Occupational Gender Composition and Union Dissolution: Exploring the Relationship and Mechanisms

Authors:

Wei-hsin Yu
University of Maryland, College Park

Janet Chen-Lan Kuo
National Taiwan University

Abstract:

Previous research has paid relatively little attention to how occupational characteristics shape individuals' risk of union dissolution. Using 17 rounds of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997, this study specifically examines the association between occupational gender composition and union dissolution hazards, as well as the underlying mechanisms. Results from event history models show that men in occupations with greater male representation are less likely, while women in such occupations are more likely, to exit an intimate union. Customarily male occupations' higher pay explains a modest part of the lower odds of union dissolution for men in such occupations. Conversely, the more family-unfriendly work schedules account for a sizable portion of male-dominant occupations' association with union instability for women. Interestingly, the higher pay and greater authority of customarily male occupations actually reduce the hazard of union dissolution for women in such occupations. Without these qualities, occupations with higher male representation would be even more strongly associated with women's risk of union dissolution.

The phenomenon of gender segregation by occupation has been one of the most persistent forms of gender disparities in the United States. Despite much growth in female educational attainment and labor force participation over time (Buchmann, DiPrete, and McDaniel 2008; England 2010; Goldin 2014), women and men to still work in different occupational settings to a large extent (Charles and Grusky 2004). Such segregation not only contributes to a sizable portion of the gender earnings gap but also accounts for women's worse working conditions and job quality compared to men's (Blau and Kahn 2000; Glass 1990; Petersen and Morgan 1995; Stier and Yaish 2014).

Although many scholars have investigated the consequences of occupational gender segregation (e.g, England 1988; Kilbourne et al. 1994; Stier and Yaish 2014), few pay attention to how working in occupations with different levels of gender composition may have an impact on the private domain—specifically, on the stability of individuals' intimate relationships. Because most people with jobs spend the majority of their waking hours at work, and because job demands and related stress often spillover to workers' family life (Mennino, Rubin, and Brayfield 2005; Williams and Alliger 1994), occupational characteristics are likely to play a role in shaping relationship quality, thereby affecting union stability. Indeed, the literature on union dissolution has long noted the importance of jobs and employment (Lyngstad and Jalovaara 2010). A lack of stable jobs and earnings for men, for example, increases the rate of union dissolution (Blossfeld and Müller 2002; Doiron and Mendolia 2012; Poortman 2005). Jobs that are conducive to work-family conflict, such as those with rotation schedules, are also likely to raise union instability (Presser 2000). Given that occupations in which men and women concentrate tend to differ in pay, working conditions, and job demands, it is likely that those working in customarily male and female occupations may have different hazards of union

dissolution. Existing research, however, sheds little light on this possibility.

Using data from 17 rounds of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), in this study we examine how individuals' occupational gender compositions are associated with their hazards of union dissolution and whether the association differs between men and women. In addition, we investigate a series of underlying mechanisms that may explain the differing hazards of union dissolution for those working in occupations with varying gender compositions. Merging the detailed occupational characteristics compiled by the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) with the NLSY97, we are able to identify the extent to which the differences in earnings, working conditions, job-related activities, selectivity of workers, and exposure to members of the different gender between customarily male and female occupations, respectively, explain the link between occupational gender composition and union stability. By doing so, this study not only helps fill the gap on the potential consequences of occupational gender segregation in the private domain but also enrich our understanding of the relationship of individuals' jobs and union stability.

Background and Hypotheses

Although previous research rarely examines the effect of occupational characteristics on union dissolution, the literatures on union stability and occupational gender segregation both provides theoretical reasons to expect occupational gender composition to be relevant to the hazard of union dissolution. Specifically, we expect that being in occupations with a higher level of male representation to be associated with greater odds of divorcing or exiting a cohabiting union for women (*Hypothesis 1a*), whereas it will be related to a slower pace of union dissolution for men (*Hypothesis 1b*). In the following, we discuss the potential reasons behind these expectations and the specific hypotheses to be tested to verify the different mechanisms.

Earnings. Previous research has long noted the importance of income on union stability (Blossfeld and Müller 2002; Kalmijn, Loeve, and Manting 2007; Lyngstad and Jalovaara 2010). Because of the traditional gender division of labor that portrays men as the provider for the family, men with lower economic resources are likely to experience a higher level of union instability. By contrast, when women have higher income, it increases their economic independence, thereby allowing them to exit an unhappy union (Kalmijn and Poortman 2006; Sayer and Bianchi 2000). Given that male dominant occupations tend to pay more (Blau and Kahn 2000; England 1988), men in customarily male occupations may have lower hazards of union dissolution, whereas women in such occupations have higher hazards, because male-dominant occupations pay more. Following this logic, we can further expect:

Hypothesis 2: Once controlling for earnings, the associations between occupational male representation and the hazard of union dissolution considerably reduce for both men and women.

