European Bank
for Reconstruction and Development

Gay glass ceilings: sexual orientation and workplace authority in the United Kingdom

Cevat Giray Aksoy, Christopher S. Carpenter, Jeff Frank and Matt L. Huffman

Abstract

We provide the first large-scale evidence on this question using confidential data from the 2009-14 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS) (N = 607,709). We find that gay men and lesbians are significantly more likely to have positions of authority in the workplace than otherwise similar heterosexual men and women. However, we also find clear evidence that gay men face glass ceilings: their higher likelihood of attaining workplace authority is driven entirely by their significantly higher odds of being low-level managers. In fact, gay men are significantly less likely than comparable heterosexual men to be in the highest-level managerial positions that come with higher status and pay. Moreover, this "gay glass ceiling" is stronger for racial minorities than for white people. Corresponding effects for lesbians exist but are notably weaker. These results provide the first direct evidence of social stratification in the workplace associated with a minority sexual orientation and reveal that differences are exacerbated for individuals with multiple marginalised identities.

Keywords: sexual orientation, workplace authority, supervisory authority, managerial occupations

JEL Classification Number: J15, J71, M54

Contact details: Cevat Giray Aksoy, One Exchange Square, London EC2A 2JN, UK.

Phone: +44 20 733 87106; email: aksoyc@ebrd.com

Cevat Aksoy is a Principal Economist at the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), a Research Associate at the London School of Economics, and IZA Institute of Labour Economics. Christopher Carpenter is a Professor of Economics at Vanderbilt University, a Research Fellow at the National Bureau of Economic Research, and IZA Institute of Labour Economics. Jeff Frank is a Professor of Economics at Royal Holloway College, University of London. Matt Huffman is a Professor of Sociology at UC Irvine.

The results in this paper are based on confidential versions of the 2009-14 Integrated Household Surveys through a special licence with the UK Office for National Statistics. Results do not imply the endorsement of the UK Office for National Statistics, EBRD or any other agency. We thank Ralph De Haas, Sergei Guriev and David Pevalin for helpful discussions. All interpretations, errors and omissions are our own.

Working Paper No. 218 **Prepared in July 2018**

1. Introduction

Do sexual minorities[1] face barriers when accessing jobs with supervisory and managerial workplace authority? Once on the managerial ladder, do sexual minorities face glass ceilings that block them from higher-level posts?

Very little empirical research has addressed these questions, despite a now comprehensive examination of how lesbian and gay earnings compare with those of heterosexuals. In contrast to the research gap for sexual minorities, large literatures document significantly less access to workplace authority for women and racial and ethnic minorities relative to white men (for example, Baxter and Wright 2000; Wright, Baxter and Birkelund, 1995; Cohen and Huffman, 2007a; Cotter et al., 2001; Hultin, 2003; Maume, 1999; and Smith, 2012).

Managerial authority in the workplace is important for three reasons given by Wright et al. First, as we will directly show in our empirical analysis, workplace authority is one of the main determinants of labour market earnings. Second, these jobs are desirable in their own right, since they typically have relatively high occupational prestige and recognition. Third, inequalities in authority across gender or ethnic groups may be key mechanisms that generate and sustain inequalities in workplace outcomes. Having more female senior managers, for example, may lead to more equitable treatment of women throughout the organisation (Cohen and Huffman, 2004). The presence of high-status female managers has a large impact on mitigating gender wage differentials.[2] Lastly, positions of authority in the workplace may allow individuals from under-represented groups to sidestep personal discrimination and potential harassment.

In this paper we provide the first large-scale systematic evidence on the relationship between a minority sexual orientation and workplace authority. We analyse confidential data from the 2009-14 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS) which asked individuals directly about their sexual orientation, as well as containing a raft of individual, household and workplace questions.

The IHS data benefit from a large sample size: we analyse data on over 645,000 working-age adults, including more than 6,000 self-identified sexual minorities. There are two independent avenues by which we can examine workplace authority. There are direct questions on whether individuals have managerial and/or supervisory authority in the workplace. A different question asks about the occupation held by the individual and codes this by the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC). We use both measures in our analysis, and we generally find that our results are robust to the measure. The NS-SEC measure has the advantage that it differentiates between upper-level managers and lower-level managers. This allows us to investigate the existence of possible glass ceiling effects (Cotter et al., 2001).

Our analysis yields clear and surprising findings for gay men. Specifically, we provide the literature's first evidence that gay men are significantly more likely than otherwise similar heterosexual men to report managerial authority and/or supervisory responsibilities in the workplace. Using the NS-SEC measure, we also find that they are more likely to have a

[1] We use the term "sexual minorities" to refer to gay and bisexual men and lesbian and bisexual women. We will sometimes refer to each group explicitly. We will also sometimes refer to heterosexual men and women as "straight".

[2] For related evidence from female representation at the highest levels of organisations, see Matsa and Miller (2011, 2013), Bell (2005), and Kunze and Miller (2014).

managerial/professional post. However, we find strong evidence from the NS-SEC that there are glass ceilings: the managerial advantage experienced by gay men stems entirely from the fact that they are more likely than heterosexual men to be low-level managers. Gay men are significantly less likely than otherwise similar heterosexual men to attain the highest level managerial positions that come with increased status and pay. When we perform Oaxaca decompositions to understand the source of the gay male disadvantage with respect to workplace authority, we find that most of the difference is due to differential returns to observed characteristics and skills (such as education) as opposed to differential endowments. That is, the evidence is most consistent with discrimination explaining differential access to top managerial positions.

The results for lesbians are less clear-cut. Lesbians are significantly more likely than heterosexual women to have managerial authority (but only weakly significantly to have more supervisory authority). But they are significantly less likely than comparable heterosexual women to have any NS-SEC managerial/professional occupation, notably including the highest-level managerial posts. Bisexual men and women are both significantly less likely than otherwise similar heterosexual adults to have any of the types of workplace authority (regardless of the measure), though these differences are not always statistically significant.

We also take advantage of this new dataset to re-examine access to workplace authority by gender and ethnicity, irrespective of sexuality. Non-white men and women show a general disadvantage compared with white men and women. They are generally less likely to report managerial and/or supervisory authority and are less likely to have a managerial occupation by the NS-SEC classification. They are, however, more likely to hold low-level managerial posts than comparable white individuals. Women, compared with men, are significantly less likely to report managerial and/or supervisory authority. They are significantly more likely to hold NS-SEC managerial posts, but this is entirely due to low-level posts. That is, our data also provide strong evidence that women face glass ceilings (which has been previously documented in the literature). Lastly, we document evidence of intersectionality: the "gay glass ceiling" effect – whereby gay men have significantly lower access to top managerial posts – is much stronger for racial minorities than for white people.

2. Prior research and conceptual framework

2.1 Prior research

Empirical research on sexual orientation and work-related inequality has focused on earnings and income. Several studies have found that gay men earn significantly less than similarly situated straight men, while lesbians earn more than similarly situated straight women. This pattern has been shown to exist not only in the United States (for example, see Badgett, 1995; Allegretto and Arthur, 2000; Antecol et al., 2010; Carpenter, 2007; and Mize, 2016) but also in Canada (Carpenter, 2008b), the United Kingdom (Aksoy et al., 2018; Arabsheibani et al., 2004, 2005), the Netherlands (Plug and Berkhout, 2004), Australia (Carpenter, 2008a), Greece (Drydakis, 2011), France (Laurent and Milhoubi, 2012), and elsewhere.[3] Aksoy et al. (2018), using the same UK dataset as we use in this paper, confirms the standard findings of a lesbian earnings premium and a gay male disadvantage.

In contrast to earnings and income, little research has addressed sexual orientation gaps in access to managerial autonomy and authority, which is our main focus. The closest related strand of research has been to examine workplace authority gaps and glass ceilings for racial minorities and women (Baxter and Wright, 2000; Huffman and Cohen, 2004; Cohen and Huffman, 2007).

Building on an earlier literature, Wright et al. (1995) engage in a comprehensive, cross-country study of gender gaps in workplace authority and – further – in whether or not glass ceilings exist. They find gender gaps in all the countries, albeit of differing magnitudes. However, they do not find evidence of glass ceilings where, once on the managerial ladder, women suffer further disadvantage in rising to higher level posts.

Smith (2012) uses a different definition of glass ceiling, and examines whether gender gaps in wages and benefits rise or fall with progression up the hierarchy. Interestingly, he finds evidence for glass escalators – white men benefiting more in a workplace with female or minority managers – rather than for glass ceilings. Zeng (2011) also finds little evidence for glass ceilings in that the primary causes of under-representation for women and minorities lie in low levels of promotions at the lower and middle part of the hierarchy, and not the top end. Further, these groups are more likely to suffer downward mobility than white males.

In contrast to this extensive literature on workplace authority and glass ceilings for women and minorities, only a few studies have examined these issues for sexual minorities.

[3] There are a few exceptions to this general pattern. For example, Carpenter (2005) finds no earnings difference associated with a minority sexual orientation using 2001 data from California, and Carpenter and Eppink (2017) find evidence that gay men earn significantly more than similarly situated heterosexual men using recent data from the National Health Interview Survey. In addition to earnings, other studies examine employment and find evidence of differential treatment faced by gay men. Tilcsik (2011), for example, performed a resumé experiment in several cities in the United States and found evidence of statistically significant differences in callback rates disfavouring candidates whose resumés were randomly assigned "gay" characteristics (such as a leadership position in an LGBT organisation).

