Sexual Orientation and Multiple Job Holding:

Evidence from Swedish Administrative Data

Christopher S. Carpenter, Erwan Dujeancourt, Samuel Mann, and Lucia Naldi*

February 2025

We use Swedish administrative data from 2001-2021 to study sexual orientation and multiple job holding. We identify over 19,000 employed individuals who ever entered a legal same-sex union and compare their outcomes with all employed individuals who were only ever in different-sex unions. We find that sexual minority individuals are significantly more likely than otherwise similar heterosexual individuals to hold multiple jobs. We explore four mechanisms: financial constraints, self-insurance, career mobility, and job heterogeneity. We find evidence in line with self-insurance mechanisms for sexual minority men. For women, we find that career mobility is a likely explanation.

JEL Codes: J15, J22

Keywords: sexual orientation, multiple job holding

* Carpenter [corresponding author] is E. Bronson Ingram University Distinguished Professor of Economics at Vanderbilt University and Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research; christopher.s.carpenter@vanderbilt.edu. Dujeancourt is Postdoctoral Researcher at SOFI, Stockholm University; erwan.dujeancourt@sofi.su.se. Mann is an Associate Economist at RAND Corporation; mann@rand.org. Naldi is Professor of Business Administration at Jönköping International Business School; lucia.naldi@ju.se. The authors are grateful to seminar participants at Jönköping International Business School, Stockholm University and conference participants at the European Economic Association for helpful comments on an earlier draft. Dujeancourt gratefully acknowledges funding from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare (FORTE, grant nr. 2023-00053). This article is based upon work from LGBTI+ Social Economic (in)equalities COST Action CA19103, supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology). The data used in this article consist of confidential administrative data from Sweden, which cannot be shared publicly. The data can be accessed by researchers by placing an order and undergoing security clearance with Statistics Sweden. The authors are willing to assist researchers interested in accessing the data (Erwan Dujeancourt; erwan.dujeancourt@sofi.su.se). All errors are our own.

doi:10.3368/jhr.0324-13477R1

1. Introduction

Multiple job holding (also referred to as moonlighting) is a widespread phenomenon in OECD countries, with 5 to 10 percent of workers holding two or more jobs (Tazhitdinova, 2022). In the US around 50% of men are dual job holders at some point in their life (Paxson & Sicherman, 1996), and over 10% of workers in the UK are multiple job holders (Heineck, 2009). The rise of precarious contracts and the emergence of the gig economy have resulted in an increase in atypical work arrangements and facilitated increases in moonlighting (Katz & Krueger, 2019). While multiple job holding has been shown to play an important role for skill acquisition, human capital accumulation, and career and occupational mobility, it also has impacts on work-life balance, sleep, and work (and non-work) injuries (Marucci-Wellman et al., 2016; Marucci-Wellman, Willetts, et al., 2014; Panos et al., 2014; Paxson & Sicherman, 1996).

Understanding who becomes a multiple job holder is important to understand who may be subject to the adverse consequences of moonlighting, especially as the incidence of moonlighting is likely to increase within the context of a global economy that is moving towards short-term labor models and online contract platforms. While a few studies have explored gender differences in moonlighting (Averett, 2001), most research to date has focused on workers with fewer educational requirements who take second jobs out of necessity (Caza et al., 2022). As a consequence of this narrow perspective, there is relatively limited work investigating the incidence and drivers of multiple job holding across different groups (Campion et al., 2020). We lack, in particular, a clear picture of moonlighting among sexual minority individuals—a group that may be at a higher risk of adverse consequences from moonlighting due to their economic vulnerabilities and disadvantaged status in the labor market (Badgett et al., 2024).

To fill this gap in the literature, we use administrative data from Sweden to document for the first time in the literature the incidence and drivers of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals. Specifically, we use population register data which allows us to identify every individual who was ever in a registered same-sex relationship in Sweden from 1995-2021, and we compare outcomes for these

individuals with the associated outcomes for individuals who were only ever observed in different-sex registered relationships. The population register data also allow us to identify whether individuals are employed by one or multiple firms within a year which we use to identify multiple job holders. Using this data, we demonstrate that sexual minority men are around 8 percentage points more likely to be multiple job holders compared to otherwise comparable heterosexual men, while sexual minority women are around 3 percentage points more likely to be multiple job holders than similarly situated heterosexual women.

We identify and analyze four potential mechanisms that may explain the higher incidence of moonlighting among sexual minority individuals. A commonly proposed explanation for holding multiple jobs pertains to *financial constraints*, namely, employees who cannot earn more in their primary job work a second job to supplement their earnings (Hirsch et al., 2016; Kimmel & Smith Conway, 2001; Shishko & Rostker, 1976; Smith Conway & Kimmel, 1998). It is well established that sexual minority individuals (especially sexual minority men) experience earnings disparities (Badgett et al., 2009); therefore, sexual minority individuals may use multiple job holding as a way to supplement their income. To explore whether financial constraints drive our main findings, we explore whether the multiple job holding disparity varies across the distribution of earnings and whether sexual minority individuals are differentially likely to work in second jobs with fewer educational requirements. Our findings demonstrate that the sexual orientation based multiple job holding disparity increases in magnitude across the distribution of earnings, that sexual minority individuals are less likely to hold a second job that has fewer educational requirements, and that sexual minority individuals are more likely to hold a second job that has greater educational requirements. Broadly, these results rule out differential financial constraints as the underlying mechanism.

Second, to the extent that sexual minority individuals, and especially sexual minority men, work in more unstable or lower paying occupations (e.g., creative industries, artistry, and teaching (Plug et al., 2014; Tilcsik et al., 2015)), holding multiple jobs could be a way to manage inconsistent earnings and protect from perceived *job insecurity* (Bell et al., 1997; Guariglia & Kim, 2004). In line with this, we explore the role of self-insurance as a mechanism, from an individual- and firm-level perspective. First, given the higher

levels of job security among public sector workers in Sweden one would expect that the disparity would be larger among private sector workers if theories related to job insecurity explained the differential incidence of multiple job holding of sexual minority individuals. We show that the male disparity is larger in the private sector than public sector. Next, we use rich firm-level data to demonstrate that firm-level labor turnover differentially predicts multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals. We find that sexual minority men are more likely than otherwise similar heterosexual men to take up multiple job holding following labor turnover within their firms, while this is not the case for women. Broadly, these findings provide evidence that self-insurance related mechanisms may explain, at least in part, the higher incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority men.