Exposure. Working in male or female dominant occupations may also affect union stability because occupations serve as settings for men and women to meet their potential partners (McClendon, Kuo, and Raley 2014). When occupations provide greater exposure to members of the other sex, individuals may have greater opportunities of forming new relationships, resulting in the dissolution of their current unions. For this reason, women in occupations with higher levels of male representation can be expected to experience greater hazards of union dissolution. At the same time, men in customarily male occupations are likely to have fewer opportunities to meet women than their counterparts in customarily female occupations, leading to the former's higher union stability.

If exposure is the main mechanism that connects occupational gender segregation to union dissolution, we can also expect that the effects of working in customarily male occupations

on men and women to be greater if their occupations require them to socialize with others frequently. That is to say, when occupations do not require many interpersonal contacts by design, such as statisticians or furniture finishers, their gender composition is less likely to affect individual workers' chances of meeting same- or different-sex people. In addition, the exposure to the other sex is more likely to increase a cohabiting person's than a married person's likelihood to form a new union. Because marriages involve a higher level of comment and are generally less likely to dissolve than cohabiting unions (Lyngstad and Jalovaara 2010), those in marriages should be less likely to be tempted by the exposure to other potential partners than those in cohabiting unions. Thus, we can derive the following hypotheses from the exposure argument:

Hypothesis 3a: Occupational male representation will have a larger effect on union dissolution for those who are cohabiting than those who are married.

Hypothesis 3b: Occupational male representation will have a larger effect on union dissolution for men and women in occupational settings that are highly sociable.

Selectivity. An alternative reason why occupational male representation may be positively associated with union dissolution hazards for women, but negatively for men, is that women and men selecting into gender-atypical occupations have different views and beliefs about relationships and families, resulting in their different hazards. Prior research on union dissolution has indicated that values play an important role in shaping the likelihood of divorce (Lyngstad and Jalovaara 2010). Specifically, a few studies show that men and women with more traditional gender views are less likely to experience union dissolution (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Kalmijn, de Graaf, and Poortman 2004; Kaufman 2000). A likely mechanism is that individuals believing in the traditional gender division of labor within the family are also more

traditional in their views about marriage and divorce, making them more likely to stick to an intimate union even when its quality is suboptimal. Similarly, such people may be more religious, and religious teaching tends to discourage marriage dissolution.

Women who choose occupations with customarily male occupations may be less traditional in their values, including those regarding marriage and family. Such women may therefore have higher union instability. At the same time, men who choose occupations with higher levels of male representation may be more traditional, making them less likely to exit an intimate union, especially marriage. If the selectivity into gender-typical or gender-atypical occupations serves as a key mechanism, then taking into account whether individuals hold relatively traditional values toward family and their level of religiosity should reduce a sizable part of the association between occupational gender composition and union dissolution risk. This argument leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Once controlling for the view on the importance of family and religiosity, the associations between occupational male representation and the hazard of union dissolution considerably reduce for both men and women.

Conflict between roles at work and in the intimate union. Another possible reason why occupational gender composition may be linked to union dissolution has to do with the qualitative differences between customarily male and female occupations. Although male- and female-dominant occupations may overlap in the types of work activities and required skills (England 1992; Kilbourne et al. 1994), men are far more likely to be in occupations that confer authority (Huffman and Cohen 2004; Wright, Baxter, and Birkelund 1995; Yaish and Stier 2009), partly because authority and leadership are seen consistent with masculinity but incompatible with beliefs about women's gender (Haveman and Beresford 2012; McClean et al.

Forthcoming). Because occupations with higher male representation are more likely to require individuals to act authoritatively, women in such occupations are more likely to find their workplace roles to be inconsistent with their expected gender roles in a different-sex union. The possible spillover of workplace roles to the personal domain could make women in male-dominant occupations have greater difficulty complying with the socially prescribed gender relations within their unions, thereby raising the risk of discord and dissolution. By the same token, men in customarily male occupations are likely to find their relatively greater authority in the workplace consistent with their gender roles in the union. This consistency may be conducive to such men's greater union stability, compared to that of men in female-dominant occupations. Following this argument, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 5: Controlling for the extent to which the occupation confers authority weakens the association between occupational male representation and the hazard of union dissolution for both men and women.