Using a sample of UK academics, Frank (2006) found that gay male academics had significantly lower ranks than their otherwise similar heterosexual male counterparts.[4] Ahmed et al. (2011) examine the relationship between sexual orientation and occupational rank using Swedish population register data on all same-sex couples who formalised their relationship with the government. They find that men in same-sex couples were significantly less likely to attain managerial positions, while lesbians were significantly more likely to attain such positions, consistent with the general pattern of results on earnings.

In contrast, Antecol et al. (2008) used data from the 2000 US census and found that partnered gay men and partnered lesbians are both significantly more likely to be in management occupations than their married and cohabiting heterosexual counterparts.

Lastly, Ueno et al. (2013) use US data from AddHealth for young adults, which include information on supervisory responsibilities on the job. They report no sexual orientation-related differences in supervisory responsibilities for their sample of young adults.[5]

While the existing studies are important, they all use data that are either limited demographically or by sample size. Relative to the studies using large samples of same-sex couples in the United States and Sweden, we study a more representative sample by examining non-partnered sexual minorities in addition to partnered sexual minorities. Importantly, we benefit from the fact that the UK classification system for managerial occupations distinguishes between higher- and lower-level managerial occupations – the former enjoy greater status, prestige and resources compared with the latter. They are also more likely to have a university degree, earn more and have managerial and supervisory authority at work. This allows us to identify our primary result on the existence of gay glass ceilings, with gay men concentrated in lower-level managerial occupations.

[4] A 2011 report from the UK Office for National Statistics also documents that gay men have a higher likelihood of having managerial and professional occupations using the 2011 wave of the data we also use here. That study did not control for demographic characteristics (such as the fact that gay men have significantly higher levels of education than heterosexual men), did not directly examine questions about managerial and supervisory authority in the workplace, and did not separately consider "higher" from "lower" managerial positions.

[5] We note that most studies in the literature on sexual orientation and earnings have recognised the importance of occupation choices and occupational segregation, even if workplace authority is not their primary focus. Most wage earnings studies, for example, include controls for broad occupation categories. Recent work by Tilcsik et al. (2015) shows that sexual minorities sort into occupations requiring greater task independence and/or social perceptiveness, even after accounting for the well-documented gender-atypical sorting of sexual minorities. Another recent study shows that sexual minorities shy away from prejudiced occupations (Plug et al. 2014). Other studies have focused on specific industries and occupations, such as public sector employment which generally has stronger antidiscrimination protections than the private sector (see, for example, Humphrey 1999, Lewis and Pitts 2009, and others).

2.2 Conceptual framework

Our empirical analyses are motivated by a conceptual framework that involves a multi-stage process for an individual's managerial/supervisory career. By investing in education, sexual minorities can gain a foothold on the managerial/supervisory ladder. Qualifications at this stage – for lower level supervisory and managerial posts – are relatively measurable. We therefore look at whether sexual minorities achieve posts with self-reported supervisory or managerial responsibilities, or whether – using the NS-SEC data – they obtain posts with managerial/professional status. While education and formal qualifications may get someone on the managerial/supervisory ladder, moving up the ladder depends more on subjective perceptions of work performance. There is consequently more of a role for potential tastes for discrimination. Using the NS-SEC data for high versus low level managerial/professional posts, we can see if this effect leads to glass ceilings.

The literature on female and visible minority workplace authority provides related stereotyping arguments for under-representation in managerial/supervisory posts and for glass ceilings with regards to moving up to higher-level managerial posts. To the extent that sex stereotypes shape the perception of managers and the exercise of workplace authority as masculine, there may be a "lack of fit" between the characteristics believed to be held by sexual minorities and the requisite skills for success in management (Heilman, 1983; Schein, 2001). This may be an especially relevant mechanism to explain gay men's low representation and lack of success in managerial roles, to the extent that beliefs about the characteristics of successful managers are thought not to be generally held by gay men. In short, gay men may be penalised for not being perceived to have the stereotypically male heterosexual traits thought to be required among managers. If this is true, we would expect the disadvantages to become more pronounced as one moves up the managerial hierarchy, for example, from "low" to "high" management. This is consistent with a glass ceiling effect, which posits that barriers become more pronounced as one moves up organisational hierarchies (Cotter et al. 2001).

3. Data and methods

3.1 Data

We analyse data from a special licence of confidential versions of the 2009-14 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS). The IHS is a large, representative household survey of UK residents similar to the March Current Population Survey in the United States. Approximately 400,000 individuals are sampled in each wave of the IHS. For our purposes, one key feature of these data is that the IHS asked respondents a direct question about their sexual orientation.[6]

The IHS contains both a telephone and face-to-face survey mode. In the former, respondents aged 16 and older are asked: "I will now read out a list of terms people sometimes use to describe how they think of themselves. (INTERVIEWER: read list to end without pausing. Note that "Heterosexual or Straight" is one option; "Gay or Lesbian" is one option.) 1. Heterosexual or Straight, 2. Gay or Lesbian, 3. Bisexual, 4. Other (Spontaneous DK/Refusal). As I read the list again please say "yes" when you hear the option that best describes how you think of yourself. (INTERVIEWER: Pause briefly after each option during second reading)."

In the face-to-face interviews, participants aged 16 and older were shown a card that had the terms printed next to a number (such as "27. Heterosexual/Straight"). Individuals were then asked "Which of the options on this card best describes how you think of yourself? Please just read out the number next to the description." Notably, sexual minorities did not have to verbalise the words "gay," "lesbian," or "bisexual" to indicate their sexual orientation in either the telephone or face-to-face survey modes, which can reduce potential stigma.[7] Approximately 1.4-1.7 per cent of individuals 16 and older self-identified as gay, lesbian or bisexual in each wave of the IHS, which is similar to other large population-based surveys in the United Kingdom, United States and Canada (Joloza et al. 2010).

The IHS asks respondents detailed questions about employment status, as well as occupation, industry, and questions about firm size among the sample that reports working. Individuals are also asked separately about both supervisory responsibility and managerial responsibility in their job. Specifically, employed individuals are asked: "In your job do you have formal responsibility for supervising the work of other employees?" Interviewers are instructed to exclude people who only supervise children (such as teachers, nannies or childminders), animals, or security or buildings (such as caretakers or security guards). Employed individuals are then asked "(And) did you have any managerial duties?"

[6] Most studies in the literature on sexual orientation and earnings have relied on indirect methods for identifying sexual minorities, such as same-sex sexual behaviour (as in some public health surveys) or, more commonly, the presence of a cohabiting same-sex partner (such as the UKLFS as used in Arabsheibani et al. 2005, 2004). Since people who do not have sex can still identify as belonging to a sexual minority, and since single non-partnered sexual minorities may have different outcomes than cohabiting partnered sexual minorities, our individual-level data on self-reported sexual orientation are preferred as a more comprehensive sample of the overall population of LGB individuals.

[7] In our empirical models below we include a dummy variable for interviews that were conducted face-to-face. Forty-four per cent of interviews were conducted either by proxy or for respondents under the age of 16, and in these cases sexual orientation questions were not asked. We exclude these observations.

We use dichotomous variables to indicate those with supervisory responsibility and managerial responsibility. If the answer to both questions is affirmative, we say that the individual has both "managerial and supervisory responsibility". The main difference between managerial and supervisory authority is that a manager has decision-making authority and is responsible for deciding the role, task and future of his/her department, whereas a supervisor implements the decisions established by the managers.

Self-reported supervisory and/or managerial responsibility is one measure of an individual's job responsibilities. We also consider complementary measures of workplace status and access to workplace authority based on an available set of occupation codes in the UK IHS data. Specifically, the UK Office of National Statistics commissioned a review of occupation codes in 1994 that resulted in a revised "National Statistics Socio-economic Classification" (NS-SEC) (Rose and Pevalin, 2003; Rose and Pevalin with O'Reilly, 2005; Rose and Harrison, 2010). The revised occupation classification system was derived from the Goldthorpe Schema (Goldthorpe 1980/1987; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992) that was designed to measure the employment relations and conditions of occupations for the purpose of measuring the structure of socioeconomic positions in modern societies. The Goldthorpe Schema has been internationally validated as a good predictor of health, education and other socioeconomic outcomes (Bartley et al., 1996). The design took a number of variables into account, such as whether the worker is an employee or self-employed; the nature of the "service relationship" between the worker and the firm (that is, whether and/or how employees are regulated through employment contracts); the size of the firm (as measured by number of workers); and the magnitude of the managerial and/or supervisory responsibilities on the job.

Given our research questions, the NS-SEC coding is advantageous because among the sample employed in managerial occupations, it distinguishes between "high" and "low" managers based on the factors described above (including firm size and the nature of the employment relationship). Although the NS-SEC was not created to be an explicitly hierarchical rubric, there is a clear ranking embedded in the distinction between the higher and lower managerial positions. Below, we document directly that individuals who the UK ONS classified as "high managers" have significantly higher earnings than "low managers" even conditional on all other observed determinants of pay (including alternative occupation dummies, the direct managerial/supervisory responsibility variables, and the job characteristics that enter into the decision rule to classify someone as a high or low manager), despite that low managers also command significant earnings premia relative to non-managers. Thus, we infer an explicit hierarchy in workplace status whereby "high" managers have greater access to workplace authority and status than "low" managers.

