, 2010; Cam, 2011). Indeed, male part-time workers earn less on average than

female part-time workers in the UK (ECHRC, 2010), suggesting that this is unlikely to be an outcome of choice for men with other options. Given their disadvantaged position in the labour market generally (see above), which limits their options and possibilities, it would be expected that ethnic minority men would be disproportionately found in part-time work in the organisation of study.

Hypothesis 1b - That ethnic minority men are more likely than White men to work part-time.

Work that is both low paid *and* part-time is heavily populated with women in the UK labour market (Platt, 2011) and has the highest concentration of women in the study organisation. The expectation is that most men would be able to avoid this on the grounds of their gender advantages in a segregated labour market. It is anticipated therefore that ethnic minority men, for reasons given above, would be less likely than White men to do so and would be disproportionately found in such work in the study organisation.

Hypothesis 1c - That ethnic minority men are significantly more likely than White men to be represented working part-time in the lowest grade (Y).

People with disabilities, defined within the UK's Disability Discrimination Act (1995, section 1.1) as those with "a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities", are also known to be disadvantaged in the UK labour market, in terms of participation rates, modes of engagement and pay (Berthoud, 2008; Platt, 2011). In part this may related to the fact that people with disabilities in the UK, on average, have lower qualifications than people without disabilities – and Metcalf (2009) notes that adjusting for this and other variables (e.g. age) has the effect of reducing the pay gap related to disability. However there is "indirect evidence" (Metcalf, 2009, p. 66) that it may also result from discrimination by employers, in hiring and promotion decisions, or in failing to make the reasonable adjustments required by UK law. Although the reasons for the their disadvantaged position are not fully established, the patterns of occupational outcomes (above) would lead to an expectation that men with disabilities would be, relative to men without disabilities, disproportionately frequently found in lower-level work, part-time work and

work that is both lower-level and part-time – work that in this organisation is heavily populated with women.

Hypothesis 2 - That men with disabilities are significantly more likely than men without disabilities to be (a) represented in the lowest grade Y, (b) in part-time work and (c) to be working part-time in the lowest grade.

The *second expectation* (hypotheses 3 and 4, below) is that the men in lower-level feminised work would be more likely than the women in these areas of work to be from disadvantaged groups in the UK labour market. It is well established that, in the UK, women from ethnic minorities and those with disabilities are, like their male counterparts, more likely to find themselves in low paid work (Metcalf, 2009). It is not the intention to provide an analysis of this phenomenon. The question posed here is whether ethnicity and disability intersect with gender in ways which give rise to different outcomes for men and women. The focus of the article is on men, and women are introduced into the analysis here for purposes of comparison. Intersectionality theory (Hofman, 2010; McCall, 2005) suggests that disadvantaged identities may have a differential impact in this way. But why should the expected difference be in the direction stated above?

Firstly, empirical evidence indicates that gender effects on vertical segregation are larger than those of other identities (Blau & Khan, 2007; Longhi & Platt, 2008; Metcalf, 2009). The likely explanation for this is that, in addition to any discriminatory effects that might also be experienced by other minorities, women are also significantly disadvantaged in employment by their disproportionate engagement, relative to men, with unpaid work in the home, for example childcare or eldercare (Sayer, 2005). This is known to interrupt women's progression in work either through framing women's own aspirations or restricting their acquisition of human capital (Hakim, 2004) or through the action of employers in organizing work around a continuous male career (England, 2005). Notwithstanding the extensive debate over this, the dominance of the gender effect suggests that researchers should look at the other characteristics of men in lower paid work to account for their presence there – women's presence already being accounted for by the dominant gender effect.

Secondly, there is some evidence from the UK that minority ethnicity and disability have a relatively larger detrimental effect on men's employment outcomes than on women's (Blackwell, 2003; Metcalf, 2009). It is not fully understood why this should be. A possible explanation arises from the Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis (SMTH) (Navarrete, McDonald, Molina & Sidanius, 2010). This sees competition for resources in male-dominated societies as primarily one between *men*. Dominant and privileged men will tend to oppress subordinate men rather than subordinate women who represent less of a threat to their position. Therefore, according to SMTH, "oppression directed at ethnic minorities should have more severe effects on minority males than minority females" (Purdie Vaughns & Eibach, 2008, p. 379). These authors' own alternative, "Intersectional Invisibility Theory" suggests that those who differ more from the prototypical other may experience invisibility. Thus, for example, in a society dominated by White men without disabilities, Black women with disabilities may be "invisible" – and thus often marginalized – but their invisibility may also mean that they avoid the "brunt of oppression" (Purdie Vaughns & Eibach, 2008, p. 383). Either theory would provide grounds for the hypothesis that men from disadvantaged groups may be relatively more likely to be found in low paid work than women from disadvantaged groups. Thirdly in support of this hypothesis, we note that there are a small number of empirical studies (Lupton, 2006; Williams & Villemez, 1993) which suggest that men from disadvantaged groups may indeed be sorted into lower paid work in this way.

To summarise, the expectation here is that while women (generally) are found in lower level work, the men who find themselves there are (relative to their female counterparts) more likely to be carrying another labour market disadvantage. This gives rise to the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 3 – That the disparity, by ethnicity, in representation (a) in grade Y, (b) in part-time work, and (c) in both, is significantly greater for men than it is for women.

Hypothesis 4 – That the disparity, by disability status, in representation (a) in grade Y, (b) in part-time work, and (c) in both, is significantly greater for men than it is for women.

It should be noted that women are used as a comparator and are not a primary focus in the analysis.

The *third expectation* (hypotheses 5 and 6, below) is that men from disadvantaged groups (again, in this case, ethnic minority men and men with disabilities) would find it harder than other men to progress (upwards) out of lower-level feminised work, i.e. to ride the glass-escalator. This derives from the general pattern of vertical segregation around minority ethnicity and disability in the UK labour market, which indicates that such men are less likely to progress in occupations and organisations anyway (Berthoud, 2008; EHRC, 2010; Platt, 2011). More specifically it draws on recent work that suggests that this differential progression may apply to men in female-dominated work areas (Harvey Wingfield, 2009; Smith, 2012), though we note that other studies have not found support for this (Karlsen, 2012; Price-Glynn and Rakowski, 2012).

Hypothesis 5- That White men are more likely to be promoted from the lowest grade (Y) to the one above it (X) than ethnic minority men.

Hypothesis 6 - That men without a disability are more likely to be promoted from the lowest grade (Y) to the one above it (X) than men with a disability.

In explaining the second expectation (above) we argued that there were theoretical grounds, arising from SMTH (Navarette et al., 2010) and Intersectional Invisibility Theory (Purdie Vaughns & Eibach, 2008) to expect that, in the context of a labour market in which vertical segregation *by gender* dominates, men would be impacted more by other disadvantaged identities than would be the case for women. We have noted that there is evidence for this as a general phenomenon in gendered labour markets in the UK and US (Blau & Khan, 2007; Greenman & Xie, 2008; Longhi & Platt; 2008). Our *fourth and final expectation* (hypotheses 7 and 8, below) simply extends this intersectional reasoning to the *progression* of disadvantaged men, relative to disadvantaged women, out of low-level work. This reasoning gives rise to the proposition that disadvantaged men will be less able to progress from low-level work than disadvantaged women. To our knowledge this idea has not been directly tested in relation to men's progression in female-dominated occupations

Hypothesis 7 - The disparity in progression rates out of grade Y (to grade X) in relation to ethnicity will be larger among men than it is among women.