Work schedules. Customarily male and female occupations are also likely to differ in their demand of time. Previous research shows, for example, that the greater likelihood to require workers to overwork—that is, working much more than the standard 40 hours per week—explains why women do not enter many male-dominant occupations, which in turn perpetuates occupational segregation between men and women (Cha 2013). In addition to the amount of time spent at work, occupations may also differ in the extent to which they have routine and predictable schedules. As schedule irregularity is found to be harmful to the family life and conducive to union dissolution (Clawson and Gerstel 2014; Presser 2000), it is possible that the link between occupational segregation and union dissolution has to do with the different levels of schedule irregularity between male- and female-dominant occupations. Based on the argument

about work schedules, we further expect:

Hypothesis 6: Controlling for whether respondents overwork at their jobs and their occupations' schedule irregularity substantially weakens the association between occupational male representation and the hazard of union dissolution.

Data and Methods

The data for the study come from the NLSY97, which collected information from a nationally representative sample of men and women born in 1980-1984 since 1997. We use the data from Round 1 to 17, with the last round fielded in 2015-16. At the last round, all the respondents were in their mid-30s. To study union dissolution, we pool all 17 rounds of data and create person-month observations based on the information recorded at each round. We then select the person-months during which respondents reported to be in either a cohabiting union or marriage, as being in a union is necessary for one to be exposed to the risk of union dissolution. We exclude union experiences before respondents turned 16 years of old, as intimate unions before such a young age may be qualitatively different. Because we are interested in how occupational characteristics are related to the risk of union dissolution, we further select all person-months during which respondents held a job and provided clear information about their occupations. In an exploratory analysis, we included person-months with no or unknown occupations, and the main results were similar. Hence we decided to exclude observations without occupational information so that the results can be interpreted more easily. After all the selections, our analytic sample contains 218,895 person-months for men and 225,268 person-months for women.

The dependent variable for the analysis is the dissolution of a union, coded as 1, and otherwise 0, if respondents reported to exit a cohabiting union or marriage in the observed

month. To test the series of hypotheses, we first introduce the male representation of occupations (from 0 to 1) created from the occupational data reported in the 2000 Census. We further include earnings, measured as the log hourly pay for the job. To test the hypothesis that the effect of occupational segregation will be stronger in more sociable occupations, we include a composite measure for occupational sociability. This measure is created from four indexes of occupational characteristics from the O*NET database: (1) the occupation's requirement for face-to-face discussion, (2) the occupation's demand for frequent contact with others, (3) the extent to which the occupation requires one to work with others and being personally connected with others on the job, and (4) the extent to which the occupation requires one to be cooperative with others. We use the alpha scoring method to create the composite index for occupational sociability (Crobach's alpha=0.8). To approximate respondents' values on family issues, we also include a measure for religiosity based on respondents' reports on the frequency of their religious practices and an index for the level in which respondents believe in the importance of family and holiday events.

We also use occupational characteristics derived from the O*NET database to create a variable for the degree to which the occupation confers authority. Specifically, we take advantage of the O*NET's indexes that measure the leadership requirement of the occupation: (1) the frequency in which incumbents in the occupation need to be responsible for others' work results and outcomes and (2) the frequency in which the incumbents must coordinate and lead others. For the hypothesis about work schedules, we use respondents' reports on the weekly hours they spent at the job observed in the sample to create a dummy variable for overworking. We consider spending 50 weekly hours or more on the job as overworking. We also include a measure derived from the O*NET to indicate schedule irregularity of the occupation.

Other than the key predictors just discussed, we control for a series of time-varying individual and partner attributes that may affect union stability, including educational level, school enrollment status, union type (i.e., marriage or cohabitation),[1] having a very young child ($\leq$ 3 years old), the age entering the union, partner's educational level, partner's employment status, having formed a union and broken up with the same partner before, work experience since age 14, job tenure, whether the observed job is part-time (<35 hours per week), geographic region, and whether to live in an urban area. We also include three time-constant variables: respondents' race-ethnicity, their parents' highest educational level, and the structure of the family in which respondents grew up (i.e., intact, two-parent family, single-mother household, step-parent family, and all other types). Moreover, because a respondent may have multiple union episodes in the sample, we control for the duration of the current union and the number of intimate unions reported before the current one in all models. To capture the potentially nonlinear relationship between union duration and the hazard of dissolution, we include union duration and duration squared in the analysis.