Third, holding multiple jobs may enable sexual minority individuals to transition to new occupations if earnings penalties or discriminatory treatment in their primary job are occupation-specific (Tilcsik et al., 2015). That is, sexual minority individuals may hold multiple jobs as a conduit to greater career progression in line with theories of multiple job holding being related to skill acquisition and career mobility (Hirsch et al., 2016; Panos et al., 2014). To identify the role of *career mobility* mechanisms, we explore the dynamics of career outcomes around the timing of multiple job holding. Our findings indicate that sexual minority men are less likely to change jobs in the years after they start moonlighting in comparison to heterosexual men, while sexual minority women are more likely to change firm and industry. These results suggest that sexual minority women may use multiple job holding to diversify skills and enter new industries, and in turn, indicate that career mobility theories may in part explain the differential incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority women.

Finally, recent literature indicates that a key motive behind multiple job holding relates to *job heterogeneity* (Böheim & Taylor, 2004; Dickey et al., 2011). The heterogeneous jobs model indicates that the diversification of job tasks increases job satisfaction and that preferences for this diversification may motivate differential job holding (Smith Conway & Kimmel, 1998). If sexual minority individuals gain greater utility (but lower earnings) from their second job, then they may hold multiple jobs to balance

earnings and job satisfaction. Relatedly, if sexual minority individuals gain greater utility from having greater task diversification, then they may be differentially likely to hold multiple jobs. To explore the role of job heterogeneity mechanisms in explaining the differential incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals, we explore whether sexual minority individuals are more likely to work in heterogeneous jobs, proxied by the industry of the primary and secondary job. We find that sexual minority individuals are more likely to work in multiple jobs in the same industry, indicating that job heterogeneity is an unlikely mechanism. The higher levels of job similarity across multiple jobs among sexual minority individuals begs the question of whether the higher incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals is simply a byproduct of sexual minority individuals working in jobs or employment sectors where multiple job holding is more common or the norm. To test if this is the case, we include detailed industry and occupation variables. These results indicate that primary job industry and occupation can account for about half of the difference in multiple job holding compared to the estimate from the baseline specification for sexual minority men, while for women including occupation and industry controls has little to no impact.

Finally, we study the association between multiple job holding and longer-run labor market outcomes among sexual minority men and women. Our results indicate that the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority women is associated with better labor market outcomes. Sexual minority women who hold multiple jobs are less likely to be unemployed and enjoy greater earnings growth in the future.

Together, our findings indicate that sexual minority individuals are more likely to be multiple job holders than their heterosexual counterparts. Our analyses provide evidence that for men this pattern is primarily driven by explanations related to self-insurance and the types of jobs that sexual minority individuals work in. For women, we find evidence that the greater incidence of moonlighting may be related to mechanisms related to career mobility. In turn, we find that the higher incidence of multiple job holding is associated with improved labor market trajectories for sexual minority women but not for men.

This new evidence contributes to several distinct literatures. First, it contributes to the literature that has identified disparities in the prevalence of multiple job holding across different demographic groups. Prior work indicates that rural workers (Alden, 1971), women (Kimmel & Powell, 1999; Panos et al., 2014), younger workers (Kimmel & Powell, 1999) and racial minorities (Kimmel & Smith Conway, 2001) are more likely to be multiple job holders. We contribute to this literature by providing evidence on an understudied population, namely, sexual minority individuals. While sexual minority individuals now make up around 21% of 19-25 year olds in the US (Gallup, 2022), the understanding of the labor market behavior of this sizeable population is limited. The present work provides new evidence on the propensity of this understudied population to engage in atypical employment behaviors, which has important consequences (Marucci-Wellman et al., 2016; Marucci-Wellman, Lin, et al., 2014; Marucci-Wellman, Willetts, et al., 2014; Panos et al., 2014; Paxson & Sicherman, 1996).

Second, we contribute to an extensive body of literature that explores the determinants of multiple job holding. Prior work has provided evidence on the role of financial constraints, career mobility, job heterogeneity, and moonlighting as self-insurance, as leading explanations for multiple job holding (Bell et al., 1997; Guariglia & Kim, 2004; Kimmel & Smith Conway, 2001; Shishko & Rostker, 1976; Smith Conway & Kimmel, 1998; Tazhitdinova, 2022). We contribute to this literature by providing new evidence on how these motivations differ across heterogeneous groups. Our findings indicate that self-insurance and career mobility drive our core finding that sexual minority individuals are more likely to be multiple job holders.

Finally, we contribute to a growing literature in LGBTQ+ labor economics. Prior work has demonstrated disparities in earnings, extensive and intensive labor supply, and occupational rankings across sexual orientation (Aksoy et al., 2019; Badgett, 1995; Badgett et al., 2021; Black et al., 2007; Sarzosa, 2023). We contribute to this literature by providing the first evidence of the propensity of sexual minority individuals to engage in atypical labor market behavior. Furthermore, building on prior work that has documented sexual orientation based labor market disparities (see Drydakis (2022) for a meta-analysis), we provide new

evidence on the association between moonlighting and the labor market trajectories of sexual minority individuals. These results demonstrate that multiple job holding is associated with a lower likelihood of unemployment and greater earnings growth for sexual minority women compared to heterosexual women; however, for men, the association between multiple job holding and labor market trajectories do not significantly differ across sexual orientation. This new evidence provides novel insights into the way that labor market disparities are constructed and provides suggestive evidence that atypical labor market behavior among sexual minority women is positively associated with labor market outcomes in the longer run.

This paper proceeds as follows. The next section provides more details regarding our Swedish administrative population register and employment record data. Section 3 presents our empirical approach. Our main results are presented in Section 4, followed by a discussion of potential mechanisms that explain our main findings in Section 5, and a discussion of the association between moonlighting and labor market outcomes by sexual orientation in Section 6. Section 7 concludes.