In addition to the critical questions on sexual orientation and workplace authority, the IHS also includes standard demographic characteristics such as sex, age, race, educational attainment, marital status and the presence of children in the household. We focus on individuals most likely to have completed their education (those aged 25 and over); however, the results are robust to including 18-24 year olds.

3.2 Empirical approach

To assess the relationship between sexual orientation and workplace authority we estimate a series of multivariate regression models relating worker characteristics to various employment outcomes, including the likelihood a person reports having managerial authority on the job, the likelihood a person reports having supervisory authority on the job, and the likelihood a person reports having both supervisory and managerial authority. In addition, we use the occupational measures from the NS-SEC coding on whether the individual is a higher or a lower manager. We proceed by estimating linear probability models for the dichotomous outcomes for ease of interpretation, though logistic regression models returned similar patterns. We estimate most models separately by sex.

Our models take the form:

$$OUTCOME_i = \alpha + \beta 1 X_i + \beta 2(GAY/LESBIAN)_i + \beta 3(BISEXUAL)_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where $OUTCOME_i$ is one of the workplace authority indicators described above (managerial responsibilities at work, supervisory responsibilities at work, higher managerial positions, lower managerial positions, and others) for individual i. X_i is a vector of demographic variables and job characteristics that includes: age and its square; education dummies (degree levels, higher education qualification below degree level, A-levels, O-levels); race dummies (white, black, Asian, mixed race, other race); location dummies (London, England excluding London, Scotland, and Northern Ireland); dummy variables for the presence of children in the household (any child <5, any child aged at least 5); a dummy variable indicating the person is in any type of partnership (marriage or cohabiting unmarried partnership); seven firm size dummies (1-10, 11-19, 20-24, 25-49, 50-249, 250-499, and ≥500); eight industry dummies (energy and water; manufacturing; construction; hotels and restaurants; transportation and communication; banking and finance; education and health; and other services); and eight occupation dummies (manager, director and senior officials; professional occupations; associate professional and technical occupations; administrative and secretarial occupations; skilled trades occupations; caring, leisure and other service occupations; customer service and sales occupations; and elementary occupations) based on the Standard Occupational Classification 2010 (SOC 2010).

Note that the occupation dummies used as controls in equation (1) from the SOC 2010 are distinct from the "higher" and "lower" manager variables described earlier which are based on the NS-SEC: specifically, the SOC 2010 occupation coding – unlike the NS-SEC coding – is not designed to account for socioeconomic status differences such as the nature of the employment relationship.

Partly because of this, the occupation dummies in equation (1) are not highly collinear with the NS-SEC occupation-based classifications, so we can estimate models predicting whether an individual is a higher or lower manager even in the presence of the standard occupation dummies.

We focus primarily on full-time workers, although in results not reported we also explored robustness to samples of all workers and found similar patterns. Note that in equation (1) model the relevant excluded category is composed of individuals who report a heterosexual orientation. In all models we separately include dummy variables for people who reported "other", who refused to respond to the sexual orientation question, or who reported "don't know" in response

to the sexual orientation question (although we do not report the coefficients in the results tables). All models include a dummy variable for interviews performed face-to-face. We estimate standard errors robust to heteroscedasticity.[8]

[8] Results were robust to clustering standard errors at the industry level.

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1a presents the descriptive statistics on demographic characteristics from the IHS data by self-reported sexual orientation for heterosexual, gay/lesbian and bisexual respondents. These broad patterns have been documented previously by the UK Office for National Statistics. The data indicate that self-identified gay men are on average younger, more highly educated, more likely to not marry, less likely to have children in the household, and more likely to live in London than either heterosexual or bisexual men. Gay men are also slightly more likely to be employed than other men.

Among women, Table 1a shows that self-identified lesbians are also more highly educated, more likely to not marry, less likely to have children in the household, and more likely to be employed than heterosexual or bisexual women. Moreover, the magnitude of the employment differences between lesbians and other women is much larger than the gap between gay men and other men.

Table 1b presents descriptive statistics for job characteristics – including the workplace authority variables we focus on here – by sexual orientation group for the sample of full-time workers aged 25-64. Results indicate that gay men are significantly more likely than heterosexual men to have supervisory or managerial authority in raw mean comparisons. The same is true for comparisons of lesbians with heterosexual women.

Turning to occupation-based measures of workplace authority and status, we find that gay men are significantly more likely than heterosexual men to be both higher managers/professionals and lower managers/professionals, with a larger difference for the lower managerial category. For lesbians we also estimate that they are unconditionally more likely to be lower managers and professionals compared with heterosexual women, though we do not find a difference in the raw means for the higher managers/professionals category. With respect to other job characteristics, Table 1b shows that gay men exhibit much different profiles of industry composition than heterosexual men, and they are also significantly more likely to be observed in the largest firms than heterosexual men.

Tables 2a and 2b show demographic characteristics for the sample of high and low managers, respectively, by sexual orientation. Notably, we find that gay men and lesbians in managerial positions are much more likely to have higher educational qualifications than heterosexual adults in those same types of managerial positions. For higher managerial posts, 70 per cent of gay men have degree-level education, compared with only 57 per cent of heterosexual men. For lower managerial posts, 51 per cent of gay men have degree-level education, compared with only 39 per cent of heterosexual men. Gay men need to have greater qualifications than heterosexual men to compete for the same jobs. A similar pattern obtains when comparing heterosexual women with heterosexual men: for every level of managerial position, heterosexual women have a greater education (consistent with more qualifications) than heterosexual men.

This difference in education levels by sexual orientation or gender for those holding managerial posts is suggestive evidence of glass ceilings, but also shows the importance of controlling for characteristics in examining whether sexual minorities achieve the same managerial/supervisory authority as their heterosexual counterparts.

4.2 Evidence that the workplace authority measures convey meaningful information

In this paper we are primarily interested in testing whether sexual minorities have different access to positions of authority in the workplace compared with otherwise similar heterosexuals.

An issue that is key to the interpretation of any differentials is whether our measures of workplace authority – managerial responsibilities at work, supervisory responsibilities at work, and whether one's occupation is as a "high" or "low" manager – are "good" outcomes from a normative perspective. While these jobs are often desirable in their own right due to greater prestige and recognition, better jobs are also typically better paid. This can reflect the greater stress of managerial and supervisory responsibilities. Alternatively, if these jobs contain more individual control of one's workload and associated flexibility, there may be a compensating differential in the opposite direction. The definitions of the variables suggest a pairwise hierarchy of workplace authority measures. Managerial authority is more senior than supervisory authority, with additional decision-making power. Similarly, "high" managers have more responsibility than "low" managers.

To provide evidence on the returns to managerial authority, we make use of the fact that we observe earnings for three years of the IHS sample (2012-14). We use these data to estimate straightforward models of log earnings controlling for detailed observable characteristics such as age, education, race and geographic location, as well as the workplace authority measures described above. We present this evidence in Table 3 which shows the key coefficients from estimation of equation (1) where we consider log earnings as our outcome of interest and where we additionally control for our key workplace authority indicators as additional control variables to see if the return to, say, managerial responsibilities at work or supervisory responsibilities at work is sizeable, positive and statistically significant. We present these results for men in column 1 and for women in column 2.

The results in Table 3 confirm that the outcomes we identify for workplace authority are associated with sizeable and statistically significant earnings premia, with the expected pairwise comparisons. For example, we estimate that – conditional on all other covariates including individual demographics, family characteristics, industry, occupation (SOC 2010) and firm size variables – full-time working men who report managerial responsibilities on the job earn 15 per cent more than otherwise similar men who do not report managerial responsibilities on the job. The associated return to managerial responsibilities for full-time working women is 17 per cent.

As expected, we estimate that among men working full time, those who report supervisory responsibilities at work earn a smaller 9 per cent premium than otherwise similar men who do not report supervisory responsibilities on the job. The associated return to supervisory responsibilities for full-time working women is about 7 per cent.

Lastly, we estimate that among full-time working men in the bottom panel of Table 3, men in the "higher managerial" occupations earn 43 per cent more than otherwise similar men. The associated return for men in the "lower managerial" occupations is substantially lower (16 per cent) and the difference between "high" and "low" managers is statistically significant. For women we also estimate that the returns to both types of managerial positions are positive and statistically significant and that the return for high managers is significantly larger than the return

for low managers.[9] Thus, taken as a whole the results in Table 3 confirm that the observable dimensions of workplace authority are strongly positively related to earnings and thus very likely reflect meaningful differences in status attainment at work.

In the next sections we turn to our primary question and ask whether sexual minority men and women are differentially likely to attain these positions compared with heterosexuals of comparable observable characteristics.[10]

4.3 Findings on sexual orientation, workplace authority and gay glass ceilings

In Table 4 we investigate whether the unadjusted patterns observed in Table 1b for managerial and supervisory duties at work remain in the presence of controls for educational attainment, demographic characteristics, and job characteristics. Specifically, we present evidence on the relationship between sexual orientation and managerial and supervisory authority for men (top panel) and women (bottom panel) aged 25-64 who work full time. All models also control for age, race/ethnicity, education, partnership, year dummies, a dummy variable for being interviewed face-to-face, location dummies, the presence of children in the household, firm size, industry and occupation dummies. The outcomes across the columns are as follows: managerial authority (column 1); supervisory authority (column 2); managerial and supervisory authority (column 3); managerial/professional occupation (column 4); "high managerial" occupation (column 5); and "low managerial" occupation (column 6).