Hypothesis 8 - The disparity in progression rates out of grade Y (to grade X) in relation to disability will be larger among men than it is among women.

Method

Participants

To test our expectations about the characteristics of men in low-level work, data collection was undertaken in a private sector organisation with a very large workforce. Analysis is based in consecutive years of data collection in the decade to 2006. Conducting all tests on annual data provides identical patterns, but with fewer viable outcomes, so for brevity, i.e. showing twelve Chi square tables instead of tens of them, and potency we report the pooled results.

The sample population is limited to the UK workforce of this company. The total sample size is 1,114,308. Our need to protect the identity of the organisation limits the details we can give, including the number of years' worth of data in the dataset and its sector; however, there are no aspects of structure and governance, HR processes, or regulatory environment that cause us to consider it as an outlier. Its occupational profile is varied and includes managerial, technical, professional, skilled and non-skilled employees. The organisation's technical activities have historically been gendered, i.e. associated with men, and it is currently numerically dominated by men (74%) . As will be seen below, women dominate in non-skilled grades.

The advantage of using single-company data in discerning internal labour market patterns is that we are able to limit the influence of sectoral and industrial effects that can determine the distribution and progression of various groups within organisations. Due to the large size of the sample, we are able to perform tests with viable sample numbers in each of the subcategories of analysis.

Procedures and Variables

Data for this study were obtained from the organisation's management information system via a third-party outsourced HR agency with express permission from senior managers of the case study organisation. The organisation released all available variables that are of interest to our research

questions. However, our analysis is constrained by the limits of the original dataset. Some variables that might have been useful in our analysis, e.g. sexuality, or social class were unavailable. We now explain each of the main variables.

Our variables of labour market disadvantage are minority ethnicity status and disability. In the original dataset, ethnicity was represented by five categories: White, Black, Asian (including Indian), Asian Oriental (including Chinese) and “other ethnicity”. Ethnicity is self-nominated according to “country/region of origin”. Because of the need to populate our analysis with viable sample sizes, categories were collapsed into “White” and “ethnic minority”. In limiting our categories to two variants of ethnicity, we recognise that we lose the potential to produce an analysis of different ethnic categories (Wrench & Madood, 2000). Missing and “other ethnicity” responses were excluded. Disability status was also self-determined. Guidance at the point of data collection suggested that employees should assess their status using the standard definition within UK equality legislation. Because workers with a disability sometimes choose not to declare their disability on monitoring forms, our figures are likely to under-represent the “real” proportion of workers with disabilities. It is not possible to know the extent to which the two measures vary. Our data do not allow us to distinguish between people with different types of impairment, although such differences are known to impact on employment outcomes (Berthoud, 2008).

There are over ten vertical job grade families in the case study organisation. Over a quarter of employees are in unskilled or semi-skilled grades, a third in skilled technical and supervisory grades and a quarter in middle managerial grades. The remainder is senior managers.

Our interest in this article is in vertical segregation into feminised low-level work and promotion out of these types of work into a higher grade; therefore we focus on the lowest pay grade (which we call “Grade Y”) and the pay grade above it, “Grade X”. Our data does not allow us to identify different types of occupation within this grade, and our need to preserve confidentiality means that we cannot do more than say that most of the work in these comprises clerical, secretarial, and customer

service work. One and a half percent of our total organisation sample (n=16,706 observations) are in grade X and 11.5% (n=127,710) are in grade Y.

We are also interested in the incidence of part-time working, defined here as anyone who works less than the standard contractual-hours week. 6.6% of the total jobs in the organisation are undertaken on a part-time basis. We find a significantly probability that jobs in the lowest grade (Grade Y) are carried out part-time; the incidence of part-time working there rises to 51% ($\chi^2=53768.9, p<.0001$).

Results

Descriptive Information and Analyses.

(Tables 1 and 2 approximately here)

Tables 1 and 2 give descriptive information about variables and the outcomes of statistical testing for relationships between main variables. In line with expectations of segregation that are typical within the UK and western labour markets, men are disproportionately located in the higher grades (75% male) and women are disproportionately found in the lowest grade (75% female). Numbers in the lowest grade are comparatively small; only 0.5% of all men in the organisation are found in lowest grade, whereas the proportion for all women is 4.5%. Men dominate the promotion grade X (76% male). Further, just as women are disproportionately found in part-time work in UK labour markets, in this organisation 85.1% of part-time workers are female.

The organisation is dominated by White workers (93.7% White; 6.3% ethnic minority), but there is little evidence of vertical segregation. The representation of ethnic minority workers in Grade Y is 6% and 7% in the promotion grade, X. In the sample population, 1.4% of both ethnic minority and White workers are in Grade Y. White employees are significantly more likely to work part-time (6.6% compared with 4.5%, $\chi^2= 468.0 p<.0001$).

The organisation is dominated by workers without disabilities (98.3% without disabilities and only 1.7% with disabilities). The proportion of workers with disabilities significantly increases in

Grade Y to 3.1% ($\chi^2=516.7$ $p<.0001$). In the promotion grade, workers with disabilities are proportionally represented at 1.7%.

As explained previously, our focus in this paper is on the intersectional effects of combinations of profile characteristics, e.g. male and with a disability. This section will take each disadvantaged characteristic in turn (minority ethnicity and disability) and examine the first expectation, whether men from these groups are more likely to be in lower status work than other men (Hypotheses 1 & 2) and the second expectation, whether they are relatively more likely than women to be there (Hypotheses 3 & 4). Finally, the section will examine the third and fourth expectations about the relative upward progression of the male groups (Hypotheses 5–8). All proportions given are mean proportions of the combined years of data collection.

To test hypotheses 1 and 2 we conducted Chi Square tests to look for overall patterns of difference. As a check for spuriousness we also ran a subsidiary binary probit model for all workers in Grade Y and all workers who work part-time to identify job and personal characteristics, other than those directly under investigation, which might be responsible for significant outcomes. No spurious effects were found.

Ethnic Minority Men.

Hypothesis 1 - That ethnic minority men are significantly more likely than White men to be (a) represented in the lowest grade Y, (b) part-time and (c) work that is in the lowest grade AND part-time.