2. Data

Our principal data combine information from Swedish population registers for the period 1995 to 2021 and information from employment records from 2001-2021. For the population registers, we start with 1995, as this was the first-year individuals could register a same-sex relationship in Sweden.[1] For every individual older than 18 who legally resides in Sweden, we can identify whether they ever entered into a legal same-sex union (either a registered partnership or a marriage) and whether they ever entered into a legal different-

[1] The introduction of registered partnership legislation for same-sex couples occurred in Sweden in 1995 (Kolk & Andersson, 2020). Registered partnership in Sweden is a legal union that provides similar rights to marriage except the opportunity to adopt a child (until 2003), access to medically assisted insemination (until 2005), and requirements of being legal residents before entering into a registered partnership (Kolk & Andersson, 2020; Rydström, 2011). In 2009, same-sex marriage legislation was introduced in Sweden. Post same-sex marriage legalization, no registered partnerships were granted, and couples that were already in a registered partnership prior to same-sex marriage legalization were given the opportunity to convert their registered partnership into marriage or could remain as a registered partnership (rather than marriage) if they so wished. In our study, we refer to registered partnerships and marriages as legal unions.

sex union. Given that the same individuals can be followed across time, the data generate an extensive individual longitudinal dataset. Individuals who ever entered a legal same-sex union are labeled 'likely sexual minority individuals' or are simply referred to as 'sexual minority individuals'. People who have entered exclusively different sex legal unions are referred to as 'likely heterosexual individuals' or are simply referred to as 'heterosexual individuals'.[2] Importantly, prior work has demonstrated that most individuals in same-sex romantic relationships describe themselves as gay, lesbian, or bisexual, or use other non-heterosexual terms to describe their sexual orientation (Badgett et al., 2021).[3] Because our only measure of minority sexual orientation is related to being in a relationship, we exclude individuals who never entered a legal union of any type. Notably, 1,782,580 women (22% of the population) and 2,079,511 men (26% of the population) in Sweden are never observed to have entered any legal union. Excluding these individuals from our analysis is essential, as it ensures that our comparison groups focus only on those who have experienced legal union formation. This allows for more accurate inferences about sexual minority and heterosexual populations.

Although we do not have direct measures of sexual orientation for individuals in different-sex legal unions in Sweden, our own calculations from the 2013-18 U.S. National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) suggest that the proportion of people in different-sex unions identifying as non-heterosexual is quite small (1.21% of men and 3.27% of women in different-sex couples). The NHIS does not indicate if the romantic unions are formally recognized with a local or national government; if we further restrict the NHIS sample to people in different-sex couples who report being married (which is more likely to be a legal status akin to the status we examine in Sweden), these rates decline even further to 0.48% of men and 0.78% of women. Given these exceptionally low percentages, the likelihood of misclassifying individuals in different-sex

[2] This approach is similar to that used in other Swedish register data studies (see: Aldén et al., 2015; Andersson et al., 2006)

[3] Notably, our approach to identifying sexual minority individuals does not require individuals to be currently in a legal union at the time we measure the multiple job holding outcome.

legal unions as heterosexual when they may identify as non-heterosexual is minimal. This provides a high degree of confidence in the accuracy of our classification based on legal union type.

Consequently, while our measurement of sexual orientation relies on relationship data, existing findings suggest that any misclassification of sexual minority status among individuals exclusively in different-sex unions is unlikely to significantly impact the overall conclusions (Badgett et al., 2021). We therefore believe our findings are broadly generalizable to populations where legal union data is available and similarly reflective of individuals' sexual orientation.

For the multiple job holding outcomes, we link our population register data to individual administrative employment records which contain confidential information on each person's occupation and whether individuals have earnings from one or multiple employers from 2001 to 2021. We use these records to define an outcome MULTIPLE JOB HOLDER that equals one if the individual received earnings from at least two employers in year t.[4] Conversely, individuals with a maximum of one employer in year t are not considered multiple job holders, regardless of any self-employment positions they may hold.[5] We restrict our sample to employed individuals between 18 and 65 years old.

3. Empirical Approach

We estimate linear probability regression models on the likelihood of multiple job holding as a function of sexual minority status and other observed demographic characteristics:

$$Y_{irt} = \alpha + \beta_1(EVER\ IN\ A\ LEGAL\ SAME - SEX\ UNION)_i + \gamma X_{irt} + \delta T_t + \varepsilon_{irt} \qquad (1)$$

[4] Occupation data is missing until the year 2002. We also unfortunately do not observe information on working hours for our full sample, so we cannot distinguish full-time from part-time work. This is a common limitation with administrative data of this type.

[5] To address the concern that holding two jobs in one year may reflect job switching as opposed to contemporaneous multiple job holding, we perform a robustness check where we examine individuals who worked for the same two employers in year t-1 and in year t. As it is unlikely that an individual switched from employer A to employer B in year t-1 and then back from employer B to employer A in year t, a finding of sexual orientation-related differences in this measure of multiple job holding increases confidence in the idea that the multiple job holding is contemporaneous as opposed to sequential.

where Y_{irt} is the multiple job holding outcome for individual *i,* in regional category *r,* at time *t,* captured by a binary variable equal to 1 if the individual is a multiple job holder and 0 otherwise. EVER IN A LEGAL SAME-SEX UNION is an indicator equal to one for individuals ever observed to be in a legal same-sex union (i.e., registered partnership or same-sex marriage).[6] X is a vector of individual demographic characteristics from the population register data: age and age squared, education (dummy variables for the following education groups: less than primary education; primary education; completed secondary education; more than secondary education, but less than a bachelor's degree; bachelor's degree; advanced degree; and other/unknown educational background; with the excluded category being uncompleted secondary school education), a dummy for immigration background,[7] a dummy for being in a legal union (married or in a registered partnership), a dummy variable for having ever been legally separated,[8] and a dummy for the presence of children in the household. The X vector also includes detailed controls for geography designed to capture urban/rural differences.[9] T_t are year dummies. The error term e_{irt} in equation (1) is assumed to be iid. β_1 is our coefficient of interest, and it represents the relative association between sexual minority status and multiple job holding. We estimate heteroskedasticity robust White standard errors.

[6] Note that we exclude individuals who were never in a legal union of any kind from the analysis. This excluded group consists of 1,782,580 women (22% of the population) and 2,079,511 men (26% of the population), who are never observed to be in a legal union in our sample. Consequently, the comparison group is composed of individuals who were observed to have been in at least one legal different-sex union and never observed in a same-sex relationship. Individuals who were observed to be in both a same-sex and a different-sex relationship at different points in their lives are included in the EVER IN A LEGAL SAME-SEX UNION category. In our sample, 427 men are observed to have entered both a same-sex and a different-sex legal union, compared to 7,595 men who have exclusively entered a same-sex legal union. Among women, 1,165 are observed in both same-sex and different-sex legal unions, while 10,094 women have exclusively entered same-sex legal unions. We document robustness to the inclusion or exclusion of these individuals in Appendix Table A6.

[7] Immigration background is a dummy variable equal to one if the individual was not born in Sweden or if the individual's two parents are immigrants, and zero otherwise. Note that this means a person can be born in Sweden and still have immigration background.

[8] While we exclude individuals who were never in any kind of legal partnership, our sample includes individuals who were in a legal partnership for at least one year.

[9] Specifically, we include the log of the municipality population and dummy variables for urban/rural categories. Appendix Table A1 contains detailed descriptions of each category. Appendix Figures A1 and A2 show the municipalities by regional categories and sexual minority share (per 100,000) of the total population.