The results in Table 4 provide direct evidence that sexual orientation is correlated with authority in the workplace. For the managerial authority outcome in column 1 we find that gay men and lesbians are 6.1 and 2.7 percentage points, respectively, more likely to have this type of workplace authority compared with similarly situated heterosexual men and women, and both estimates are statistically significant ($p < 0.01$). We also find that bisexual women are significantly less likely to have managerial authority in the workplace than otherwise similar heterosexual women.[11]

Moving to supervisory authority in column 2 we find that gay men and lesbians are 5.7 and 1.6 percentage points, respectively, more likely to have supervisory responsibility in the workplace than otherwise similar heterosexual adults. The result for gay men is significant at the 1 per cent level while the estimate for lesbians is significant at the 10 per cent level. Bisexual men and women are also estimated to be less likely to have supervisory authority in the workplace, though only the result for women is statistically significant.

Column 3 shows results for individuals reporting both managerial and supervisory responsibility in the workplace and shows that, again, gay men and lesbians are both significantly more likely

[9] These patterns also hold if we remove the SOC 2010 occupation dummies. Recall that the high and low manager indicators are based on the NS-SEC occupation classification.

[10] A limitation of the NS-SEC measure is that it includes professional occupations with managerial occupations. This is likely to contribute to the substantially higher salaries for high managerial/professional occupations compared with low managerial/professional occupations (and compared with non-managerial/professional occupations). It is also likely to contribute to the pattern that the share of full-time workers observed in these managerial/professional occupations (about half the sample) is substantially higher than the share of full-time workers directly reporting managerial and/or supervisory authority at work.

[11] These patterns also held when we removed the full-time employment requirement.

to have this combination of workplace authority compared with otherwise similar heterosexual adults, while bisexual women are significantly less likely to have positions with both managerial and supervisory authority.

Column 4 addresses workplace authority in a different way by using the NS-SEC occupation-based measures rather than self-reported authority measures. The occupation measures take into account the nature of the "service relationship" between the worker and the firm as well as the magnitude of the managerial responsibilities on the job. This occupation-based approach is common to most prior work on sexual orientation and economic outcomes. In column 4 of Table 4 we show results for a model where the outcome is a dummy variable indicating that the individual's occupation is in the managerial or professional occupations (based on the NS-SEC classification system). Results in the top panel of column 4 indicate that gay men are 5.7 percentage points more likely to be in managerial and professional occupations compared with otherwise similar heterosexual men, and this estimate is statistically significant at the 5 per cent level. Bisexual men, in contrast, are 6.5 percentage points less likely to be in these high-status occupations, and this difference is also statistically significant.

Moving to columns 5 and 6 we separate the "manager and professional" grouping into two subgroups: in column 5 we consider an outcome equal to 1 if the respondent works in a "high managerial and professional" occupation, while in column 6 we consider an outcome equal to 1 if the respondent works in a "low managerial and professional" occupation.

The results when we disaggregate the managerial/professional occupations are striking: specifically, we find that gay men are 7.9 percentage points more likely to be in the low managerial and professional occupations but are 2.2 percentage points less likely to be in the high managerial and professional occupations, and both estimates are statistically significant at the 1 per cent level. This suggests that the gay male "advantage" in access to positions of high workplace status documented in column 4 is driven entirely by the relatively low-end of the high-status group. In fact, the results are consistent with gay men having systematically less access to the highest status positions in the UK workplace.[12] Columns 5 and 6 also show that the lower likelihood of bisexual men attaining high-status positions in the workplace is driven mainly by their inability to access the high managerial and professional occupations: they are 5 percentage points less likely to have these positions, and this estimate is statistically significant.

For women in the bottom panel of columns 4-6 of Table 4 we find less robust evidence of systematic differences in access to high status positions in the workplace. Column 4 indicates that lesbians are 2.8 percentage points less likely than otherwise similar heterosexual women to be in managerial and professional occupations; this is the opposite of the managerial authority finding in the bottom panels of columns 1-3. Bisexual women are also estimated to be 3.5 percentage points less likely to be in managerial and professional occupations, and this estimate is statistically significant. Columns 5 and 6 of the bottom panel of Table 4 suggest that the lesbian disadvantage in occupation-based managerial authority is driven by their significantly lower likelihood of accessing the higher managerial and professional positions, consistent with a glass ceiling effect with respect to the highest status managerial positions.

[12] One possible concern with the interpretation of the gay glass ceiling is that gay men may systematically select into industries that lack managerial hierarchies that would permit advancement to the top managerial posts. In results not reported we found that the core finding of gay glass ceilings was robust to adding controls for interactions between firm size and industry dummies.

The specification in these regressions has treated the determination of low and high managerial jobs as independent, and compared sexual minority representation relative with holding non-managerial posts. Our alternative model is that individuals first decide whether or not to join the managerial ladder, and subsequently can move into higher level managerial posts through promotion. To examine this possibility, we present in column (3) results for holding a high managerial post, conditional on being on the managerial ladder (that is, in either a low or high managerial post) at all. It is seen that, for gay men, the likelihood of holding a top managerial post remains significantly negative. This is direct evidence of a glass ceiling effect.

This result on glass ceilings – that gay men are more likely than heterosexuals to hold low-level managerial posts, and less likely to hold high-level managerial posts – differs from the raw data. In the raw data, gay men were more likely to hold both levels of managerial posts. The explanation is primarily to do with the role of educational attainment. As already observed, gay men are much more likely to hold degrees than heterosexual men in the same level of posts. We return to this point in our Oaxaca (1973) decompositions below.

4.4 Findings related to gender and visible minority status (and interactions with sexual orientation)

Do the differences in workplace authority by sexual orientation mimic those of individual characteristics of gender and visible minority status? As we have observed, the literature has shown that women and non-white individuals are less likely to have managerial authority in the workplace. Results on glass ceilings have been less clear, with different studies coming to contradictory conclusions. By looking at gender and race/ethnicity in Tables 5 and 6 we can compare the effects by these characteristics to those of sexual orientation. Further, given the advantages of our dataset, we can contribute to the open question on whether women and non-white people face glass ceilings within the managerial hierarchy of jobs.

The format of Tables 5 and 6 follows Table 4 in that each column presents results for a different workplace authority outcome, with evidence for glass ceiling effects coming primarily from columns 4-6 for managerial/professional occupations, higher managerial professions, and lower managerial professions, respectively. To examine gender differences in Table 5 we estimate models where we combine men and women and report the coefficient on the indicator variable for being a woman from similarly specified models as in Table 4. The results in Table 5 show that there is a sizeable gender gap in workplace authority: women are 3.4 percentage points less likely to have managerial authority at work compared with otherwise similar men (column 1), and this difference is statistically significant. Women are also significantly less likely to have supervisory authority at work and are significantly less likely to have both managerial and supervisory authority at work – a difference on the order of about three percentage points depending on the model. These results are consistent with the existing literature on women and managerial authority. Importantly, these patterns contrast sharply to the results for sexual minorities in Table 4: while women are significantly less likely to have workplace authority compared with men, sexual minorities are significantly more likely to have workplace authority compared with heterosexuals.

In columns 4-6 of Table 5 we investigate differences in the higher and lower managerial position outcomes associated with gender. We estimate that women are significantly less likely than

similarly situated men to be in the highest managerial positions, and we also estimate that women are significantly more likely than similarly situated men to be in the lower managerial occupations. On net this results in a small but statistically significant higher likelihood that women are in managerial occupations than otherwise similar men in the sample of full-time workers. These patterns are qualitatively identical to those observed for gay men compared with heterosexual men in Table 3 and are consistent with a glass ceiling effect associated with gender.

In Table 6 we investigate differences in these same workplace authority outcomes associated with race, with estimates for men reported in the top panel and estimates for women reported in the bottom panel of Table 6. The results for men show that visible minority status is associated with a small but generally significant lower likelihood of having managerial and/or supervisory authority at work in columns 1-3. Differences are in the order of 1 percentage point.

For women in the bottom panel of Table 6 we find a broadly similar pattern with slightly larger magnitudes: non-white women are generally significantly less likely to have workplace authority than otherwise similar white women, a difference of about 1.5-2.5 percentage points after controlling for detailed characteristics. As with the differences associated with gender in Table 5, these patterns for race are qualitatively different than those for sexual orientation, as sexual minorities are consistently estimated to have greater workplace authority than heterosexuals, while racial minorities are consistently estimated to have less workplace authority than white individuals.

Lastly, in columns 4-6 of Table 6 we investigate differences in the higher and lower managerial position outcomes associated with race. The results in the top panel of Table 6 for men show that visible minority status is associated with a statistically significant lower likelihood of having any managerial occupation. This effect is driven primarily by their significantly lower likelihood of attaining the higher managerial occupations. Notably, there is no offsetting increase in the likelihood of having a lower managerial occupation for non-white workers, unlike the findings for gay men. For women in the bottom panel of Table 6 we find a broadly similar pattern in that non-white women are significantly less likely to be in managerial or professional occupations. Unlike the patterns for men, however, this disadvantage for non-white women is primarily driven by their significantly lower likelihood of attaining the lower managerial positions. While we do not estimate that non-white women are significantly more likely than otherwise similar white women to attain the highest managerial positions, the point estimates are small in magnitude and not statistically significant.