(Table 3 approximately here)

As outlined above, men are unlikely to be found in Grade Y ($n=3,614$; that is only 0.5% of total male observations), however, as shown in Table 3, ethnic minority men are significantly more likely than their White male counterparts to be there. The same patterns hold true with respect to part-time jobs. Findings show that ethnic minority men are significantly more likely, i.e. nearly 50% more likely, to work part-time (1.66% of the organisation for ethnic minority workers in comparison to 1.15% of

White workers). Put another way; in the data-donor organization, White workers are numerically dominant, particularly in full-time jobs where the ratio of White to ethnic minority workers is 16:1. In the part-time group this is reduced to 8:1. Finally, the number of men who are working part-time and in Grade Y is comparatively small ($n= 1,912$), however patterns in the data are robust enough to support the hypothesis. As representations of their group, the proportion of ethnic minority men in low-grade work is twice the proportion of White men. All three propositions within Hypothesis 1 are supported.

Men with Disabilities.

Hypothesis 2 - That men with disabilities are significantly more likely than men without a disability to be represented (a) in the lowest grade, (b) in part-time work and (c) to be working part-time in the lowest grade (Y).

(Table 4 approximately here)

Hypothesis 2a is supported. Men in Grade Y are just over 3 times more likely than men outside Grade Y to have a disability. Outside Grade Y in the wider organisation, 1 in 58 men have a disability; in Grade Y the ratio is reduced to 1 in 19. Hypothesis 2b, however, is not supported. Men with disabilities are significantly less likely than their counterparts without disabilities to work part-time. Hypothesis 2c is also not supported. In low status work the proportion of men with disabilities is almost identical to the proportion of men without disabilities.

The next set of comparisons relates to the *second expectation* contained in Hypotheses 3 and 4 that the men in lower-status feminised work would be more likely than the women in these areas of work to be from disadvantaged groups.

To examine this expectation we conducted Chi Square tests to look for overall patterns of difference. Here we report the LR Chi Square statistic which builds on the likelihood of the data under the null hypothesis relative to the Maximum Likelihood. We reinforce our findings with two sample t-tests with the unequal variance assumption and corrected with Scatterthwaites degrees of freedom.

This test is designed to test hypotheses about the mean where the data are from two random samples of independent observations, each from an underlying normal distribution. Here this test identifies cases where the difference between males' presence, say White and non-White in Grade Y (difference=0.00284), is significantly different than the difference between White and non-White females presence in Grade Y (difference=-0.0146). We report all cases with their appropriate *t*-test statistic.

Once again, we also ran a subsidiary binary probit model to check for spurious effects. We found that the key distinguishing variable within Grade Y was that women workers, holding all other factors constant, had a 29.4% lower probability of being based in London. To examine whether or not this confounded our findings we re-ran all the tests above but excluded workers based in London. Our findings show that the key results still hold in all cases but one (reported below). Likewise, with part-time working there are significant differences in length of service between male and female workers, with females having longer service on average. If we adjust for this difference, and re-run our tests with a service length restriction omitting the shortest and longest tenure part-time workers, patterns are confirmed. In general, the consistency in the general patterns and overall findings helps validate the results.

Comparisons within and across Genders: Ethnicity

Hypothesis 3 – That the disparity, by ethnicity, in representation (a) in grade Y, (b) in part-time work, and (c) in both, is significantly greater for men than it is for women.

(Table 5 approximately here)

Hypothesis 3a is supported. While men in grade Y are 66% *more* likely to be from an ethnic minority group as seen here and above in table 3; women in this grade are 32.7% *less* likely to be. We can conclude that White women may be numerically dominant in Grade Y (72.6% of the grade comprises White women); but taken proportionally the grade is significantly over-populated by ethnic minority men.

(Table 6 approximately here)

Hypothesis 3b is also supported by the findings in Table 6. Whilst, as above, male ethnic minority workers are more likely than their White counterparts to work part-time, ethnic minority women are found in significantly smaller proportions in this mode of work (22.98% compared to 11.8%; i.e. 48.7% less likely to be there). Once again we conclude that White women numerically dominate the part-time group, but ethnic minority men are represented in comparatively and significantly greater proportions.

(Table 7 approximately here)

Hypothesis 3c is also supported. Ethnic minority men, relative to their White counterparts are significantly more likely than ethnic minority women, also relative to their White counterparts, to be found in this group. The proportion of ethnic minority women in this group is nearly 40.6% less than White women. We note for completeness that the difference between White and ethnic minority women has a regional dimension, and is non-significant in respect of employees outside the London region, but remains significant overall.

Overall, in relation to ethnicity, all sections of hypotheses 1, and 3 result in consistent support. Ethnic minority men are significantly more likely to be found in low-level work and more likely to be found in this type of work than are ethnic minority women. We now move on to the hypotheses concerning the job situation of men with disabilities.

Comparisons within and across Genders: Disabilities.

Hypothesis 4 – That the disparity, by disability status, in representation (a) in grade Y, (b) in part-time work, and (c) in both, is significantly greater for men than it is for women.

(Table 8 approximately here)

As we saw in Table 4, men with a disability are 3 times more likely to be found in Grade Y than men without disabilities. Table 8 shows that women with a disability are also more likely to be found in

Grade Y; however, they are less than twice as likely to be there. Relative to their overall distribution in the workforce, then, men with disabilities are significantly more likely to be found in Grade Y, offering support for Hypothesis 4a.

(Table 9 approximately here)

Table 4 also showed that men with disabilities are *less* likely to work part-time. Table 9 shows that women with disabilities are similarly less likely to work part-time. The proportional reduction for both sexes is almost equal and the difference between them is not significant. Hypothesis 4b is not supported.

(Table 10 approximately here)

Finally, Table 4 demonstrated that the position of men with disabilities in low-level (grade Y and part-time) work is almost exactly matched to those without disabilities. The outcome of tests on Hypothesis 4c in table 10 indicates statistical significance; however this is due to women with disabilities being much *less* likely than women without disabilities to be in this type of employment (1.88% compared with 2.36%). We note that this finding is in line with our general expectation that men with disabilities are in a disadvantageous position in comparison to women with disabilities, however Hypothesis 4c, as stated, is not supported.

Overall, in relation to disability, there is mixed support for the hypotheses. Men with disabilities are more likely to be sorted into in low-grade work, and more likely to be sorted into low-grade part-time work than women with disabilities. However, the latter pattern is anomalous because the findings with regard to women with disabilities runs counter to our expectation. Lastly there is no support for the suggestion that men with disabilities are disproportionately sorted into part-time work.

The glass escalator

Our final interest concerning men in low-level employment is in progression out of the lowest grade. Our data allow us to track promotions from the lowest grade to the one above it –taking the glass escalator from the basement to the ground floor, as it were. Clearly, there are other possible routes out

of low-grade work, for example promotion to a higher-grade job in another organisation, or double promotions internally; limitations in our data set prevent us from commenting on these. Also, our data cannot tell us whether people who are promoted to Grade X remain there or progress further.

However, we contend that single internal promotions are likely to be indicative of the wider pattern of exit from the lowest grade, and are in any case interesting to analyse in their own right. During the period covered by the data, 7.3% of Grade Y workers were promoted one grade higher.

First, we report evidence for the existence of a glass escalator in this organisation. In total, 9.07% of men who started the research period in Grade Y were promoted to Grade X. The equivalent figure for women was 6.69%. This is significantly less ($t=25.25$, $p<.0001$). However, our main interest here is our expectation that White men and men without disabilities are more likely to ride the glass escalator than (respectively) ethnic minority men and men with disabilities; and that these differences will be greater than they are for women.