For nearly all independent variables we use a dummy variable to indicate missing values. Since most variables have only a small proportion with invalid values (<5%), the main results were ultimately unchanged when we eliminated the observations with missing values in an earlier analysis. Regarding the analytic strategy, we use discrete-time hazard rate models and fit models separately for men and women. Because the NLSY97 oversampled certain minority groups and inevitably have attrition over time, we apply the custom weights from the survey that are designed to address both issues. In accordance with the application of sampling weights, we also estimate robust standard errors for all models.

[1] In the models we consider all intimate unions together, while controlling for union type. Separating marriage from cohabitation, however, did not lead to meaningful changes in the results regarding occupational characteristics.

Preliminary Findings

Table 1 shows discrete-time hazard rate models predicting union dissolution for men and women. Model 1 is the baseline model that includes all the time-varying and time-constant control variables. Model 2 adds the proportion of men in the occupation. The results indicate that men working in occupations with higher proportions of men have lower odds of existing a union, conditional on they have not exited earlier. Conversely, women in occupations with greater male representation experience union dissolution at a faster pace. These results provide direct support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b.

To examine the underlying mechanisms for women's faster and men's slower paces of union resolution while working in occupations with higher representation of men, we fit a series of models and compare the model fit with Wald tests.[2] Table 2 lists for men the models tested and the comparisons of the models. While including earnings significantly improves the models (Model 2), the other predictors, which are related to Hypotheses 3-6, respectively, ultimately do not improve Model 2, indicating that these predictors explain little of men's risk of union dissolution. We further show the coefficients for the key predictors from Models 1-6 in Table 3 (other coefficients in the models omitted to conserve space). The results are rather inconsistent with the arguments emphasizing the exposure to the other sex, religious and family values, occupational authority, or work schedules. Thus, the higher earnings of customarily male occupations are the only explanation that accounts for some of the negative association between occupational male presentation and union dissolution hazards for men. We should note, however, including earnings only reduces some of this association; being in occupations with higher male

[2] Because logistic regression models using sampling weights can only estimate the values of pseudo log likelihood, a comparison of model fit using log likelihood is not feasible for our analysis. We therefore opt for using Wald tests to indicate whether any added variable has made a significant contribution to the model. Tables 2 and 4 report the results of such tests.

representation is associated with men's lower odds of exiting a union even after taking into account their pay. In this sense, the findings provide just modest support for the argument that men in male-dominant occupations are less likely to undergo union dissolution because of their higher income.

Table 4 compares a series of discrete-time hazard rate models predicting women's union dissolution risk. In contrast to the results for men, each model improves the previous nested one significantly for women. To show how the significant contributions of the various predictors correspond to the hypotheses, we present coefficients for the key predictors in Table 5. Interestingly, Model 2 shows although adding log hourly pay improves the model fit, the effect of earnings is not consistent with the hypothesis. Rather than reducing women's union stability, women with higher earnings actually have lower odds of exiting a union. Therefore, the higher pay of customarily male occupations cannot explain why women in such occupations experience greater union instability.

With regards to the argument about exposure to the other sex, the results from Models 3a and 3b are also contradictory to the related hypotheses. Specifically, Model 3a shows that occupational male representation is associated with higher odds of dissolution for marriage instead of cohabiting unions. As argued earlier, because the exposure to the other sex should be more tempting for those with lower commitment to their unions—that is, those who cohabit instead of being in a marriage, we should find the opposite if exposure constitutes a primary mechanism. Similarly, we find that occupational male representation does not affect women more if their occupations are also more sociable. This finding rejects Hypothesis 3b.

Model 4 further indicates that the level of religiosity and relatively traditional belief about family appear to reduce the odds of union dissolution for women, but the associations are

only marginally significant. More important, the inclusion of these variables alter the magnitude of the association of occupational male representation only slightly. Thus, taking into account values that may select women into gender-atypical occupations accounts for a rather small part of the relationship between occupational male representation and union dissolution risk for them.

Adding occupational authority in Model 5 affects the coefficient of occupational male representation substantially, but the coefficient changes in the opposite direction as expected in Hypothesis 5. In fact, occupying positions that confer authority is negatively associated with the risk of union dissolution. In other words, women in occupations that empower them are less likely to exit from a union, contradictory to the expectation that the spillover from their workplace role will increase discord in their unions. Perhaps women who have more power at work also feel a greater sense of control, which enable them to better manage their emotions and intimate relationships, leading to greater union stability. Once we take into account occupational authority and its negative association with union dissolution risk, occupational male representation is actually more strongly linked to union instability for women. Thus, had it not been the fact that women in customarily male occupations also have more power and authority at work, such women would experience union dissolution at an even faster pace.