4. Results

We present descriptive statistics of our Swedish sample in Table 1. We present means for four groups: women exclusively observed in different-sex unions (Column 1), women ever observed in same-sex unions (Column 2), men exclusively observed in different-sex unions (Column 3), and men ever observed in same-sex unions (Column 4). We present means for a variety of demographic variables from the population registers and for economic outcomes from the administrative employment data. The patterns in Table 1 confirm that sexual minority individuals are, on average, more likely to hold multiple jobs than heterosexual individuals. For men and women, this difference is approximately 41% (about 11 percentage points). Regarding demographics, Table 1 shows that sexual minority individuals are significantly younger, less likely to be currently in a legal union, and less likely to have had children than heterosexual individuals. Sexual minority individuals are also more likely to have bachelor's or advanced degrees than heterosexual individuals, and they live in much more highly populated metropolitan areas than heterosexual people.[10]

Table 2 presents our main estimates on sexual orientation and multiple job holding likelihood. Results for women are presented in the top panel; results for men are presented in the bottom panel. We present unadjusted estimates in Column 1, and we sequentially add time fixed effects (Column 2); controls for observable individual-level covariates (Column 3); and geographic characteristics (Column 4).[11] Each entry is the coefficient estimate on 'ever in a legal same-sex union'; we provide an expanded set of regression coefficients in Appendix Table A3.

[10] Appendix Table A2 shows the gender differences in labor market outcomes in Sweden for individuals aged 18-65. Notably, Sweden is the 4th most gender equal country in the world (United Nations, 2024). Men and women have very similar employment rates and there is no gender difference in the overall likelihood of multiple job holding. There are large income differences, and we also observe that men are overrepresented in manufacturing, construction, and service sectors while women are overrepresented in healthcare, administration, and public sectors. Appendix Figure A1 shows the highly populated metropolitan areas. Appendix Figure A2 shows the share of sexual minority employees relative to all 18-65 employees by municipality.

[11] Including municipality fixed effects rather than geographic characteristics does not change qualitative or quantitative patterns.

The results in Columns 1-4 of Table 2 confirm that there is a significant association between sexual orientation and multiple job holding that survives after controlling for demographic and geographic characteristics. Specifically, in the top panel, we estimate that sexual minority women are about 3 percentage points more likely to be multiple job holders than otherwise similar heterosexual women. For men in the bottom panel, we estimate an even larger difference: sexual minority men are 7.6 percentage points more likely than otherwise similar heterosexual men to be multiple job holders.[12] As a share of the relevant full sample means, these estimates are about 12 percent for women and 29 percent for men.[13] Thus, Table 2 provides the first evidence in the literature that sexual orientation is significantly related to multiple job holding, and these differences are large in magnitude, especially for men.

Our measure of multiple job holding identifies individuals who receive earnings from more than one employer within a calendar year. While this method offers valuable insights into employment patterns, it is important to note that we cannot always confirm whether these jobs were held simultaneously, as some individuals may have simply switched jobs during the year. To address this limitation, we conducted robustness checks (Table 3) by focusing on individuals who remained with the same employers in both year *t-1* and year *t*. The intuition behind this test is that it is unlikely that someone would switch from employer A to employer B in year *t-1* and then switch back from employer B to employer A in year *t*. Thus, individuals

[12] Appendix Table A4 shows the sensitivity of our main results on multiple job holding to controlling for childbearing and age. In both cases, excluding the relevant control has much larger effects on the estimated differences in multiple job holding likelihood for sexual minority women compared to heterosexual women than for sexual minority men compared to heterosexual men. These patterns are likely to be related to a role for career concerns in explaining the sexual orientation-based differential in multiple job holding for women. Appendix Table A5 displays the estimates from a pooled model which shows the coefficients from a model predicting multiple job holding for every group relative to otherwise comparable men exclusively in different-sex legal unions. Notably, sexual minority men and women have a significantly higher likelihood to be multiple job holders than both men and women exclusively in different-sex legal unions, and there is also a significant gender gap between men and women exclusively in different-sex legal unions. These patterns are important for contextualizing the results in Table 2 since we compare outcomes for men ever in a same-sex legal union with a relatively privileged group (i.e., men exclusively in different-sex legal unions) while we compare outcomes for women ever in a same-sex legal union with a group that itself may suffer discrimination (i.e., women exclusively in different-sex legal unions). In Appendix Table A6, we report the results after excluding individuals ever observed in both same-sex and different-sex legal unions. Results are qualitatively and quantitatively similar.

[13] Results presented in Appendix Figure A3 indicate that the multiple job holding disparity has been fairly consistent over time.

with the same employers across both years are more likely to have held both jobs concurrently, indicating that they were truly multiple job holders.

The results from Table 3 confirm the robustness of our findings: sexual minority women are 8 percent more likely, and sexual minority men are 50 percent more likely, to be multiple job holders with identical employers across two consecutive years compared to their heterosexual peers. This confirms that the observed differences are unlikely to be driven by job switching, strengthening our conclusion that sexual orientation is significantly associated with multiple job holding.

5. Mechanisms

Thus far, we have shown that sexual minority individuals, especially sexual minority men are substantially more likely to be multiple job holders than their heterosexual counterparts. However, a natural question remains: what explains this substantial disparity? We test four mechanisms. Building on prior work that has identified financial constraints, self-insurance, career mobility, and job heterogeneity as leading motivations for holding multiple jobs, we explore whether these motivations can explain the differentially greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals.

5.1. Financial Constraints

Theoretical and empirical work has provided evidence that one motivation for holding multiple jobs is financial constraints. In Table 4, we explore whether this can explain the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals. First, in Columns 1 through 4, we document the multiple job holding disparities across labor income percentile for all jobs. These results demonstrate that for sexual minority men the disparity in multiple job holding is more pronounced at the higher end of the income distribution. Specifically, sexual minority men in the top income percentiles are 10.6 percentage points more likely to hold multiple jobs, a rate 41% higher than the sample mean. In contrast, those in the lower income percentiles are 4.3 percentage points more likely to hold multiple jobs, representing a rate 14%

higher than the sample mean. For sexual minority women the disparity is relatively consistent across the labor income distribution (the disparity varies by less than 2 percentage points across the distribution).[14] These findings suggest that the association between sexual orientation and multiple job holding is more significant for higher-income individuals, implying that financial constraints do not drive the multiple job holding disparity.