We undertake these comparisons using simple frequency data. Sample sizes are too small to undertake inferential statistical tests. The cell size is less than 5%.

Hypothesis 5 - That White men are more likely to be promoted from the lowest grade (Y) to the one above it (X) than ethnic minority men.

Hypothesis 7 - The disparity in progression rates out of grade Y (to grade X) in relation to ethnicity will be larger among men than it is among women.

(Table 11 approximately here)

This table shows that White men are much more likely to be promoted than ethnic minority men and the difference is large (9.58% compared with 5.02% exited Grade Y to proceed upwards). For White and ethnic women there is a less sizeable difference and it is marginally in the favour of ethnic minority women. The table shows that White men are the most likely to be promoted out of Grade Y and ethnic minority men are the least likely.

Hypothesis 6 - That men without a disability are more likely to be promoted from the lowest grade (Y) to the one above it (X) than men with a disability

Hypothesis 8- The disparity in progression rates out of grade Y (to grade X) in relation to disability will be larger among men than it is among women.

(Table 12 approximately here)

This table shows that men without disabilities are over 4 times more likely to be promoted than men with disabilities. For women with disabilities this general finding also holds, but the scale of the difference is much smaller. Once again, of the four groups, men from disadvantaged groups, this time those with disabilities, are the least likely to be promoted.

Summary of Findings

The analysis indicates that both men of minority ethnicity and men with disabilities are more likely than other men to be found in low-level work and relatively more likely to be found there than (respectively) women of minority ethnicity and women with disabilities. The same patterns apply with ethnic minority men in respect of part-time work and work that is both low-level and part-time. However, disability has a different association with part-time work; men with disabilities are no more likely to be found in such work and no more likely to be found there than women with disabilities. In relation to the third and fourth expectations, the analysis shows that ethnic minority men and men with disabilities are less likely to progress from low-level work than are other men, and that this pattern is much more marked than it is amongst women.

Discussion

The data give empirical support for the idea that men with labour market disadvantages are sorted into lower-level work that is typically, and demonstrably in this case, numerically dominated by women. In this organisation, both men of minority ethnicity and men with a disability are considerably more likely than other men to find themselves in the female-dominated lowest grade, and they are less likely to ride the glass escalator out of it. This suggests that if researchers are seeking to account for

the presence of men in lower-level female-dominated work, the presence of other labour market disadvantages amongst these men would be a good starting point (Lupton, 2006; Williams & Villemez, 1993).

Taken by itself, this is not a particularly surprising –if little-made –observation: it is already widely recorded that minority ethnicity and disability are associated in the UK labour market with less favourable employment outcomes (Longhi & Platt, 2008; Metcalf, 2009). Put another way, if minority men’s presence in lower-level work were principally the result of a general sorting of people with labour market disadvantages into lower-level employment, the analysis would simply have offered some important empirical evidence to support this “disadvantage” thesis. What makes these findings of greater interest is the fact that the pattern for men is different from that for women, and that it differs in respect of ethnicity and disability. The data show that the sorting of men from disadvantaged groups into low-level work is much more marked than the sorting of women. This points to the presence of *intersectional* effects (McCall, 2005) impacting on employment outcomes, with the individual factors (gender, ethnicity, disability) that impact on people’s employment prospects working in combination. Accordingly, the discussion that follows applies this intersectional thinking with a view to accounting for the disproportionate presence of some groups of men in feminised work. We start this discussion by looking at men in low-level work, before examining part-time work and exit from low-level work (the glass-escalator).

Building an intersectional account for the presence of minority men in low-status, feminised work

It is well established that, in western societies such as the UK, the gendering of the labour market sorts, on average, women into lower-level work and men into higher-level work (Longhi & Platt, 2008). There is also strong evidence that social structures and cultural practices around ethnicity and disability sort, on average, disadvantaged minority ethnic workers and those with a disability with the same effect (Metcalf, 2009; Berthoud, 2008). The interesting question, both theoretically and empirically, is how these vectors of disadvantage behave when they intersect. Important strands of intersectionality theory suggest that when they intersect, different effects emerge that cannot be read

off from the combinations (Hancock, 2007), and this is what is found here. Taking the gender and ethnicity interaction first, it is clear that a simple gender-plus-ethnicity model does not fit with the data – the impact of one’s ethnicity on one’s employment prospects appears to depend on whether one is a man or a woman. The pattern with disability is even more marked in the data – men with disabilities are nearly 3 times over-represented in low-level work. This finding is consistent with other work that has found that men of minority ethnicity and men with disabilities can fare worse in labour markets than their female counterparts (EHRC, 2010; Greenman & Xie, 2008; Metcalf, 2009).

As noted earlier, Subordinate Male Target theory (Navarette et al., 2010) and Intersectional Invisibility Theory (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008) each provide grounds for anticipating that disadvantaged men may fare worse than disadvantaged women. Also, in respect of disability specifically, there is research from matched-pairs experiments in the UK (Woodhams & Corby, 2003) to indicate that men are regarded as, so to speak, more disabled than women with an identical impairment. It is not known why, but it may be that impairment impacts on perceptions of men’s ability to conform to privileged hegemonic forms of masculinity – and this would be expected to affect the labour market prospects of men with disabilities detrimentally. We note that the findings in this study are broadly consistent with these theories and empirical findings but cannot be confident, on the basis of this research alone, that any or all of them contributes significantly to an account of men’s presence in low-status feminised work. It is also noted that there may be other intersectional effects at work. Specific and direct intersectional effects are not necessarily the only place to look. The observed patterns could be second order effects of more general underlying labour market forces. One possibility is that there are unobserved factors underlying the differential sorting of men and women. Social class may be one. For example, if women are sorted primarily by gender into lower status work (Anker, 1998), and men by social class (Goldthorpe & Jackson, 2007), a co-relation between minority ethnicity and socio-economic background would contribute to the over-representation of minority ethnic men in low-paid female work. The same argument is available in respect of disability, on the grounds of the association between socio-economic background and the likelihood of developing an impairment (Bowen & Gonzales, 2010; Cooper et al., 2008). This is an

intriguing hypothesis, but not one that can be tested here in the absence of data on social class. It is also one to be approached cautiously, given the evidence that the relationship between, for example, ethnicity and social class is neither deterministic nor uniform (Anthias, 2001; Platt, 2007).

A second possibility is that the impact of gender in structuring the labour market is so dominant over other vectors that minority ethnic women and women with disabilities have, as it were, no more disadvantage to absorb – whereas men, who do not suffer this general gender disadvantage, are much more clearly sorted by their other disadvantaged identities into lower-level work. However, this, like the “hidden factor” explanation, would have difficulty accounting for the fact that ethnic minority and women with disabilities in this dataset are not only less disadvantaged than one might expect, but actually *less* likely than White women to be in low-status work. To account for this, one would then need to invoke additional explanations. For example it may be that women from *particular* ethnic minorities are less likely to be found in the lowest grade, distorting the figures for ethnic minority women in general. Another possibility is that there is a selection effect operating amongst minority ethnic women and those with disabilities –for example that they are otherwise so disadvantaged that those who manage to secure employment at all are especially capable and thus able to progress.