Model 6 further includes work schedule variables. As expected, working in occupations that impose irregular schedules increase women's odds of exiting from a union. Working 50 hours or more per week also has a marginally significant effect—such working hours appear to increase union instability for women. Moreover, consistent with Hypothesis 6, controlling for overwork and schedule irregularity considerably weakens the association between occupational male representation and union dissolution hazards. Although occupational male representation is still positively associated with union dissolution risk in Model 6, male-dominant occupations'

temporal restrictions explain a substantial proportion of this association.

To summarize, results from the analysis confirm that men working in occupations with higher male representation are less likely, whereas women in such occupations are more likely, to experience union dissolution. On the mechanisms for these associations, for men, we find no support for the hypotheses derived from the explanations about the exposure to members of the other sex, the selectivity into customarily male occupations based on traditional values, the conflict in authority roles between workplace and home, or family irresponsive work schedules. The higher earnings of men in occupations with greater male representation explain such men's lower odds of union dissolution to some extent, but their lower odds remain even after we control for pay. For women, the mechanism that explains the most of the association between occupational gender composition and union dissolution risk is the work schedules for occupations with higher proportions of men. Consistent with the argument emphasizing scheduling conflict, women with greater schedule irregularity are more likely to undergo union dissolution. Moreover, the greater likelihood of schedule irregularity of customarily male occupations accounts for a sizable part of the association between such occupations and union dissolution risk. Even after controlling for work schedules, however, occupational male representation continues to be negatively associated with women's risk of union dissolution, if we also take into the account male-dominant occupations' greater authority, which is conducive to women's union stability. Perhaps beyond all the mechanisms we have considered, working in gender-atypical occupations requires individuals to constantly convince others their competence and to face more scrutiny at work (Kanter 1977). Such workplace dynamics could lead to extra psychological stress and, hence, increase the risk of union dissolution. Detailed and longitudinal

data collection on workplace dynamics and stress, however, is needed for future researchers to specifically examine this additional mechanism.

REFEREENCES

Blau, Francine D. and Lawrence M. Kahn. 2000. "Gender Differences in Pay." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14:75-99.

Blossfeld, Hans-Peter and Rolf Müller. 2002. "Union Disruption in Comparative Perspective: The Role of Assortative Partner Choice and Careers of Couples." *International Journal of Sociology* 32:3-35.

Buchmann, Claudia, Thomas A. DiPrete, and Anne McDaniel. 2008. "Gender Inequalities in Education." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:319-337.

Cha, Youngjoo. 2013. "Overwork and the Persistence of Gender Segregation in Occupations." *Gender & Society* 27:158-184.

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

Clawson, Dan and Naomi Gerstel. 2014. *Unequal Time: Gender, Class, and Family in Employment Schedules*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Davis, Shannon N. and Theodore N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:87-105.

Doiron, Denise and Silvia Mendolia. 2012. "The impact of job loss on family dissolution." *Journal of Population Economics* 25:367-398.

England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*: Aldine de Gruyter.

—. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society* 24:149-166.

England, Paula, George Farkas, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne, and Tomas Dou. 1988. "Explaining Occupational Sex Segregation and Wages: Findings from a Model with Fixed Effects." *American Sociological Review* 53:544-558.

Glass, Jennifer. 1990. "The Impact of Occupational Segregation on Working Conditions." *Social Forces* 68:779-796.

Goldin, Claudia. 2014. "A Grand Gender Convergence: Its Last Chapter." *American Economic Review* 104:1091-1119.

Haveman, Heather A. and Lauren S. Beresford. 2012. "If You're So Smart, Why Aren't You the Boss? Explaining the Persistent Vertical Gender Gap in Management." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 639:114-130.

Huffman, Matt L. and Philip N. Cohen. 2004. "Occupational Segregation and the Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: National Versus Local Labor Markets." *Sociological Forum* 19:121-147.

Kalmijn, Matthijs, Paul M. de Graaf, and Anne-rigt Poortman. 2004. "Interactions Between Cultural and Economic Determinants of Divorce in The Netherlands." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:75-89.

Kalmijn, Matthijs, Anneke Loeve, and Dorien Manting. 2007. "Income dynamics in couples and the dissolution of marriage and cohabitation." *Demography* 44:159-179.

Kalmijn, Matthijs and Anne-Rigt Poortman. 2006. "His or Her Divorce? The Gendered Nature of Divorce and its Determinants." *European Sociological Review* 22:201-214.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kaufman, Gayle. 2000. "Do Gender Role Attitudes Matter?: Family Formation and Dissolution Among Traditional and Egalitarian Men and Women." *Journal of Family Issues* 21:128-144.