Second, in line with Tazhitdinova (2022), we explore whether sexual minority individuals are differentially likely to work in a second job that has fewer educational requirements. Tazhitdinova (2022) highlights that working in such a job likely reflects financial constraints as a key motivation as jobs with fewer educational requirements generally have lower wages and therefore are unlikely to be attractive unless earnings from a person's primary job are too low.[15] To explore this, we identify whether sexual minority individuals are differentially likely to hold a second job that has an above median share of employees with less than a high school diploma (Column 5) or at least a bachelor's degree (Columns 6). Following previous literature (Tazhitdinova, 2022), we also explore whether sexual minority individuals are differentially likely to hold a multiple job in the service sector (Column 7).[16] These results demonstrate that sexual minority men are significantly less likely than their heterosexual counterparts to work in jobs with fewer education requirements (proxied by having an above median share of firm employees who have less than a high school degree) and that both sexual minority men and women are more likely to hold a second job with higher educational requirements (proxied by having an above median share of employees who have at least a bachelor's degree). Sexual minority men and women are also significantly less likely to hold a second job

[14] In Appendix Table A7, we document the multiple job holding disparity for above and below median labor income from all jobs and above and below median wealth. Results are similar to those reported in Table 4. More details regarding the wealth data are provided in Appendix Table A1. In Appendix Table A8, we report the heterogeneity in main results on multiple job holding by labor income on the primary job. Results are qualitatively identical to the results we present in Table 4.

[15] We define the primary job as the position that generates the highest labor income and the secondary job as the one with the second highest labor income.

[16] Although the service sector is diverse and includes high-paying and low-paying jobs, on average the jobs in this sector have lower pay and require fewer educational requirements compared to jobs in other sectors.

in the service sector.[17] Taken together, our results imply that financial constraints likely do not explain the differential uptake of multiple jobs among sexual minority individuals.

5.2. Self-Insurance

Next, we explore the role of self-insurance from job loss. Prior work has consistently demonstrated that people hold multiple jobs as a way to protect themselves against job or income loss (Bell et al., 1997; Guariglia & Kim, 2004). If sexual minority individuals experience (or expect to experience) discrimination in the labor market, then they may have lower levels of perceived job security and, in turn, may protect themselves from job loss by moonlighting. Furthermore, sexual minority individuals may perceive their jobs to be more precarious when firms face downturns due to perceptions regarding discrimination. We use rich firm-level data to explore firm-level factors that are highly correlated with perceived job security and therefore may predict the need to use multiple job holding to provide self-insurance. This allows us to explore whether sexual minority individuals differ from heterosexual individuals in their responses to increased job insecurity.

In Table 5 Columns 1 and 2, we report results from our baseline model (Column 4 of Table 2) for people who work in the public sector and those who do not, given the well-established higher levels of job security among public sector employees. These results indicate that the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals persists among both public and private sector employees but is larger for men among those working in the private sector.

Next, to the extent that labor turnover signals job insecurity, an employee who works for a firm with higher labor turnover may be more likely to hold multiple jobs. To explore whether this drives disparities in the take up of multiple jobs across sexual orientation we next control for (and include interactions between

[17] We report in Appendix Table A9 whether men and women ever in same-sex legal unions are significantly less likely to work in the service sector in the primary job and secondary job relative to men and women exclusively in different-sex legal unions, respectively. Results are qualitatively and quantitatively similar.

sexual orientation and) measures of firm-level labor turnover. In Column 3 of Table 5, we include a new control variable that equals 1 if the individual is working in a firm that reduced their number of employees in t-1, as well as an interaction between this control variable and sexual minority status. In Columns 4 through 6, we report the results from comparable models where the control equals 1 if the employer reduced the number of employees by at least 2%, 5%, and 10%, respectively. These results demonstrate that sexual minority women are significantly less likely to become multiple job holders than their heterosexual counterparts when their firm experiences labor turnover. For men, the results indicate that sexual minority men are significantly more likely to become multiple job holders than their heterosexual counterparts when their firms have increased labor turnover. That is, sexual minority men seemingly differentially respond to firm-level downturns and self-insure against these downturns by moonlighting.

Broadly, these results demonstrate that self-insurance is an unlikely underlying mechanism explaining the differential incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority women. For men, our results provide evidence that differential rates of job insecurity may in part explain the higher levels of multiple job holding among sexual minority men. Higher labor turnover within a firm is predictive of sexual minority men becoming multiple job holders, suggesting that as job insecurity increases, sexual minority men are more responsive than their heterosexual counterparts.

5.3. Career Mobility

Prior studies indicate that multiple job holding may be used by individuals to diversify their skills, acquire new human capital, and acts as a conduit to career progression. That is, prior work has demonstrated that career progression may motivate individuals to engage in multiple job holding (Panos et al, 2014). Given the pre-existing literature that has documented that sexual minority men are paid less than their heterosexual counterparts (Badgett et al., 2009), and that sexual minority men try to avoid jobs that have high levels of prejudicial coworkers (Plug et al., 2014), it may be the case that sexual minority individuals use multiple job holding as a way to achieve greater career progression and explore career alternatives.

To explore the role of career mobility in explaining our core findings we study the association between the first occurrence of multiple job holding in period *t* and several career mobility outcomes in *t+1*. These results are presented for men in Table 6 and for women in Table 7. Panel A Column 1 reports results for whether there is a differential association between sexual orientation and changing industry in *t+1*, while columns 2 through 4 report comparable results for differential associations with occupation changes, firm changes, and switching to being an entrepreneur as the primary job role. Column 5 reports whether there is a differential likelihood that sexual minority individuals change their primary job in *t+1* to one of their additional jobs in period *t*. Panels B and C provide synonymous results for *t+3* and *t+5*.

Table 6 Panel A indicates that, in comparison to heterosexual men, sexual minority men are 12% (3.6 percentage points) less likely to change industry, 7% (1.4 percentage points) less likely to change occupation, 3% (1.4 percentage points) less likely to change firm, and 5% (1.3 percentage points) less likely to have moved from their primary job to one of their additional jobs within a year of becoming a multiple job holder for the first time. By *t+5*, sexual minority men are 12% (6.2 percentage points) less likely to have changed industry, 6% (2.7 percentage points) less likely to have changed occupation, 3% (2.0 percentage points) less likely to have changed firm, 13% (0.8 percentage points) less likely to have become an entrepreneur, and 5% (1.4 percentage points) less likely to have moved from their primary job to one of their additional jobs.