It seems unlikely that there is a single intersectional account available that explains both the disproportionate representation of men from disadvantaged groups in low-paid feminised work and the relative under-representation of women from disadvantaged groups. It is more likely that an explanation rests on a number of these effects, and others, acting in combination. Further research, as we detail below, is required to explore this, but our findings indicate that such an intersectional analysis will be fertile.

Building an intersectional account for the presence of minority men in part-time work

One possible explanation is that minority ethnic men are sorted into part-time work by their labour market disadvantage, but that at least some women (of all backgrounds) may *choose* to work part-time. Leaving aside the vexed question of whether working part-time is always a genuine choice, it is certainly true that more women than men work part-time in the UK generally (5.2 million versus 1.5

million, ONS, 2013c) and more do so in the organisation studied. There is also evidence that men who work part-time are less likely than women to report that they do so because they *want to* work part-time, reporting rather that they do so because a full-time job is not available to them (32% versus 13%, ONS, 2013c). Given this, one might expect to find that the men in part-time work were more likely than the women in part-time work to be from disadvantaged groups (e.g. ethnic minorities). Again, an intersectional lens offers an explanation for the phenomenon observed. Further support for this line of argument is provided by the fact that the proportion of men of minority ethnicity in work that is both low status *and* part-time is more than double that of White men. The lowest-level, most feminised work is that most likely to be populated by the least advantaged men.

This discussion only applies in relation to disadvantages arising from ethnicity. The data showed that while men with disabilities are more likely to be found in low-level work, they are less likely than other men to be found in part-time work. It is not immediately obvious why minority ethnicity would sort men into feminised part-time work but disability would not do so. Given that the pattern is similar for women, it is possible that this reflects a general feature of people with disabilities' engagement with paid work in *this* organisation. In the UK overall, people with a disability are considerably less likely to do paid work than are people without disabilities (50% versus 70%, EHRC, 2010), but if they work, they are more likely to do so part-time (ECHR, 2010). The pattern is reversed in the organisation of study, suggesting that there may be organisation-specific factors at play. Whilst it would be interesting to know what these are, we note that while this would contribute to an understanding of people with disabilities engagement with work generally, it would not be central to our discussion of the distribution of men specifically.

Intersectionality and the glass escalator

The third point of discussion is our finding that men from disadvantaged groups (minority ethnic and with a disability) are less likely to ride the glass escalator to higher-level work. There is a need for caution in drawing conclusions from these findings, as there are only data available for one type of upward progression, and because the results in this section are not in a form that can be inferentially

statistically tested. That said, the findings do provide clear empirical support for existing ideas in the literature. First, the data suggest that there *is* a glass escalator (Hultin, 2003; Williams, 1995) – men are more likely to be promoted out of the lowest grade than women. Second, the data suggest that this effect varies between groups of men (Harvey Wingfield, 2009). Minority ethnic men are nearly half as likely to be promoted as White men, while men with disabilities are more than 4 times less likely to be promoted than men without disabilities. As before, the most interesting thing here is that these disparities are greater amongst men than women. Once again, there is evidence for an intersectional effect that divides men much more than it does women. Not only are men with a disadvantage more likely to find themselves working alongside women in low-paid work, they are less likely than other men to move upwards – and less likely to do so than the women they work alongside. These processes are, of course, mutually reinforcing.

Reflections on intersectionality

There is a lively debate in the literature around the meaning of “intersectionality”, its theoretical value, and the appropriate approach to researching it. One perspective views intersectionality as the tangible expression of interacting social structures (Bagilhole, 2010), with a corresponding intercategory methodological approach (McCall, 2005) which looks for patterns in outcomes for people in more than one category. A contrasting view emphasises the uniqueness of the experiences of people with multiple identities, advocating methodologies that examine these experiences in detail in their specific social context (Hofman, 2010 ; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). There is a secondary debate around the nature of interactional effects – broadly, whether social disadvantages combine in an additive or multiplicative way (Berthoud, 2003; Browne & Misra, 2003; Hancock, 2007).

The approach in this article falls within the first of these traditions, and will offer some support for those who see value in intersectional analysis of this kind. Firstly, it is clear that an intersectional approach offers some traction on the issue in question, the presence of men in female-dominated work. Secondly, it is clear that there are systematic patterns in the way that the effect of socially

dis/advantaged identities combine to impact on people's employment outcomes. However, these patterns do not suggest a straightforward adding up of single category disadvantages. As reported, within the general patterns there are nuances in the magnitude of the effects of multiple identities (gender, ethnicity and disability) and one outlier finding in relation to disability and part-time work. This suggests to us that while there is merit in a realist ontology of intersectionality, the intercategorical approach to researching it is best viewed as an important starting point. Both finer-grained categorical analysis and detailed qualitative analysis are needed to draw out the complexities and identify the causal mechanisms at work in particular settings.

Limitations

These conclusions need to be considered in the light of some limitations in the study. Firstly, the study is located in a single organisation, even if this is a large one and one which is unremarkable. Although there are few threats to validity i.e. no selection effects because the sample represents a total population, the use of reliable and stable measures, and statistical analysis which eliminates the effects of confounding variables, there is need for caution in generalizing to other organisational settings. Secondly, the study is located in the UK, and while it is likely that the UK shares many features of other western labour markets, there may be country specific affects which limit the generalisability of findings. Finally, one part of the analysis, that pertaining to the glass escalator, is not supported by inferential statistical testing, and should be treated cautiously.

Conclusion

This paper has considered the presence of men in low-level and part-time female-dominated work in relation to wider labour market patterns and the processes underlying them that distribute workers with different characteristics into different sorts of jobs. This approach is relatively unusual in studies of men in female-dominated occupations, which tend to focus on men's experiences in such work rather than how they got there – and, if addressing the latter question, tend to frame it in relation to individual difference and choice. There is no doubt that individual difference and choice and men's experiences and expectations of female-dominated work play important parts in explaining men's

presence (or absence) from such work domains. However, it is suggested here that these choices and decisions take place in the context of wider labour market patterns to which we have referred. Using this approach, it has been possible to show that – in respect of a very large organisational sample in the UK – men with labour market disadvantages (in terms of ethnicity and disability) are in almost all cases more likely to be found in feminised low-status work, but also that, where they are, this sorting effect is more pronounced amongst men than it is amongst women. This same pattern can also be seen in relation to movement out of low-level work –the glass escalator.

These are interpreted as intersectional effects, where the interaction of gender and other vectors of advantage/disadvantage intersect to the particular detriment of minority ethnic men and men with disabilities, and explanations have been suggested for how and why these intersectional effects may have the outcomes that they do. The challenges for other researchers are: (1) to establish whether these patterns apply in other organisational and wider labour market settings, and in other national contexts; and (2) to investigate through more detailed quantitative work, or through qualitative studies, the causal processes underpinning them.