Kilbourne, Barbara Stanek, George Farkas, Kurt Beron, Dorothea Weir, and Paula England. 1994. "Returns to Skill, Compensating Differentials, and Gender Bias: Effects of Occupational Characteristics on the Wages of White Women and Men." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:689-719.

Lyngstad, Torkild and Marika Jalovaara. 2010. "A review of the antecedents of union dissolution." *Demographic Research* 23:257-292.

McClean, Elizabeth, Sean R. Martin, Kyle J. Emich, and Todd Woodruff. Forthcoming. "The social consequences of voice: An examination of voice type and gender on status and subsequent leader emergence." *Academy of Management Journal*.

McClendon, David, Janet Chen-Lan Kuo, and R. Kelly Raley. 2014. "Opportunities to Meet: Occupational Education and Marriage Formation in Young Adulthood." *Demography* 51:1319-1344.

Mennino, Sue Falter, Beth A. Rubin, and April Brayfield. 2005. "Home-to-Job and Job-to-Home Spillover: The Impact of Company Policies and Workplace Culture." *The Sociological Quarterly* 46:107-135.

Petersen, Trond and Laurie A. Morgan. 1995. "Separate and Unequal: Occupation-Establishment Sex Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap." *The American Journal of Sociology* 101:329-365.

Poortman, Anne-Rigt. 2005. "How Work Affects Divorce:The Mediating Role of Financial and Time Pressures." *Journal of Family Issues* 26:168-195.

Presser, Harriet B. 2000. "Nonstandard Work Schedules and Marital Instability." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:93-110.

Sayer, Liana C. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2000. "Women's Economic Independence and the Probability of Divorce:A Review and Reexamination." *Journal of Family Issues* 21:906-943.

Stier, Haya and Meir Yaish. 2014. "Occupational segregation and gender inequality in job quality: a multi-level approach." *Work, Employment and Society* 28:225-246.

Williams, Kevin J. and George M. Alliger. 1994. "Role Stressors, Mood Spillover, and Perceptions of Work-Family Conflict in Employed Parents." *Academy of Management Journal* 37:837-868.

Wright, Erik Olin, Janeen Baxter, and Gunn Elisabeth Birkelund. 1995. "The Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: A Cross-National Study." *American Sociological Review* 60:407-435.

Yaish, Meir and Haya Stier. 2009. "Gender Inequality in Job Authority:A Cross-National Comparison of 26 Countries." *Work and Occupations* 36:343-366.