For sexual minority women (Table 7), we find evidence that sexual minority women who are multiple job holders experience greater career mobility than their heterosexual counterparts, at least in the short-run. In the first year after becoming a multiple job holder, sexual minority women are 6% (1.4 percentage points) more likely to have changed industry and 6% (2.6 percentage points) more likely to have changed firm, however, they are around 5% (0.9 percentage points) less likely to have changed occupation. These patterns indicate that while sexual minority women experience career mobility across industries and firms following becoming a multiple job holder, this does not result in changes in occupational rank, suggesting that sexual minority women are differentially making horizontal career moves.

Overall, the results in Tables 6 and 7 suggest that career mobility likely does not explain the multiple job holding disparity for sexual minority men. In fact, sexual minority men are less career mobile than their heterosexual counterparts in the years after becoming a multiple job holder. For sexual minority women, our results provide evidence that the multiple job holding disparity may be explained by differences in career mobility and progression motivations. Our results indicate that in the years after becoming a multiple job holder, sexual minority women are differentially likely to be career mobile.

5.4. Job Heterogeneity

The final mechanism for explaining the multiple job holding differentials experienced by sexual minority individuals that we explore is job heterogeneity. Prior work indicates that a key motive behind multiple job holding relates to job heterogeneity (Böheim & Taylor, 2004; Dickey et al., 2011). The heterogeneous jobs model indicates that diversification of job tasks increases job satisfaction and that preferences for this diversification may motivate differential job holding (Kimmel & Smith Conway, 2001).

First, we explore whether sexual minority individuals are differentially likely to work in heterogeneous jobs. To do so, we explore whether sexual minority individuals are differentially likely to hold multiple jobs in a different industry than their primary job, using 2-digit industry codes[18] (which correspond to 87 industries). These results are presented in Table 8. We find that sexual minority men are around 11% (2.2 percentage points) more likely than otherwise similar heterosexual men to work in multiple jobs in the same industry. For women, we find that sexual minority women are around 5% (1.2 percentage points) more likely than otherwise similar heterosexual women to work in multiple jobs in the same industry. These findings indicate that disparities in multiple job holding are unlikely to be driven by job heterogeneity mechanisms.

[18] In Appendix Table A1, we describe the industry code in greater detail. Unfortunately, we do not observe occupation of the second job, so we cannot do this same robustness check using occupation.

The higher levels of job similarity across multiple jobs among sexual minority individuals beg the question of whether the higher incidence of multiple job holding is simply a byproduct of sexual minority individuals working in systematically different types of jobs or in different employment sectors where multiple job holding is more common or the norm (for example, artists and technology workers commonly piece together multiple jobs due to the nature of their work). Indeed, prior work has demonstrated that sexual minority individuals are more represented in specific sectors which may imply that sexual minority individuals are pushed into these sectors due to discrimination or may reflect occupational preferences among sexual minority individuals (Del Río & Alonso-Villar, 2019; Plug et al., 2014; Tilcsik et al., 2015; Waite & Denier, 2016). If sexual minority individuals are disproportionately likely to be in jobs where multiple job holding is the norm, then this could produce the observed association documented in Table 2. To test this, Column 2 of Table 8 presents results from models where we augment the main baseline specification from Column 4 of Table 2 with detailed controls for industry and occupation, which we observe for every individual on their primary job.[19] The results indicate that controlling for industry and occupation has little to no effect on the sexual orientation based multiple job holding disparity among women. For men, controlling for industry and occupation can account for approximately half of the difference in multiple job holding compared to the estimate from the baseline specification in Column 4 of Table 2, but a significant difference remains.

Taken together, these results indicate that the higher incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals is unlikely to be explained by job heterogeneity, although systematic differences in the types of jobs in which sexual minority men work (and associated norms regarding multiple job holding) can explain approximately half of the differential.

[19] Occupation data initiates from the year 2002. Consequently, there is an absence of occupation data for the year 2001, resulting in approximately 5% of observations being unavailable for analysis. The estimations presented in Column 2 of Table 8 are concentrated on the period from 2002 to 2021.

6. Association between Multiple Job Holding and Labor Market Outcomes Among Sexual Minority Individuals

In the final step, we explore whether the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals is associated with broader labor market trajectories of sexual minority individuals. On the one hand holding multiple jobs may reduce productivity in one's primary job, and multiple job holding has been shown to be associated with lower levels of wellbeing, work-life balance, and sleep, all of which are positively associated with labor market outcomes (Marucci-Wellman, Lin, et al., 2014; Marucci-Wellman, Willetts, et al., 2014). However, multiple job holding has also been shown to play an important role in skill acquisition, human capital accumulation, and career and occupational mobility (Panos et al., 2014; Paxson & Sicherman, 1996). Furthermore, our findings presented in Section 5.3 indicate that multiple job holding is associated with greater career mobility among sexual minority women, which in turn may be associated with better labor market outcomes. Taken together, it is unclear whether the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals is associated with broader labor market outcomes of sexual minority individuals.

To test this, we provide estimates of the association between multiple job holding in period *t* and two key measures of labor market outcomes (unemployment and earnings growth) in *t+1, t+3* and *t+5.* These results are presented in Table 9 Panel A for women and in Panel B for men. Our results indicate that sexual minority men do not significantly differ from heterosexual men in terms of unemployment probabilities or earnings growth 1, 3, or 5 years after becoming multiple job holders. That is, the higher incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority men is not directly associated with their labor market trajectories. However, a different story emerges for women. Sexual minority women who held multiple jobs in period *t* are 9% (0.8 percentage points) less likely to be unemployed and enjoy around 10-11% greater earnings growth by *t+5* relative to heterosexual women who hold multiple jobs in period t. These results indicate that the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority women is associated with improved labor market outcomes in the long run.

7. Conclusion

This paper is the first to show that sexual minority individuals are significantly more likely to be multiple job holders than heterosexual individuals. Having identified this new disparity, we explore four key mechanisms: financial constraints, career mobility, self-insurance, and job heterogeneity.

For women, we provide evidence that this disparity is likely related to career mobility motivations. Sexual minority women who become multiple job holders are differentially likely to be career mobile. In turn, multiple job holding is associated with better labor market outcomes among sexual minority women in the longer run – reducing the incidence of unemployment and increasing earnings growth.

For men, we provide suggestive evidence that the higher incidence of multiple job holding is likely driven by self-insurance mechanisms. Sexual minority men are more likely to take up a second job when their firm experiences labor turnover. Furthermore, accounting for job-based norms accounts for approximately half of the overall disparity for men.