References

- Allan, J. (1993). Male elementary teachers: Experiences and perspectives. In C.L. Williams (Ed.), *Doing "women's work": Men in nontraditional occupations* (pp. 113–127). London: Sage.
- Anderson, P. (1998). Choice: Can we Choose it? In J. Radford (Ed.), *Gender and Choice in Education and Occupation* (pp. 141–161). London: Routledge.
- Anker, R. (1998). *Gender and Job: Sex segregation of occupations in the world*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Anthias, F. (2001). The concept of social division and theorizing social stratification: Looking at ethnicity and social class. *Sociology*, 35, 835–854. doi: 10.1177/0038038501035004003
- Bagilhole, B. (2003). Prospects for change? Structural, cultural and action dimensions of the careers of pioneer women priests in the Church of England. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10, 361–377. doi: 10.1111/1468-0432.00200
- Bagilhole, B. (2010). Applying the lens of intersectionality to UK equal opportunities and diversity policies. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 27, 263–271. doi: 10.1002/cjas.167
- Berthoud, R. (2003). *Multiple disadvantage in employment: A quantitative analysis*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Berthoud, R. (2008). Disability employment penalties in Britain. *Work, Employment and Society*, 22, 129–146. doi: 10.1177/0950017007087420
- Blackwell, L. (2003). Gender and ethnicity at work: Occupational segregation and disadvantage in the 1991 British census. *Sociology*, 37, 713–731. doi: 10.1177/00380385030374005
- Blau, F. & Kahn, L. (2007). The gender pay gap: Have women gone as far as they can? *Academy of Management: Perspectives*, 21, 7–23. doi: 10.5465/AMP.2007.24286161
- Bowen, M. & Gonzales, H. (2010). Childhood socioeconomic position and disability in later life: Results of the health and retirement study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100, S197–S203. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.160986
- Browne, I. & Misra, J. (2003). The intersection of gender and race in the labor market. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 487–513. doi: 10.1002/9780470996973.ch9
- Budig, M. (2002). Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator? *Social Problems*, 49, 258–277. doi: 10.1525/sp.2002.49.2.258
- Cam, S (2011). Involuntary Part-time Workers in Britain: Evidence from the Labour Force Survey. *Cardiff School for Social Sciences Working Paper Series*. 142. Retrieved from: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/resources/wp142.pdf>
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R. & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14, 551–604. doi: 10.1007/BF00160017
- Collinson, D.L. & Hearn, J. (1994). Naming men as men: Implications for work, organizations and management. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1, 2–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.1994.tb00002.x
- Connolly, S. & Gregory, M. (2008). The part-time pay penalty: Earnings trajectories of British women. *Oxford Economic Papers* 2009, i76–i97. doi: 10.1093/oenp/gpn043

- Cooper, D., McCausland, W. & Theodossiou, I. (2008). Unemployed, uneducated and sick: The effects of socio-economic status on health duration in the European Union. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series- A: Statistics in Society*, 171, 939–952. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-985X.2008.00541.x
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299. doi: 10.2307/1229039
- Cross, S. & Bagilhole, B. (2002). Girlss: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of c*Gender, Work and Organization*, 9, 204–206. doi: 10.1111/1468-0432.00156
- Dabbs, J.R., de La Rue, J.M.D. & Williams, P.M. (1990). Testosterone and occupational choice: Actors, ministers, and other men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1261–65. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.59.6.1261
- De Ruijter, J. & Huffman, M. (2003). Gender composition effects in the Netherlands: A multi-level analysis of occupational wage inequality. *Social Science Research*, 32, 312–334. doi:10.1016/S0049-089X(02)00061-3
- Denissen, A.M. (2010). The right tools for the job: Constructing gender meaning and identities in the male-dominated building trades. *Human Relations*, 63, 1051–1069. doi: 10.1177/0018726709349922
- England, P. (2005). Gender Inequality in Labor Markets: The Role of Motherhood and Segregation Social Politics, 12, 264–288. doi: 10.1093/sp/jxi014
- England, P. & Herbert, M.S. (1993). The pay of men in "female" occupations: Is comparable worth only for women? In C.L. Williams (Ed.), *Doing "women's work": Men in nontraditional occupations* (pp. 28–48). London: Sage.
- Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010). *How Fair is Britain?* Retrieved from http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/triennial_review/how_fair_is_britain_-_complete_report.pdf
- Erikson, R. & Goldthorpe, J.H. (2010). Intergenerational class mobility and the convergence thesis: England, France and Sweden. *British Journal of Sociology*, 61,1, 185–219. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01246.x
- Galbraith, M. (1991). Attracting men to nursing: What will they find important in their career? *Journal of Nursing Education*, 30, 182–86.
- Germain, M-L., Herzog, M.J.R. & Hamilton, P.R. (2012). Women employed in male-dominated industries: Lessons learned from female aircraft pilots, pilots-in-training and mixed-gender flight instructors. *Human Resource Development International*, 15, 435–453. doi: 10.1080/13678868.2012.707528
- Goldthorpe, J. & Jackson, M. (2007). Intergenerational class mobility in contemporary Britain: Political concerns and empirical findings, *British Journal of Sociology*, 58, 525–546. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2007.00165.x
- Greenman, E. & Xie, Y. (2008). Double jeopardy? The interaction of gender and race on earnings in the United States. *Social Forces*, 86, 1217–1244. doi: 10.1353/sof.0.0008
- Hakim, C. (2004). Key issues in women's work: female diversity and the polarisation of women's employment. London: GlassHouse Press.

- Hancock, A-M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal diversity and the polarisation of women's employment. London: *GlassHouse Perspectives on Politics*, 5, 63–79. doi: 10.1017/S1537592707070065
- Harvey Wingfield, A. (2009). Racializing the glass escalator: Reconsidering mention of women's with women Wingfield *Gender and Society*, 23, 5–26. doi: 10.1177/0891243208323054
- Hofman, N. (2010). Understanding women on the glass escalator: Reconsidering men's experiences employment *Cultural Dynamics*, 22, 179–195. doi: 10.1177/0921374010383852
- Hultin, M. (2003). Some take the glass escalator, some hit the glass ceiling? Career consequences of occupational sex segregation. *Work and Occupations*, 30, 30–61. doi: 10.1177/0730888402239326
- Institute of Public Policy Research (2010). Trends in Part-time and Temporary Working Retrieved from: <http://www.ippr.org/uploadedFiles/pressreleases/Part-time%20and%20temporary%20work%20technical%20briefing.pdf>
- Jacobs, J.A. (1993). Men in female-dominated fields: Trends and turnover. In C.L. Williams (Ed.), *Doing "women's work": Men in nontraditional occupations* (pp. 49–63). London: Sage.
- Jome, L.M. & Tokar, D.M. (1998). Dimensions of masculinity and major choice traditionality. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 52, 120–34. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1996.1571
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karlsen, H. (2012). Gender and Ethnic Differences in Occupational Position and Earnings among Nurses and Engineers in Norway: Identical Educational Choices: Unequal Outcomes. *Work, Employment and Society*, 26, 278–295 doi: 10.1177/0950017011432907
- Long, P. (1984). *The personnel specialists: A comparative study of male and female careers*. London: IPM.
- Longhi, S. & Platt, L. (2008). *Pay gaps across equality areas*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- Lupton, B. (2000). Maintaining masculinity: Men who do and female carees *British Journal of Management*, 11, S33–S48. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.11.s1.4
- Lupton, B. (2006). Explaining men's masculinity: Men who do and female careers among Nurses and Engineers in Norway: Identical *Gender, Work and Organization*, 13, 103–128. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2006.00299.x
- Navarrete, C., McDonald, M., Molina, L. & Sidanius, J. (2010). Prejudice at the nexus of race and gender: An out-group male target hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 933–945. doi:10.1037/a0017931
- Marshall, J. (1984). *Women managers: Travellers in a male world*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality, *Signs*, 30, 1771–1800. doi: 10.1086/426800
- Metcalf, H. (2009). *Pay gaps across the equality strands: A review* (Report No. 14). Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- ONS (Office for National Statistics, UK) (2011). *Business Register and Employment Survey, 2011*. Retrieved from: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_280655.pdf