Table 1: Discrete-time hazard rate models predicting union dissolution

	Men				Women			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2	
Duration of union	-.007**	(.002)	-.006**	(.002)	-.001	(.002)	-.001	(.002)
Union duration squared	-.000	(.000)	-.000	(.000)	-.000	(.000)	-.000	(.000)
Race-ethnicity (Ref: Non-Hispanic white):								
Black	.013	(.064)	-.003	(.064)	.197***	(.060)	.207***	(.060)
Hispanic	-.087	(.068)	-.099	(.068)	-.078	(.066)	-.067	(.066)
Other ethnoracial group	.067	(.139)	.047	(.139)	.038	(.116)	.046	(.116)
Parental Education (Ref. < high School):								
High school	.101	(.071)	.101	(.071)	-.023	(.075)	-.018	(.075)
Some college	.021	(.080)	.019	(.080)	.155*	(.078)	.159*	(.078)
College +	.138	(.087)	.123	(.087)	.081	(.087)	.083	(.087)
Missing parent education	-.009	(.122)	-.008	(.122)	.194+	(.112)	.195+	(.112)
Childhood Family Structure (Ref. Two-biological parent):								
Single mother	.112*	(.056)	.111*	(.056)	.144**	(.053)	.147**	(.053)
Step-family	.197+	(.102)	.201*	(.102)	.250**	(.083)	.251**	(.083)
Other types of family	.200*	(.078)	.191*	(.078)	.269***	(.076)	.273***	(.076)
Family Structure missing	-.193	(.189)	-.195	(.188)	-.003	(.189)	-.008	(.189)
Respondent's education (Ref. High school):								
< High school	-.096	(.072)	-.092	(.072)	-.203**	(.073)	-.208**	(.073)
Some college	.052	(.060)	.031	(.061)	.004	(.055)	.008	(.055)
College +	-.345**	(.112)	-.395***	(.113)	-.111	(.084)	-.111	(.084)
Education missing	.044	(.127)	.037	(.127)	-.208+	(.120)	-.215+	(.120)
Region of residence (Ref. Northeast):								
North central	-.005	(.080)	.008	(.080)	-.050	(.073)	-.049	(.073)
South	.053	(.077)	.066	(.077)	.035	(.066)	.039	(.066)
West	-.021	(.085)	-.010	(.085)	.015	(.074)	.023	(.074)
Region missing	.359	(1.045)	.348	(1.043)	-1.122	(.731)	-1.098	(.732)
Urban residence (Ref. Rural):								
Urban	.108+	(.063)	.096	(.063)	.173**	(.059)	.175**	(.059)
Unknown	-.732	(1.043)	-.718	(1.041)	.787	(.727)	.770	(.728)
School enrollment (Ref. No enrolled):								
Enrolled	-.050	(.088)	-.077	(.088)	.150*	(.061)	.154*	(.061)
Unknown enrollment status	.534	(.481)	.546	(.477)	.321	(.381)	.333	(.382)
Any kid age 3 or younger (Ref. No):								
Have kids age 3 or younger	-.183***	(.053)	-.177***	(.053)	-.114*	(.049)	-.111*	(.049)
Unknown	-.022	(.165)	-.028	(.165)	-1.212**	(.397)	-1.216**	(.396)
Number of unions	.058*	(.028)	.058*	(.028)	.094***	(.024)	.094***	(.024)
Union Type (Ref. Marriage):								
Cohabitation	.943***	(.063)	.943***	(.063)	1.005***	(.059)	1.003***	(.059)
Age starting current union	-.042***	(.010)	-.041***	(.010)	-.051***	(.010)	-.052***	(.010)
Ever broke up with current partner	.334***	(.079)	.339***	(.079)	.144*	(.069)	.150*	(.069)
Employment status of the partner (Ref. Not employed):								
Employed	.068	(.057)	.065	(.057)	-.229***	(.063)	-.228***	(.063)
Employment status unknown	.025	(.094)	.014	(.094)	-.375***	(.094)	-.376***	(.094)
Education of the partner (Ref. < high school):								
High school	.072	(.087)	.073	(.087)	-.108	(.076)	-.102	(.076)
Some College	-.081	(.096)	-.083	(.096)	-.361***	(.087)	-.356***	(.087)
College+	-.452***	(.119)	-.459***	(.119)	-.598***	(.110)	-.593***	(.110)
Partner's education unknown	1.507***	(.088)	1.510***	(.088)	1.320***	(.077)	1.328***	(.077)
Respondent's employment status (Ref. Full-time)								
Part-time	.184**	(.059)	.168**	(.059)	-.019	(.047)	-.015	(.047)
Unknown	-.392	(.283)	-.377	(.282)	.128	(.279)	.101	(.281)
Work experience (years)	-.035***	(.010)	-.037***	(.010)	-.015	(.011)	-.015	(.011)

Job tenure (years)	-.024*	(.011)	-.023*	(.011)	-.073***	(.013)	-.073***	(.013)
Male representation in occupation			-.286**	(.095)			.333***	(.099)
Constant	-4.057***	(.229)	-3.865***	(.239)	-3.742***	(.231)	-3.842***	(.232)
N	218,895		218,895		225,268		225,268	

Note: Values in parentheses are robust standard errors. The NLSY97 longitudinal weights are applied to all models.
+ $p < .1$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$*** $p < .001$

Table 2: Comparison of discrete-time hazard rate models predicting union dissolution for men

		Wald test statistics		
	df	df change	chi2	*p*
Model 1: baseline + occupational male representation	42			
Model 2: Model 1 + Log hourly pay and missing pay	44			
Model 2 vs. Model 1		2	7.7	*
Model 3a: Model 2 + occupational male representation*union type	45			
Model 3a vs. Model 2		1	.75	
Model 3b: Model 2 + occupational sociability +occupational male presentation*sociability	46			
Model 3b vs. Model 2		2	.13	
Model 4: Model 2 + religiosity + family view + missing religiosity or family view	48			
Model 4 vs. Model 2		4	7.47	
Model 5: Model 2 + occupational authority	45			
Model 5 vs. Model 2		1	.08	
Model 6: Model 2 + overwork + schedule irregularity	46			
Model 6 vs. Model 2		2	2.08	

+ p <.1 * p < .05 ** p < .01*** p <.001

Table 3: Coefficients from discrete-time models predicting union dissolution for men