From a policy perspective, the varied drivers and outcomes associated with the greater incidence of multiple job holding among sexual minority individuals suggest different policy responses. On the one hand, our research shows that some sexual minority individuals, in particular sexual minority men, use multiple job holding as a hedging strategy against insecurity— especially because they are more likely to be in jobs with less job security—without gaining other benefits in terms of labor market trajectories. Consequently, some policy measures should focus on enhancing the working conditions and income stability of individuals in precarious jobs. On the other hand, other sexual minority individuals, notably sexual minority women, engage in multiple job holding for career-related reasons, and especially for horizontal career moves, often enjoying better labor market outcomes in the longer run. This evidence calls for policy initiatives that support, or at a minimum, do not penalize (e.g. in terms of taxation or pension benefits) multiple job holding.

Our study is subject to some limitations, many owing to the data. Although the population registers provide us with very large samples and high confidence in the individuals we identify as sexual minority individuals, a consequence of our use of entry into legal same-sex unions to identify sexual minority individuals is that we cannot identify sexual minority individuals who are never observed to enter legal same-sex unions. Our definition also prevents us from identifying sexual minority individuals in same-sex couples who choose not to register their relationships with the Swedish government. Since we know from other research that bisexual individuals are disproportionately likely to enter different-sex relationships if they enter relationships at all (Badgett et al., 2024), this means that our data on likely sexual minority individuals are also very likely to not identify a large share of partnered bisexual individuals. We encourage future studies to further advance our understanding regarding these groups.

The study is conducted in Sweden which is a progressive country that was among the first in the world to legally recognize same-sex relationships and grant sexual minority individuals significant rights. While the data landscape in Sweden provides interesting opportunities due to available administrative linkages (like those used in the current study), future work should explore opportunities to understand the relationship between minority sexual orientation and multiple job holding from other contexts.

References

Aksoy, C. G., Carpenter, C. S., Frank, J., & Huffman, M. L. (2019). Gay Glass Ceilings: Sexual Orientation and Workplace Authority in the UK. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *159*, 167–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2019.01.013

Alden, J. (1971). Double-Jobholding: A Regional Analysis of Scotland. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, *18*(1), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9485.1971.tb00976.x

Aldén, L., Edlund, L., Hammarstedt, M., & Mueller-Smith, M. (2015). Effect of Registered Partnership on Labor Earnings and Fertility for Same-Sex Couples: Evidence From Swedish Register Data. *Demography*, *52*(4), 1243–1268. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-015-0403-4

Andersson, G., Noack, T., Seierstad, A., & Weedon-Fekjær, H. (2006). The Demographics of Same-Sex Marriages in Norway and Sweden. *Demography*, *43*(1), 79–98. https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2006.0001

Averett, S. L. (2001). Moonlighting: Multiple Motives and Gender Differences. *Applied Economics*, *33*(11), 1391–1410. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840010007957

Badgett, M. V. L. (1995). The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination. *ILR Review*, *48*(4), 726–739. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979399504800408

Badgett, M. V. L., Carpenter, C. S., Lee, M. J., & Sansone, D. (2024). A Review of the Economics of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *62*(3), 948–994. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20231668

Badgett, M. V. L., Carpenter, C. S., & Sansone, D. (2021). LGBTQ Economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *35*(2), 141–170. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.35.2.141

Badgett, M. V. L., Sears, B., Lau, H., & Ho, D. (2009). Bias in the Workplace: Consistent Evidence of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination 1998–2008. *Chi.-Kent L. Rev*, *84*. https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/chknt84&i=571

Bell, D., Hart, R. A., & Wright, R. E. (1997). Multiple Job Holding as a “Hedge” Against Unemployment. *CEPR Discussion Papers*. https://ideas.repec.org/p/cpr/ceprdp/1626.html

Black, D. A., Sanders, S. G., & Taylor, L. J. (2007). The Economics of Lesbian and Gay Families. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *21*(2), 53–70. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.21.2.53

Böheim, R., & Taylor, M. P. (2004). And in the Evening She's a Singer with the Band - Second Jobs, Plight or Pleasure? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.525962

Campion, E. D., Caza, B. B., & Moss, S. E. (2020). Multiple Jobholding: An Integrative Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, *46*(1), 165–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319882756

Del Río, C., & Alonso-Villar, O. (2019). Occupational segregation by sexual orientation in the U.S.: exploring its economic effects on same-sex couples. *Review of Economics of the Household*, *17*(2), 439–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-018-9421-5

Dickey, H., Watson, V., & Zangelidis, A. (2011). Is it All about Money? An Examination of the Motives Behind Moonlighting. *Applied Economics*, *43*(26), 3767–3774. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036841003724403

Drydakis, N. (2022). Sexual Orientation and Earnings: a Meta-Analysis 2012–2020. *Journal of Population Economics*, *35*(2), 409–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-021-00862-1

Gallup. (2022). *LGBT Identification in US Ticks Up to 7.1%.* https://aefsg.ch/wp-content/uploads/lgbt-inehmen-zu.pdf

Guariglia, A., & Kim, B.-Y. (2004). Earnings Uncertainty, Precautionary Saving, and Moonlighting in Russia. *Journal of Population Economics*, *17*(2), 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-004-0184-3

Heineck, G. (2009). The Determinants of Secondary Jobholding in Germany and the UK. *Zeitschrift Für ArbeitsmarktForschung*, *42*(2), 107–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12651-009-0008-8

Hirsch, B. T., Husain, M. M., & Winters, J. V. (2016). Multiple job holding, local labor markets, and the business cycle. *IZA Journal of Labor Economics*, *5*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40172-016-0044-x

Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2019). The Rise and Nature of Alternative Work Arrangements in the

United States, 1995–2015. *ILR Review*, *72*(2), 382–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793918820008

Kimmel, J., & Powell, L. M. (1999). Moonlighting Trends and Related Policy Issues in Canada and the United States. *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, *25*(2), 207. https://doi.org/10.2307/3551889

Kimmel, J., & Smith Conway, K. (2001). Who Moonlights and Why? Evidence from the SIPP. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, *40*(1), 89–120. https://doi.org/10.1111/0019-8676.00198

Kolk, M., & Andersson, G. (2020). Two Decades of Same-Sex Marriage in Sweden: A Demographic Account of Developments in Marriage, Childbearing, and Divorce. *Demography*, *57*(1), 147–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00847-6

Marucci-Wellman, H. R., Lin, T.-C., Willetts, J. L., Brennan, M. J., & Verma, S. K. (2014). Differences in Time Use and Activity Patterns When Adding a Second Job: Implications for Health and Safety in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*, *104*(8), 1488–1500. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.301921

Marucci-Wellman, H. R., Lombardi, D. A., & Willetts, J. L. (2016). Working Multiple Jobs over a Day or a Week: Short-Term Effects on Sleep Duration. *Chronobiology International*, *33*(6), 630–649. https://doi.org/10.3109/07420528.2016.1167717