- ONS (Office for National Statistics, UK) (2013a). *Women in the Labour Market, Full Report*. Retrieved from: www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_328352.pdf
- ONS (Office for National Statistics, UK) (2013b). *Table A09 labour market status by ethnicity*. Feb 2013 release. Retrieved from <http://www.ons.gov.uk>
- ONS (Office for National Statistics, UK) (2013c). *Summary of labour market statistics March 2013 Release*. Retrieved from <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/lms/labour-market-statistics/march-2013/sty-uk-employment.html>
- Perfect, D. (2011). *Gender pay gaps* (Equality and Human Rights Commission Briefing paper 2). Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission Research.
- Platt, L. (2007). Making education count: The effect of qualifications on intergenerational class mobility. *Sociological Review*, 55, 485–508. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00715.x
- Platt, L. (2011). *Understanding Inequalities: Stratification and Difference*. Cambridge Polity Press
- Price-Glynn, K. & Rakowski, C. (2012). Who rides the Glass-Escalator? Gender, Race and Nationality in the National Nursing Assistant Study. *Work Employment and Society*, 26, 699–715 doi: 10.1177/0950017012451634
- Pringle, R. (1993). Male secretaries. In C.L. Williams (Ed.), *Doing "women's work": Men in nontraditional occupations* (pp. 128–151). London: Sage.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V. & Eibach, R. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, 59, 377–391 doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4
- Rafferty, A. (2012). Ethnic penalties in graduate level over education, unemployment and wages: Evidence from Britain. *Work, Employment and Society*. 26, 987-1006. doi:10.1177/0950017012458021
- Sargent, P. (2000). Real men or real teachers? Contradictions in the lives of men elementary teachers. *Men and Masculinities*, 2, 410–433. doi: 10.1177/1097184X00002004003
- Sayer, L. (2005). Gender, Time and Inequality: Trends in Women's and Men's Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Free Time. *Social Forces*, 84, 285–303. doi:10.1353/sof.2005.0126
- Simpson, R. (2004). The experiences of men in female-dominated occupations. *Work, Employment and Society*, 18, 349–368. doi: 10.1177/09500172004042773
- Smith, R. (2012). Money, benefits and power: A test of the glass ceiling and glass escalator hypothesis. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 639, 149–172. doi: 10.1177/0002716211422038
- Snyder, K. & Green, A. (2008). Revisiting the glass escalator: The case of gender segregation in a female-dominated occupation, *Social Problems*, 55, 271–299. doi: 10.1525/sp.2008.55.2.271
- Williams, C.L. (Ed.) (1993). *Doing "women's work": Men in nontraditional occupations*. London: Sage.
- Williams, C.L. (1995). *Still a man's world: Men who do women's work*. London: University of California Press.
- Williams, L.S. & Villemez, W.J. (1993). Seekers and finders: Male entry and exit in female dominated jobs. In C.L. Williams (Ed.), *Doing "women's work": Men in nontraditional occupations* (pp. 64–90). London: Sage.

- Wood, M., Hales, J., Purdon, S., Sejersen, T. & Hayllar, O. (2009). *A Test of Racial Discrimination in Recruitment Practice in British Cities* (Research Report 607). Leeds: National Centre for Social Research. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130314010347/http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rports2009-2010/rrep607.pdf>
- Woodhams, C. & Corby, S. (2003). Defining disability in theory and practice: A critique of the British Disability Discrimination Act 1995. *Journal of Social Policy*, 32, 2, 1–20. doi: 10.1017/S0047279402006979
- Wrench, J. & Modood, T. (2000). *The Effectiveness of Employment Equality Policies in Relation to Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in the UK*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Table 1: Sample Descriptives and chi-square statistical tests

		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Disability</i>		
	n	%	White (%)	Ethnic minority (%)	Without disabilities (%)	With disabilities (%)
Gender						
Male	832,951	74.8	93.9	6.1	98.3	1.7
Female	281,357	25.2	93.0	7.0	98.3	1.7
Total	1,114,308		990,454 (93.7%)	66,759 (6.3%)	1,095,012 (98.3%)	19,296 (1.7%)
			$\chi^2 (1, 1,057,212) = 304.9^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 0.122$ ns	

***p<.0001

Table 2: Organisation and sample descriptives, *t* and chi-square statistical tests

		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Ethnicity</i>		<i>Disability</i>	
		Male (%)	Female (%)	White (%)	Ethnic minority (%)	Without disabilities (%)	With disabilities (%)
Grade	<i>n</i>						
Y	16,706	0.5	4.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	3.1
X	127,710	11.7	10.8	10.8	11.5	11.4	14.5
Others	969,892	87.8	84.8	87.8	87.1	87.1	82.5
χ^2		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 22305.2^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,057,212) = 304.9^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 516.7^{***}$	
Mode	<i>n</i>						
Full-time	1,040,258	98.7	77.6	93.4	95.5	93.3	95.3
Part-time	74,050	1.3	22.4	6.6	4.5	6.7	4.7
χ^2		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 150735.6^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,057,212) = 468.0^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 114.6^{***}$	
Mean Length of Service (range 0 -46)		17.3 (9.7)	10.6 (7.7)	16.4 (9.5)	12.5 (7.5)	15.6 (9.7)	18.4 (8.8)
<i>t</i> =		<i>t</i> (1,114,306) = 334.7***		<i>t</i> (1,057,211) = 102.4***		<i>t</i> (1,114,306) = -40.329***	
Age (range 16-69)	Mean	40.8 (8.4)	37.4 (9.1)	40.4 (8.6)	38.1 (8.1)	39.9 (8.7)	43.85 (7.9)
<i>t</i> =		<i>t</i> (1,114,306) = 182.1***		<i>t</i> (1,057,211) = 66.7***		<i>t</i> (1,114,306) = -62.9***	
Geographic region	<i>n</i>						
Region 1	283,810	27.1	24.5	26.4	27.1	26.4	1.8
Region 2	213,084	18.3	24.5	20.8	5.5	19.8	2.1
Region 3	249,280	23.6	22.0	23.8	15.4	23.2	21.9
Region 4	34,246	3.1	3.8	3.5	0.5	3.3	4.7
Region 5	38,936	7.3	9.2	8.4	0.8	7.9	5.6
Region 6	28,371	2.5	3.0	2.9	0	2.7	2.0
London	179,578	18.0	13.0	14.0	50.8	16.8	14.5
χ^2		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 9016.9^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,057,212) = 67472.1^{***}$		$\chi^2 (1, 1,114,307) = 478.0^{***}$	

Table 3: Ethnic minority men and job variables, chi-square statistical tests.