In Table 7 we return to the evidence for gay glass ceilings and investigate intersectionality and "double disadvantage" in this effect. We focus on men, for whom the evidence of gay glass ceilings in Table 4 is strongest. Specifically, we ask whether the differential likelihood of having high or low managerial status for gay men varies with another marginalised characteristic: non-white race. Do non-white gay men do better or worse than white gay men? The format of Table 7 mirrors that of Table 4, except the sample is only men. We present results for white men in the top panel and non-white men in the bottom panel.

The results in Table 7 are striking and suggest that the phenomenon of gay glass ceilings is much stronger for non-white men than for white men. Specifically, we estimate that non-white gay men are 7.5 percentage points less likely than otherwise similar non-white heterosexual men to be in the highest status managerial occupations (column 5), but they are 15.1 percentage points more likely than otherwise similar non-white heterosexual men to be in the lower managerial

occupations (column 6). We also find a much larger penalty for bisexual men in managerial and professional occupations among the sample of non-white men, and that is entirely driven by their lower likelihood of attaining the highest status managerial occupations. These patterns are consistent with our prediction of a double disadvantage – glass ceilings are particularly strong for non-heterosexual men who are also non-white.[13] Notably, we find that the total effect of being non-white and a gay man (Table 7) exceeds the sum of the separate effects of being a non-white man (Table 6) and being a gay man (Table 4).

To provide even more direct evidence of differential access to the highest status managerial positions in the workplace, we present in Table 8 the results of analyses where we revisit each of the glass ceiling patterns examined in Tables 4-6 (by sexual orientation, by gender and by visible minority status) and restrict attention only to individuals who are either high or low managers. That is, in Table 8 we eliminate the workplace processes that lead to access to any managerial post and focus only on what drives differences in access to the highest positions of power in the workplace. The format of Table 8 is as follows: each column is from a separate regression, and the outcome is an indicator for being in a high managerial post in the sample of higher and lower managers. Column 1 presents results on sexual orientation and visible minority status in the sample of men, column 2 presents results on gender in the full sample, and columns 3 and 4 revisit the intersectionality of sexual orientation and visible minority status by reporting results separately for samples of white and non-white men.

The results in columns 1 and 2 of Table 8 confirm that the glass ceilings we documented above for gay men relative to heterosexual men, visible minority men relative to white men, and women relative to men are all robust to restricting attention to individuals in managerial posts. Moreover, the patterns in columns 3 and 4 of Table 8 confirm that the previous finding that the gay glass ceiling for men is stronger for non-white men than for white men also obtains when we restrict attention to individuals in managerial posts. This is particularly strong evidence of differential access to the highest status managerial posts in the workplace that is not simply about being suited for a managerial post per se.

4.5 Oaxaca decompositions

Lastly, we present evidence from Oaxaca decompositions where we isolate the roles of different endowments (including education and skills) versus different returns to those endowments (commonly interpreted to be discrimination) in driving the managerial disadvantages faced by gay men. To do so, we focus on individuals in any managerial post (as in Table 8) and decompose the difference in access to higher managerial positions for sexual minority men and heterosexual men. We present these results in Table 9.

The results in Table 9 provide strong evidence that the gay glass ceilings faced by gay men are more consistent with discrimination than with differences in endowments and productivity. Specifically, column 1 of the top row shows that gay men are 7 percentage points less likely to be high managers than heterosexual men. The top panel of column 2 of Table 9 shows that this gap would have been even larger if gay men had the same characteristics as heterosexual men;

[13] In results not reported we also considered heterogeneity across several other dimensions and found weaker evidence of heterogeneity in the gay glass ceiling effect by age, partnership status, education, firm size or industry.

this is intuitive given the patterns from Tables 1-2, which show that gay men had higher educational qualifications than heterosexual men at both low and high managerial levels. The top panel of column 3 of Table 9 indicates that the majority of the observed gap is attributable to differential returns to endowments; that is, heterosexual men are rewarded more strongly with advancement to the highest status managerial positions in the workplace for their observable skills than gay men are.

Lastly, the top panel of column 4 of Table 9 indicates a non-trivial role for the interaction of differential endowments and differential returns in driving the gay glass ceiling documented in Tables 4 and 8. Instead, the results of the Oaxaca decompositions point to discrimination as the key factor behind gay men's lower likelihood of attaining higher managerial positions. Notably, the decomposition exercise shows smaller but sizeable gaps in higher managerial positions for bisexual men than for gay men (both when compared with heterosexual men), though the bisexual differential is also attributed mainly to differential returns to characteristics than differential characteristics themselves. Table 9 also returns smaller gaps in higher managerial positions for sexual minority women compared with heterosexual women.

5. Discussion and conclusion

This paper makes important contributions to the literature on work-related inequality by providing the first large-scale evidence on the understudied sexual orientation gap in key indicators of workplace advantage. Importantly, and perhaps counterintuitively, we find that lesbians and gay men are markedly more likely than otherwise comparable heterosexual adults to possess managerial authority and supervisory responsibilities in the workplace. This is true net of their differential distribution across occupations and taking account of observable characteristics.

However, the story is not a simple one. The advantages held by gay men in particular stem solely from their higher likelihood of being low-level managers. In fact, gay men are significantly less likely to hold "high manager" positions that come with increased status and pay. These patterns are consistent with a glass ceiling effect for gay men. Further, the Oaxaca decomposition suggests that the underlying cause is a lower return to education and other observed skills and characteristics for gay men in attaining managerial posts. This is consistent with the raw data that show that gay men have higher levels of educational attainment than heterosexuals in both low and high-level managerial posts. We also found evidence of important dynamics between race and sexual orientation: the evidence for glass ceilings for gay men was much stronger for non-white men than for white men. Lastly, we find that bisexuals of both sexes are significantly less likely than otherwise similar heterosexual adults to have various types of workplace authority.

Our findings on differential access to top managerial positions for gay men should be considered in the context of major improvements in attitudes towards sexual minorities over the past few decades. The fact that self-identified gay men were substantially younger than heterosexual men – this was true overall and in managerial posts – is consistent with the idea that access to workplace authority could be improving quickly for gay men. That is, the situation may have been worse (for example, gay men have less access even to low-level managerial positions than heterosexual men) prior to the window of our data. A notable limitation of our data is that we cannot rule out that there are unobserved factors correlated both with the decision to identify as a sexual minority on the survey and the outcomes under study, and this may also vary in intersectional ways (for example, if non-white gay men are particularly unlikely to reveal their sexual orientation to the survey interviewer).

We are also able to use this new dataset to re-examine gender and ethnicity effects on attaining workplace authority, and to provide new evidence about glass ceilings. The latter is particularly important given the contradictory results in the current literature. We generally confirm the existing literature that women and non-white individuals have lower workplace authority than comparable men and white people. With respect to glass ceilings, we find evidence that women and non-white men are disadvantaged in attaining high-level managerial posts: they too face glass ceilings.

Our results complement existing work that has focused primarily on wage and earnings gaps between sexual minorities and heterosexuals. However, access to managerial authority, and particularly high-level managerial posts, is not just about the individual. Those holding these posts are the exemplars, the mentors and the decision-makers as to who will be the next generation of senior leaders. Bringing more sexual minorities, women and non-white individuals into managerial posts potentially increases the access for those further down the managerial/supervisory ladder – with similar characteristics – to be promoted. As with

representation of women and minority groups on corporate boards, there is the potential to shift to a more representative outcome more broadly within the organisation.

References

C. Aksoy, C. Carpenter and J. Frank (2018), "Sexual Orientation and Earnings: New Evidence from the UK", Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 71(1): 242-272.

S. Allegretto and M. Arthur (2001), "An Empirical Analysis of Homosexual/ Heterosexual Male Earnings Differentials: Unmarried and Unequal?", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 54(3): 631-646.

A.M. Ahmed, L. Andersson and M. Hammarstedt (2011), "Sexual Orientation and Occupational Rank", Economics Bulletin 31(3): 2,422-2,433.

H. Antecol, A. Jong and M. D. Steinberger (2008), "Sexual orientation wage gap: The role of occupational sorting and human capital", Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 61(4): 518-543.

G.R. Arabsheibani, A. Marin and J. Wadsworth (2005), "Gay Pay in the UK", Economica 72: 333-347.

G.R. Arabsheibani, A. Marin and J. Wadsworth (2004), "In the Pink: Homosexual-Heterosexual Wage Differentials in the UK", International Journal of Manpower 25(3/4): 343-354.

M.V.L. Badgett (2001), Money, Myths, and Change: The Economic Lives of Lesbians and Gay Men, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

M.V.L. Badgett (1995), "The Wage Effects of Sexual-Orientation Discrimination", Industrial and Labor Relations Review 48(4): 726-739.

M. Bartley, L. Carpenter, K. Dunnell and R. Fitzpatrick (1996), "Measuring inequalities in health: an analysis of mortality patterns using two social classifications", Sociology of Health & Illness 18(4): 455-475.