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Union type (*ref. Marriage*)							
Cohabitation	.943***	.939***	1.077***	.939***	.910***	.939***	.943***
	(.063)	(.063)	(.170)	(.063)	(.067)	(.063)	(.063)
Male representation in occupation	-.286**	-.245*	-.087	-.281	-.236*	-.242*	-.172
	(.095)	(.096)	(.210)	(1.658)	(.096)	(.096)	(.110)
Log hourly pay		-.083*	-.084*	-.083*	-.084*	-.083*	-.086*
		(.036)	(.036)	(.036)	(.036)	(.036)	(.036)
Pay unknown		-.248	-.246	-.246	-.235	-.247	-.246
		(.165)	(.165)	(.165)	(.164)	(.165)	(.165)
Cohabitation × male representation			-.199				
			(.229)				
Occupational sociability				-.038			
				(.280)			
Occupational sociability × male representation				.005			
				(.397)			
Importance of family					-.030		
					(.035)		
Missing family importance					-.227		
					(.143)		
Religiosity					-.035+		
					(.018)		
Missing religiosity					-.473		
					(.784)		
Occupational authority						-.015	
						(.052)	
Schedule irregularity							-.189
							(.133)
Overwork (>50 hours)							-.013
							(.075)
Constant	-3.865***	-3.961***	-4.076***	-3.797**	-3.782***	-3.915***	-3.756***
	(.239)	(.241)	(.277)	(1.199)	(.257)	(.292)	(.280)
N	218,895	218,895	218,895	218,895	218,895	218,895	218,895

Note: All models control for the same variables included in the baseline model (i.e., Model 1 in Table 1), but the coefficients are omitted to conserve space. Values in parentheses are robust standard errors. The NLSY97 longitudinal weights are applied to all models.
+ p <.1 * p < .05 ** p < .01*** p <.001

Table 4: Comparison of discrete-time hazard rate models predicting union dissolution for women

		Wald test statistics		
	df	df change	chi2	*p*
Model 1: baseline + occupational male representation	42			
Model 2: Model 1 + Log hourly pay and missing pay	44			
Model 2 vs. Model 1		2	6.69	*
Model 3a: Model 2 + occupational male representation*union type	45			
Model 3a vs. Model 2		1	5.45	*
Model 3b: Model 2 + occupational sociability +occupational male presentation*sociability	46			
Model 3b vs. Model 2		2	4.78	+
Model 4: Model 2 + religiosity + family view + missing religiosity or family view	48			
Model 4 vs. Model 2		4	10.01	*
Model 5: Model 2 + occupational authority	49			
Model 5 vs. Model 4		1	6.27	*
Model 6: Model 2 + overwork + schedule irregularity	51			
Model 6 vs. Model 4		2	9.59	**

+ p <.1 * p < .05 ** p < .01*** p <.001

Table 5: Coefficients from discrete-time models predicting union dissolution for women

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Union type (*ref. Marriage*):							
Cohabitation	1.003***	1.001***	1.181***	1.002***	0.973***	0.970***	0.970***
	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.098)	(0.059)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)
Male representation in occupation	0.333***	0.333***	0.744***	-0.278	0.317**	0.374***	0.241*
	(0.099)	(0.100)	(0.205)	(1.518)	(0.100)	(0.102)	(0.117)
Log hourly pay		-0.082*	-0.082*	-0.082*	-0.080*	-0.076*	-0.060
		(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)
Pay unknown		0.204	0.201	0.208	0.211	0.210	0.201
		(0.155)	(0.155)	(0.155)	(0.155)	(0.155)	(0.156)
Cohabitation × male representation			-0.548*				
			(0.235)				
Occupational sociability				-0.241			
				(0.166)			
Occupational sociability × male representation				0.123			
				(0.358)			
Importance of family					-0.072+	-0.075*	-0.074*
					(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)
Missing family importance					-0.060	-0.063	-0.077
					(0.134)	(0.134)	(0.135)
Religiosity					-0.033+	-0.033+	-0.032+
					(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)
Missing religiosity					-0.492	-0.464	-0.459
					(0.477)	(0.477)	(0.477)
Occupational authority						-0.124*	-0.125*
						(0.049)	(0.050)
Schedule irregularity							0.322*
							(0.136)
Overwork (>50 hours)							0.171+
							(0.093)
Constant	-3.842***	-3.896***	-4.049***	-2.841***	-3.617***	-3.227***	-3.558***
	(0.232)	(0.235)	(0.245)	(0.762)	(0.250)	(0.292)	(0.325)
N	225,268	225,268	225,268	225,268	225,268	225,268	225,268

Note: All models control for the same variables included in the baseline model (i.e., Model 1 in Table 1), but the coefficients are omitted to conserve space. Values in parentheses are robust standard errors. The NLSY97 longitudinal weights are applied to all models.
+ p <.1 * p < .05 ** p < .01*** p <.001