Variables		White (%)	Ethnic Minority (%)	$\chi^2(df=1, 792,430)$
Grade	Grade Y	0.73	0.44	78.094***
	Other grades	99.27	99.56	
Mode	Part-time	1.66	1.15	94.431***
	Full-time	98.34	98.85	
Grade and Mode	Low-grade and part-time	0.38	0.19	86.56***
	Not low-grade and part-time	99.62	99.81	

***= $p < .0001$ $n = 792,431$ (excludes 'other' ethnicity category)

Table 4: Men with disabilities and job variables, chi-square statistical tests.

Variables		With Disabilities (%)	Without Disabilities (%)	$\chi^2(df=1, 892,950)$
Grade	Grade Y	1.48	0.48	281.152***
	Other grades	98.52	99.52	
Mode	Part-time	0.94	1.33	16.568***
	Full-time	99.34	99.85	
Grade and Mode	Low-grade and part-time	0.23	0.24	0.73 ns
	Not low-grade and part-time	99.77	99.75	

*** $p < .0001$ $n = 832,951$

Table 5: Gender/Ethnicity Interaction: Workers in Grade Y

Variable	Grade Y (%)	Other grades (%)	Proportion of ethnic minority group vs. same-gender white group (%)
Male White <i>n</i> = 744,284	0.44	99.56	166 (LR χ^2 = 66.34***)
Male Ethnic Minority <i>n</i> = 48,148	0.73	99.27	
Female White <i>n</i> = 246,170	4.47	95.53	67.3 (LR χ^2 = 93.51***)
Female Ethnic Minority <i>n</i> = 18,612	3.01	96.99	
Two samples t-test with unequal variance assumption for gender difference= 10.819*** using Scatterthwaites degrees of freedom adjustment			

****p*<.0001

Table 6: Gender/Ethnicity Interaction: Part-time workers

Variable	Part-time (%)	Full-time (%)	Proportion of ethnic minority group vs. same-gender white group (%)
Male White <i>n</i> = 744,284	1.15	98.85	144.3 (LR χ^2 = 89.16***)
Male Ethnic Minority <i>n</i> = 48,148	1.66	98.34	
Female White <i>n</i> = 246,170	22.98	77.02	51.3 (LR χ^2 = 1,400.00***)
Female Ethnic Minority <i>n</i> = 18,612	11.80	88.20	
Two samples t-test with unequal variance assumption for gender difference = 35.835*** using Scatterthwaites degrees of freedom adjustment			

****p*<.0001

Table 7: Gender/Ethnicity Interaction: Workers who are both Grade Y and Part-time

Variable	Grade Y and part-time work (%)	Not grade Y and part-time work (%)	Proportion of ethnic minority group vs. same-gender white group (%)
Male White <i>n</i> = 744,284	0.19	99.81	205.3 (LR χ^2 = 65.45***)
Male Ethnic Minority <i>n</i> = 48,148	0.39	99.61	
Female White <i>n</i> = 246,170	2.29	97.71	59.4 (LR χ^2 = 75.61***)
Female Ethnic Minority <i>n</i> = 18,612	1.36	98.64	

****p* < .0001

Table 8: Gender/Disability Interaction: Workers in Grade Y

Variable	Grade Y (%)	Other grades (%)	Proportion of group with disabilities group vs. same-gender group without disabilities (%)
Men with disabilities <i>n</i> = 14,403	1.48	98.52	308.3 (LR χ^2 = 185.74***)
Men without disabilities <i>n</i> = 818,458	0.48	99.52	
Women with disabilities <i>n</i> = 4,893	7.68	92.3	174.5 (LR χ^2 = 101.51***)
Women without disabilities <i>n</i> = 274,646	4.40	95.6	
Two samples t-test with unequal variance assumption for gender difference = 7.571** using Scatterthwaites degrees of freedom adjustment			

****p* < .0001

Table 9: Gender/Disability Interaction: Part-time workers

Variable	Part-Time (%)	Full-time (%)	Proportion of group with disabilities vs. same-gender group without disabilities (%)
Men with disabilities <i>n</i> = 14,403	0.94	99.06	75.8 (LR $\chi^2 = 18.40^{**}$)
Men without disabilities <i>n</i> = 818,458	1.24	98.76	
Women with disabilities <i>n</i> = 4,893	15.94	84.06	70.8 (LR $\chi^2 = 129.37^{***}$)
Women without disabilities <i>n</i> = 274,646	22.52	77.48	
Two samples t-test with unequal variance assumption for gender difference= -10.185*** using Scatterthwaites degrees of freedom adjustment			

p*<.001 *p*<.0001

Table 10: Gender/Disability Interaction: Workers who are Part-time and in Grade Y

Variable	Grade Y and part-time work (%)	Not grade Y and part-time work (%)	Proportion of group with disabilities vs. same-gender group without disabilities (%)
Men with disabilities <i>n</i> = 14,403	0.24	99.77	104.3 (LR $\chi^2 = 0.11$)
Men without disabilities <i>n</i> = 818,458	0.23	99.75	
Women with disabilities <i>n</i> = 4,893	1.88	98.12	79.7 (LR $\chi^2 = 5.09^{**}$)
Women without disabilities <i>n</i> = 274,646	2.36	97.64	
Two samples t-test with unequal variance assumption for gender difference= -2.211** using Scatterthwaites degrees of freedom adjustment			

p*<.001 *p*<.0001

Table 11: Gender/Ethnicity Interaction: Workers promoted from Grade Y into Grade X

Variable	Proportion of Grade Y that were promoted to Grade X (%)	<i>n</i>	Incidence of ethnic minority group compared with same-gender white group (%)
Male White	9.58	314	52.4
Male Ethnic Minority	5.02	17	
Female White	6.51	717	103.7
Female Ethnic Minority	6.75	36	

Table 12: Gender/Disability Interaction: Workers promoted from Grade Y into Grade X

Variable	Proportion of Grade Y that were promoted to Grade X (%)	<i>n</i>	Proportion of group with disabilities vs. same-gender group without disabilities (%)
Men without disabilities	9.4	371	24.5
Men with disabilities	2.3	5	
Women without disabilities	6.8	826	50
Women with disabilities	3.4	13	