A.K. Baumle, C. D'Lane and D. L. Poston (2009), Same-sex Partners: The Demography of Sexual Orientation, Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

J. Baxter and E. Olin Wright (2000), "The Glass Ceiling Hypothesis: A Comparative Study of the United States, Sweden, and Australia", Gender & Society 14: 275-294.

G. Becker (1993), Human Capital, 3rd Edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

G. Becker (1991), A Treatise on the Family, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

L.A. Bell (2005), "Women-Led Firms and the Gender Gap in Top Executive Jobs,", IZA Working Paper no. 1,689.

D.A. Black, S. G. Sanders and L.G. Taylor (2007), "The Economics of Lesbian and Gay Families", Journal of Economic Perspectives 21(2): 53-70.

D. Black, G. Gates, S. Sanders and L. Taylor (2000), "Demographics of the Gay and Lesbian Population in the United States: Evidence from Available Systematic Data Sources", Demography 37(2): 139-154.

D. Black, H. Makar, S. Sanders and L. Taylor (2003), "The Earnings Effects of Sexual Orientation", Industrial and Labor Relations Review 56(3): 449-469.

D. Blackaby and J. Frank (2000), "Ethnic and Other Minority Representation in UK Academic Economics", The Economic Journal 110(June): F293-F311.

J. Blandford (2003), "The Nexus of Sexual Orientation and Gender in the Determination of Earnings", Industrial and Labor Relations Review 56(4): 622-642.

D. Brady, R. M. Finnigan and S. Hübgen (2017), "Rethinking the Risks of Poverty: A Framework for Analyzing Prevalences and Penalties", Forthcoming, American Journal of Sociology.

C. Carpenter (2008a), "Sexual Orientation, Income, and Non-Pecuniary Economic Outcomes: New Evidence from Young Lesbians in Australia", Review of Economics of the Household, 6(4): 391-408.

C. Carpenter (2008a), "Sexual Orientation, Work, and Income in Canada", Canadian Journal of Economics, 41(4): 1239-1261.

C. Carpenter (2007), "Revisiting the Earnings Penalty for Behaviorally Gay Men: Evidence from NHANES III", Labour Economics, 14 (1): 25-34.

C. Carpenter (2005), "Self-Reported Sexual Orientation and Earnings: Evidence from California", Industrial and Labor Relations Review 58(2): 258-273.

C. Carpenter and S. T. Eppink (2017), "Does It Get Better? Recent Estimates of Sexual Orientation and Earnings in the United States", Southern Economic Journal, 84(2): 426-441.

P. N. Cohen and M. L. Huffman (2007a), "Black Under-representation in Management across U.S. Labor Markets", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 609: 181-199.

P. N. Cohen and M. L. Huffman (2007b), "Working for the Woman? Female managers and the Gender Wage Gap", American Sociological Review 72(5): 681-704.

D. A. Cotter, J. M. Hermsen, S. Ovadia and R. Vanneman (2001), "The Glass Ceiling Effect", Social Forces, 80(2): 655-681.

N. Drydakis (2011), "Women's Sexual Orientation and Labor Market Outcomes in Greece", Feminist Economics 17(1): 89-117.

N. Drydakis (2009), "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the Labour Market." Labour Economics 16: 364-372.

R. Erikson and J. H. Goldthorpe (1992), "Individual or Family? Results from Two Approaches to Class Assignment", Acta Sociologica 35(2): 95-105.

J. Frank (2006), "Gay Glass Ceilings", Economica 73: 485-508.

J. H. Goldthorpe (1980), "Class Mobility in Modern Britain: A Reply to Crompton", Sociology 14(1): 121-123.

M. E. Heilman (1983), "Sex Bias in Work Settings: The Lack of Fit Model", Research in Organizational Behavior, 5: 269-298.

M. L. Huffman and P. N. Cohen (2004), "Occupational Segregation and the Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: National Versus Local Labor Markets", Sociological Forum 19(1): 121-147.

M. Hultin (2003), "Some Take the Glass Escalator, Some Hit the Glass Ceiling: Career Consequences of Occupational Sex Segregation", Work and Occupations, 30:30-61.

J. C. Humphrey (1999), "Organizing sexualities, organized inequalities: Lesbians and Gay men in Public Service Occupations", Gender, Work, and Organization, 6(3): 134-151.

T. Joloza, J. Evans, R. O'Brien and A. Potter-Collins (2011), "Correction Notice: New ONS Integrated Household Survey: Experimental Statistics: Measuring Sexual Identity: An Evaluation Report September 2010", UK Office of National Statistics Report.

T. Joloza, J. Evans, R. O'Brien and A. Potter-Collins (2010), "Measuring Sexual Identity: An Evaluation Report", Official report from the UK Office for National Statistics.

M. Klawitter (2012), "Meta-analysis of the Effects of Sexual Orientation on Earnings", *Mimeo*.

M. Klawitter and V. Flatt (1998), "The Effects of State and Local Antidiscrimination Policies on Earnings for Gays and Lesbians", Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 17(4): 658-686.

E. Laumann, J. Gagnon, R. Michael and S. Michaels (1994), The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

G. B. Lewis and D. W. Pitts (2009), "Representation of Lesbians and Gay Men in Federal, State, and Local Bureaucracies", Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 21: 159-180.

D. J. Maume (1999), "Glass Ceilings and Glass Escalators: Occupational Segregation and Race and Sex Differences in Managerial Promotions", Work and Occupations 26(4): 483-509.

D. Matsa and A. R. Miller (2013), "A Female Style in Corporate Leadership? Evidence form Quotas," American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 5(3): 136-169.

D. Matsa and A. R. Miller (2011), "Chipping Away at the Glass Ceiling: Gender Spillovers in Corporate Leadership", American Economic Review, 101(3): 635-39.

A. Kunze and A. R. Miller (2014), "Women Helping Women? Evidence from Private Sector Data on Workplace Hierarchies", NBER Working Paper 20761.

T. Mize (2016), "Sexual Orientation and the Labor Market", American Sociological Review, 81(6): 1,132-1,160.

R. Oaxaca (1973), "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets", International Economic Review, 14(3): 693-709.

E. Plug and A. Berkhout (2004), "Effects of Sexual Preference on Earnings in the Netherlands", Journal of Population Economics 17(1): 117-131.

E. Plug, D. Webbink and N. Martin (2014), "Sexual Orientation, Prejudice, and Segregation" Journal of Labor Economics, 32(1): 123-159.

B. F. Reskin and D. Branch McBrier (2000), "Why not Ascription: Organizations' Employment of Male and Female Managers", American Sociological Review 65:210-233.

D. Rose and K. O'Reilly (1998), The ESRC Review of Government Social Classifications, London: Office of National Statistics.

D. Rose and D. J. Pevalin (2001), "The National Statistics Socio-economic Classification: Unifying Official and Sociological Approaches to the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Social Class", Institute for Social and Economic Research Working Paper Number 2001-4.

V. E Schein (1973), "The Relationship between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics", Journal of Applied Psychology 57: 95-100.

V. E. Schein (2001), "A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management", Journal of Social Issues 57: 675-688.

R. A. Smith (2002), "Race, gender, and authority in the workplace: Theory and research", Annual Review of Sociology, 28, 509-542.

R. A. Smith (2012), "Money, Benefits, and Power: A Test of the Glass Ceiling and Glass Escalator Hypotheses", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 639: 149-172.

A. Tilcsik (2011), "Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination Against Openly Gay Men in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, 117(2): 586-626.

A. Tilcsik, M. Anteby and C. R. Knights (2015), "Concealable Stigma and Occupational Segregation: Toward a Theory of Gay and Lesbian Occupations", Administrative Science Quarterly 60(3): 446-481.

K. Ueno, A. E. Pena-Talamantes and T.A. Roach (2013), "Sexual Orientation and Occupational Attainment", Work and Occupations 40(1): 3-36.

D. Weichselbaumer (2003), "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in Hiring", Labour Economics 10: 629-642.

E. O. Wright, J. Baxter and G. E. Birkelund (1995), "The Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: A Cross-National Study", American Sociological Review 60:407-435.

Z. Zeng (2011), "The myth of the glass ceiling: Evidence from a stock-flow analysis of authority attainment", Social Science Research 40:312-25.

Table 1a: Demographic characteristics
Adults aged 25-64

Variables	Heterosexual men	Bisexual men	Gay men	Heterosexual women	Bisexual women	Lesbians
Age	46.67 (11.19)	44.19 (11.29)	43.23 (10.67)	45.77 (11.16)	42.11 (11.27)	42.60 (10.56)
Highest education level:						
Degree level	0.248 (0.432)	0.286 (0.452) [A]	0.403 (0.491) [A]	0.226 (0.418)	0.302 (0.459) [B]	0.370 (0.483) [B]
Higher ed.	0.106 (0.308)	0.102 (0.302)	0.107 (0.309)	0.119 (0.324)	0.099 (0.299) [B]	0.129 (0.347)
A level	0.234 (0.424)	0.161 (0.368) [A]	0.194 (0.396) [A]	0.160 (0.367)	0.153 (0.361)	0.165 (0.383)
O level	0.219 (0.413)	0.218 (0.413)	0.190 (0.393) [A]	0.301 (0.459)	0.267 (0.442) [B]	0.221 (0.396) [B]
White	0.867 (0.339)	0.820 (0.384) [A]	0.905 (0.293) [A]	0.877 (0.329)	0.864 (0.343)	0.924 (0.266) [B]
Partnered	0.686 (0.464)	0.471 (0.500) [A]	0.437 (0.496) [A]	0.650 (0.477)	0.702 (0.457) [B]	0.637 (0.481)
Any child <16	0.148 (0.335)	0.094 (0.293) [A]	0.005(0.075) [A]	0.207 (0.405)	0.196 (0.397)	0.083 (0.276) [B]
England	0.753 (0.431)	0.791 (0.407) [A]	0.831 (0.375) [A]	0.747 (0.435)	0.826 (0.379) [B]	0.796 (0.403) [B]
London	0.083 (0.276)	0.143 (0.350) [A]	0.214 (0.410) [A]	0.081 (0.274)	0.152 (0.359) [B]	0.093 (0.291) [B]
N. Ireland & Wales & Scotland	0.247 (0.431)	0.209 (0.407)	0.169 (0.375)	0.253 (0.329)	0.174 (0.379) [B]	0.204 (0.403) [B]
Full-time worker	0.676 (0.468)	0.595 (0.491) [A]	0.681 (0.466)	0.365 (0.481)	0.386 (0.487)	0.581 (0.494) [B]
Sample size	245,100	728	3,678	353,764	1,727	2,712

Source: 2009-14 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS).
Note: Weighted means (standard deviations). Not reported (but included in the models) there are 16,575 men and 21,021 women who, when asked about sexual orientation, responded "other", "don't know" or who refused a response. [A] The superscript letter A means statistically significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between the groups of gay men and bisexual men in contrast to the heterosexual men. [B] The superscript letter B means statistically significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between the groups of lesbians and bisexual women in contrast to the heterosexual women.

Table 1b: Job characteristics
Full-time workers aged 25-64

Variables	Heterosexual men	Bisexual men	Gay men	Heterosexual women	Bisexual women	Lesbians
Supervisory responsibilities	0.474 (0.499)	0.427 (0.495)	0.555 (0.497) [A]	0.449 (0.497)	0.402 (0.491) [B]	0.493 (0.500) [B]
Managerial responsibilities	0.339 (0.473)	0.139 (0.346)	0.441 (0.497) [A]	0.301 (0.459)	0.270 (0.444)	0.358 (0.480) [B]
Higher managerial and professional	0.221 (0.415)	0.187 (0.390)	0.241 (0.428) [A]	0.139 (0.346)	0.144 (0.351)	0.156 (0.363)
Lower managerial and professional	0.291 (0.454)	0.266 (0.442)	0.425 (0.494) [A]	0.404 (0.491)	0.407 (0.492)	0.436 (0.496) [B]
Intermediate occupations	0.082 (0.275)	0.102 (0.302)	0.121 (0.327) [A]	0.203 (0.402)	0.218 (0.413)	0.153 (0.360) [B]
Small emp. and own account workers	0.036 (0.009)	0	0.004 (0.020)	0.001 (0.010)	0	0.000 (0.025) [B]
Lower supervisory and technical	0.144 (0.352)	0.104 (0.306) [A]	0.071 (0.258) [A]	0.053 (0.226)	0.055 (0.229)	0.070 (0.256) [B]
Semi-routine occupations	0.108 (0.311)	0.143 (0.352) [A]	0.069 (0.255) [A]	0.127 (0.333)	0.102 (0.303)	0.105 (0.307) [B]
Routine occupations	0.121 (0.326)	0.155 (0.362) [A]	0.037 (0.190) [A]	0.039 (0.196)	0.033 (0.179)	0.048 (0.216)
Admin./secretary	0.091 (0.288)	0.071 (0.258)	0.136 (0.343) [A]	0.169 (0.375)	0.177 (0.382)	0.151 (0.358)
Skilled person/sales	0.083 (0.276)	0.062 (0.242)	0.083 (0.277)	0.095 (0.293)	0.073 (0.261)	0.078 (0.268) [B]
Agri/energy/cons/trans	0.260 (0.439)	0.236 (0.425)	0.169 (0.374) [A]	0.080 (0.272)	0.101 (0.301)	0.110 (0.314) [B]
Manufacturing	0.186 (0.389)	0.136 (0.343) [A]	0.066 (0.249) [A]	0.069 (0.254)	0.045 (0.211) [B]	0.060 (0.238)
Hotels/restaurant	0.129 (0.335)	0.143 (0.351)	0.153 (0.360) [A]	0.123 (0.328)	0.084 (0.278) [B]	0.095 (0.294) [B]
Banking/finance	0.149 (0.356)	0.169 (0.375)	0.183 (0.387) [A]	0.142 (0.349)	0.144 (0.351)	0.126 (0.332)
Education/health	0.206 (0.405)	0.226 (0.419)	0.352 (0.478) [A]	0.518 (0.500)	0.535 (0.499)	0.550 (0.498) [B]
1-10 at workplace	0.168 (0.374)	0.139 (0.346)	0.160 (0.367)	0.142 (0.349)	0.134 (0.341)	0.129 (0.335)
11-24 at workplace	0.111 (0.314)	0.113 (0.317)	0.104 (0.306)	0.121 (0.327)	0.114 (0.318)	0.103 (0.305) [B]
25-49 at workplace	0.119 (0.324)	0.157 (0.364) [A]	0.109 (0.312)	0.145 (0.352)	0.129 (0.336)	0.128 (0.334)
50-249 at workplace	0.267 (0.443)	0.300 (0.459)	0.242 (0.428) [A]	0.259 (0.428)	0.261 (0.44)	0.276 (0.447)
250 or more at workplace	0.303 (0.460)	0.261 (0.440)	0.362 (0.481) [A]	0.302 (0.459)	0.309 (0.463)	0.347 (0.476) [B]
Sample size	165,580	433	2,503	129,040	666	1,575

Source: 2009-14 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS).
Note: Weighted means (standard deviations). [A] The superscript letter A means statistically significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between the groups of gay men and bisexual men in contrast to the heterosexual men. [B] The superscript letter B means statistically significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between the groups of lesbians and bisexual women in contrast to the heterosexual women.

Table 2a: Demographic characteristics – high managers

Adults aged 25-64 not missing information on earnings

Variables	Heterosexual men	Bisexual men	Gay men	Heterosexual women	Bisexual women	Lesbians
Age	45.85 (10.64)	42.38 (10.17)	42.37 (9.85)	43.20 (10.15)	42.25 (9.99)	44.38 (9.63)
Highest education level:						
Degree level	0.572 (0.495)	0.620 (0.488)	0.702 (0.458)	0.659 (0.474)	0.761 (0.428)	0.719 (0.450)
Higher ed.	0.138 (0.345)	0.130 (0.388)	0.083 (0.277)	0.109 (0.311)	0.063 (0.245)	0.078 (0.269)
A level	0.163 (0.369)	0.100 (0.302)	0.130 (0.337)	0.100 (0.301)	0.084 (0.279)	0.113 (0.316)
O level	0.087 (0.283)	0.080 (0.273)	0.057 (0.232)	0.098 (0.298)	0.049 (0.217)	0.071 (0.259)
White	0.849 (0.358)	0.860 (0.349)	0.928 (0.258)	0.873 (0.333)	0.908 (0.289)	0.950 (0.218)
Partnered	0.782 (0.413)	0.570 (0.498)	0.507 (0.500)	0.714 (0.452)	0.739 (0.440)	0.781 (0.414)
Any child <16	0.171 (0.377)	0.060 (0.239)	0.004 (0.066)	0.210 (0.408)	0.155 (0.363)	0.093 (0.292)
England	0.792 (0.406)	0.820 (0.386)	0.876 (0.330)	0.790 (0.407)	0.859 (0.349)	0.850 (0.358)
London	0.108 (0.310)	0.160 (0.368)	0.336 (0.473)	0.131 (0.338)	0.204 (0.405)	0.184 (0.388)
N. Ireland & Wales & Scotland	0.208 (0.406)	0.180 (0.386)	0.124 (0.330)	0.210 (0.407)	0.141 (0.349)	0.150 (0.358)
Full-time worker	0.849 (0.358)	0.810 (0.394)	0.883 (0.322)	0.657 (0.475)	0.676 (0.470)	0.769 (0.422)
Sample size	43,063	100	684	27,331	142	320

Source: 2009-14 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS).

Note: Weighted means (standard deviations).

Table 2b: Demographic characteristics – low managers

Adults aged 25-64 not missing information on earnings

Variables	Heterosexual men	Bisexual men	Gay men	Heterosexual women	Bisexual women	Lesbians
Age	45.89 (10.97)	44.32 (10.78)	41.90 (10.24)	44.92 (10.75)	41.23 (10.74)	42.50 (10.02)
Highest education level:						
Degree level	0.386 (0.487)	0.521 (0.501)	0.512 (0.500)	0.429 (0.495)	0.486 (0.500)	0.580 (0.494)
Higher ed.	0.158 (0.365)	0.155 (0.363)	0.132 (0.229)	0.205 (0.404)	0.138 (0.345)	0.166 (0.372)
A level	0.224 (0.417)	0.155 (0.363)	0.174 (0.379)	0.145 (0.352)	0.144 (0.352)	0.125 (0.331)
O level	0.162 (0.369)	0.106 (0.308)	0.138 (0.346)	0.169 (0.375)	0.158 (0.365)	0.103 (0.304)
White	0.887 (0.316)	0.831 (0.376)	0.904 (0.295)	0.895 (0.307)	0.873 (0.333)	0.931 (0.254)
Partnered	0.770 (0.421)	0.528 (0.501)	0.479 (0.500)	0.697 (0.460)	0.711 (0.454)	0.688 (0.464)
Any Child <16	0.161 (0.368)	0.106 (0.308)	0.004 (0.067)	0.198 (0.398)	0.153 (0.361)	0.075 (0.265)
England	0.767 (0.423)	0.761 (0.428)	0.828 (0.378)	0.750 (0.433)	0.838 (0.369)	0.804 (0.397)
London	0.095 (0.294)	0.204 (0.405)	0.234 (0.424)	0.086 (0.281)	0.160 (0.367)	0.117 (0.322)
N. Ireland & Wales & Scotland	0.233 (0.423)	0.239 (0.428)	0.172 (0.378)	0.250 (0.433)	0.162 (0.369)	0.196 (0.397)
Full-time worker	0.817 (0.386)	0.810 (0.394)	0.813 (0.390)	0.569 (0.495)	0.593 (0.492)	0.744 (0.437)
Sample size	58,920	142	1,307	91,645	457	922

Source: 2009-2014 UK Integrated Household Surveys (IHS).

Note: Weighted means (standard deviations).

Table 3:
Workplace authority variables are strongly positively related to earnings
Adults age 25-64 with full time employment

	Men	Women
Managerial responsibilities	0.141***	0.162***
	(0.005)	(0.005)
Supervisory responsibilities	0.088***	0.071***
	(0.004)	(0.004)
Higher managerial occupation	0.362***	0.390***
	(0.006)	(0.007)
Lower managerial occupation	0.150***	0.163***
	(0.005)	(0.005)
R-squared	0.371	0.442
N	75,017	59,221

Source: 2012-14 UK IHS
Note: * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Outcome is log earnings. Models include additional controls not reported, including: dummy variables for self-reported sexual orientation (gay/lesbian, bisexual, other, don't know, refused); a dummy variable for being interviewed face-to-face; age and its square; dummy variables for degree levels, higher education (HE qualification below degree level), A-levels, O-levels; race/ethnicity dummies (white, black, Asian, mixed race, other race); a dummy for being in any kind of partnership; year dummies; location dummies (London, England, Scotland and Northern Ireland), a dummy variable for the presence of children (any child <5 & any child ≥5) in the household; a private sector dummy; seven firm size dummies (1-10, 11-19, 20-24, 25-49, 50-249, 250-499, >500); eight industry dummies (energy/water, manufacturing, construction, hotels/restaurants, transportation/communication, banking/finance, education/health, other services); and eight occupation dummies (manager/director/senior officials, professional occupations, associate professional/technical occupations, administrative and secretarial occupations, skilled trade occupations, caring/leisure/other service occupations, customer service and sales occupations, elementary occupations).

Table 4: Workplace authority gap associated with sexual orientation and evidence of gay glass ceilings

Adults aged 25-64 in full time employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Outcome is ➔	Managerial authority	Supervisory authority	Managerial & Supervisory authority	Occupation is managerial/professional occupations	Occupation is "higher managerial occupations"	Occupation is "lower managerial occupations"
Men						
Gay	0.061***	0.057***	0.062***	0.057***	-0.022***	0.079***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Bisexual	-0.030*	-0.034	-0.027	-0.065***	-0.050***	-0.015
	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.019)
R-squared	0.167	0.094	0.145	0.373	0.254	0.166
N	179,980	179,980	179,980	179,980	179,980	179,980
Women						
Lesbian	0.027***	0.016*	0.023**	-0.028***	-0.017**	-0.010
	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.011)
Bisexual	-0.037**	-0.049***	-0.036**	-0.035**	-0.014	-0.020
	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.018)
R-squared	0.141	0.102	0.127	0.372	0.193	0.211
N	140,084	140,084	140,084	140,084	140,084	140,084

Source: 2009-14 UK IHS.

Note: * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. All models include controls for: a dummy variable for being interviewed face-to-face; age and its square; dummy variables for degree levels, higher education (HE qualification below degree level), A-levels, O-levels; race/ethnicity dummies (white, black, Asian, mixed race, other race); a dummy for being in any kind of partnership; year dummies; location dummies (London, England, Scotland and Northern Ireland); dummies for the presence of children (any child <5 & any child ≥5) in the household; a private sector dummy; seven firm size dummies (1-10, 11-19, 20-24, 25-49, 50-249, 250-499, >500); eight industry dummies (energy/water, manufacturing, construction, hotels/restaurants, transportation/communication, banking/finance, education/health, other services); and eight occupation dummies (manager/director/senior officials, professional occupations, associate professional/technical occupations, administrative and secretarial occupations, skilled trades occupations, caring/leisure/other service occupations, customer service and sales occupations, elementary occupations). Standard errors robust to heteroscedasticity are reported in parentheses.

Table 5: Workplace authority gap associated with gender

Adults aged 25-64 in full time employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Outcome is ➔	Managerial authority	Supervisory authority	Managerial & supervisory authority	Occupation is managerial/professional occupations	Occupation is "higher managerial occupations"	Occupation is "lower managerial occupations"
Woman	-0.034***	-0.029***	-0.031***	0.005***	-0.061***	0.066***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)
R-squared	0.155	0.095	0.136	0.370	0.232	0.194
N	320,064	320,064	320,064	320,064	320,064	320,064

Source: 2009-14 UK IHS.

Note: * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. See notes to Table 4.

Table 6: Workplace authority gap associated with race/ethnicity

Adults aged 25-64 in full time employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Outcome is ➔	Managerial authority	Supervisory authority	Managerial & supervisory authority	Occupation is managerial/professional occupations	Occupation is "higher managerial occupations"	Occupation is "lower managerial occupations"
Men						
Non-white	-0.013**	-0.008	-0.009*	-0.005	-0.003*	0.013***
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)
R-squared	0.167	0.094	0.145	0.166	0.039	0.057
N	179,980	179,980	179,980	179,980	179,980	179,980
Women						
Non-white	-0.018***	-0.022***	-0.016***	-0.025***	-0.002	0.008***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.002)
R-squared	0.141	0.102	0.127	0.211	0.020	0.073
N	140,084	140,084	140,084	140,084	140,084	140,084

Source: 2009-14 UK IHS.

Note: * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. See notes to Table 4.

Table 7: The gay glass ceiling effect is stronger for non-white men

Males aged 25-64 with full time employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Outcome is ➔	Managerial authority	Supervisory authority	Managerial & supervisory authority	Occupation is managerial/professional occupations	Occupation is "higher managerial occupations"	Occupation is "lower managerial occupations"
White men						
Gay	0.054***	0.055***	0.057***	0.055***	-0.017**	0.072***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)
Bisexual	-0.035	-0.047*	-0.031	-0.049**	-0.035*	-0.015
	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.021)
R-squared	0.172	0.094	0.149	0.381	0.255	0.171
N	156,476	156,476	156,476	156,476	156,476	156,476
Non-white men						
Gay	0.100***	0.084***	0.098***	0.075***	-0.075***	0.151***
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.023)	(0.030)
Bisexual	-0.001	0.024	-0.001	-0.104**	-0.092**	-0.012
	(0.044)	(0.052)	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.036)	(0.045)
R-squared	0.133	0.094	0.118	0.338	0.265	0.138
N	23,504	23,504	23,504	23,504	23,504	23,504

Source: 2009-14 UK IHS.

Note: * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. See notes to Table 4.

Table 8: Robustness to restricting sample to higher and lower managers

Adults aged 25-64 in full time employment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)
Outcome is➔	Higher manager	Higher manager	Higher manager	Higher manager
Sample is➔	Men	All	White men	Non-white men
Gay/lesbian	-0.058***	--	-0.050***	-0.158***
	(0.011)		(0.011)	(0.037)
Bisexual	-0.023	--	-0.006	-0.097
	(0.034)		(0.037)	(0.086)
Black	-0.052***	--	--	--
	(.013)			
Women	--	-.120***	--	--
		(.002)		
R-squared	0.109	0.133	0.110	0.114
N	92,391	168,351	80,921	11,470

Source: 2009-14 UK IHS.

Note: Sample is adults in high or low managerial positions. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. See notes to Table 4.

Table 9: Oaxaca decompositions
Males aged 25-64 in full time employment

	(1) Total gap in access to higher managerial positions	(2) Difference due to characteristics (i.e., endowments)	(3) Difference due to coefficients (i.e., returns)	(4) Difference due to interactions between characteristics and coefficients
Gay men vs. heterosexual men				
	0.070	-0.015	0.058	0.027
	(0.012)	(0.033)	(0.011)	(0.033)
Bisexual men vs. heterosexual men				
	0.018	0.001	0.023	-0.006
	(0.038)	(0.031)	(0.037)	(0.030)
Lesbians vs. heterosexual women				
	-0.008	0.009	0.011	-0.028
	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.013)
Bisexual women vs. heterosexual women				
	-0.004	-0.008	0.018	-0.014
	(0.024)	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.019)

Source: 2009-14 UK IHS.
Note: Sample is high + low managers. Baseline specification, with demographic controls.