Marucci-Wellman, H. R., Willetts, J. L., Lin, T.-C., Brennan, M. J., & Verma, S. K. (2014). Work in Multiple Jobs and the Risk of Injury in the US Working Population. *American Journal of Public Health*, *104*(1), 134–142. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301431

Panos, G. A., Pouliakas, K., & Zangelidis, A. (2014). Multiple Job Holding, Skill Diversification, and Mobility. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, *53*(2), 223–272. https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12055

Paxson, C. H., & Sicherman, N. (1996). The Dynamics of Dual Job Holding and Job Mobility. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *14*(3), 357–393. https://doi.org/10.1086/209815

Plug, E., Webbink, D., & Martin, N. (2014). Sexual Orientation, Prejudice, and Segregation. *Journal of*

Labor Economics, *32*(1), 123–159. https://doi.org/10.1086/673315

Rydström, J. (2011). *Odd Couples : A History of Gay Marriage in Scandinavia*. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.5117/9789052603810

Sarzosa, M. (2023). Sexual Orientation and Labor Market Disparities. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *212*, 723–755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2023.06.007

Shishko, R., & Rostker, B. (1976). The Economics of Multiple Job Holding. *The American Economic Review*, *66*(3), 298–308. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1828164?seq=1

Smith Conway, K., & Kimmel, J. (1998). Male Labor Supply Estimates and the Decision to Moonlight. *Labour Economics*, *5*(2), 135–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(97)00023-7

Tazhitdinova, A. (2022). Increasing Hours Worked: Moonlighting Responses to a Large Tax Reform. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, *14*(1), 473–500. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20190786

Tilcsik, A., Anteby, M., & Knight, C. R. (2015). Concealable Stigma and Occupational Segregation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *60*(3), 446–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839215576401

United Nations. (2024). *Gender Inequality Index (GII)*. https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/thematic-composite-indices/gender-inequality-index#/indicies/GII

Waite, S., & Denier, N. (2016). Self-Employment among Same-Sex and Opposite-Sex Couples in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie*, *53*(2), 143–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12103

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Employed Individuals Aged 18-65

	(1) **Women Exclusively in DSC**	(2) **Women Ever in SSC**	(3) **Men Exclusively in DSC**	(4) **Men Ever in SSC**
Has multiple jobs in a year	0.244	0.347***	0.261	0.368***
Age	43.929	35.980***	44.389	41.371***
Immigration background	0.205	0.160***	0.206	0.252***
Currently in legal union	0.672	0.417***	0.664	0.446***
Childbearing	0.473	0.310***	0.463	0.049***
Less than primary education	0.028	0.003***	0.040	0.010***
Primary education	0.067	0.061***	0.097	0.066***
Uncompleted secondary school education	0.232	0.116***	0.257	0.163***
Completed secondary education	0.199	0.243***	0.211	0.199***
More than secondary education, but less than a bachelor's degree	0.166	0.191***	0.156	0.171***
Bachelor's degree	0.293	0.363***	0.213	0.354***
Advanced degree	0.011	0.019***	0.019	0.029***
Other/unknown education	0.004	0.004*	0.008	0.009**
Already divorced	0.177	0.194***	0.163	0.165
Population, municipality	134,610	238,006***	135,778	341,796***
Firm size	10,367	12,081***	5,242	9,838***
Agricultural	0.004	0.004***	0.012	0.004***
Manufacturing	0.070	0.059***	0.206	0.054***
Construction	0.010	0.012***	0.095	0.013***
Service	0.293	0.323***	0.420	0.451***
Healthcare	0.299	0.251***	0.080	0.176***
Public and administration	0.284	0.297***	0.135	0.241***
Other sectors	0.039	0.054***	0.052	0.062***
Metropolitan	0.312	0.483***	0.315	0.647***
Cities with high access	0.406	0.351***	0.408	0.233***
Cities with low access	0.076	0.043***	0.076	0.028***
Rural with high access	0.121	0.079***	0.119	0.061***
Rural with low access	0.077	0.041***	0.075	0.029***
Rural with very low access	0.007	0.004***	0.007	0.002***
Number of unique individuals	2,073,191	11,259	2,023,443	8,022
Number of individual-year observations	29,021,883	179,090	27,114,810	113,228

Author calculations from Sweden population register from 2001 to 2021. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 indicate the statistical significance of the difference in means between Column 1 and Column 2 or Column 3 and Column 4.

Table 2: Sexual Minority Men and Women are More Likely to be Multiple Job Holders

	(1) **No Controls**	(2) **+ Year Fixed Effects**	(3) **+ Demographic Characteristics**	(4) **+ Geographic Characteristics**
Women				
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.104***	0.105***	0.033***	0.030***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Sample mean	0.244	0.244	0.244	0.244
Adj-R-squared	0.000	0.001	0.038	0.039
Number of individual-year observations	29,200,973	29,200,973	29,200,973	29,200,973
Men				
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.107***	0.108***	0.080***	0.076***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Sample mean	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261
Adj-R-squared	0.000	0.002	0.022	0.023
Number of individual-year observations	27,228,038	27,228,038	27,228,038	27,228,038
Year fixed effects?		X	X	X
Demographic characteristics?			X	X
Geographic characteristics?				X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan.

Table 3: Sexual Minority Individuals are More Likely to be Multiple Job Holders with the Same Employers in Years t-1 and t

	(1) **Same Employers in Years t-1 and t**
Women	
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.008***
	(0.001)
Sample mean	0.098
Adj-R-squared	0.004
Number of individual-year observations	29,200,973
Men	
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.051***
	(0.001)
Sample mean	0.101
Adj-R-squared	0.006
Number of individual-year observations	27,228,038
Year fixed effects?	X
Demographic characteristics?	X
Geographic characteristics?	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan.

Table 4: The Role of Financial Constraints in Explaining the Higher Likelihood of Multiple Job Holding Among Sexual Minority Individuals

	(1) **Lowest 25% Labor Income**	(2) **25-50% Labor Income Range**	(3) **50-75% Labor Income Range**	(4) **>75% Top 25% Labor Income**	(5) **Share of Employees in MJ with < HS Diploma**	(6) **Share of Employees in MJ with at least a Bachelor's Degree**	(7) **Second Working Position in the Service Sector**
Women							
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.031***	0.035***	0.022***	0.026***	-0.001	0.007***	-0.062***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Sample mean	0.270	0.225	0.209	0.274	0.247	0.210	0.351
Adj-R-squared	0.063	0.062	0.030	0.019	0.267	0.305	0.051
Number of individual-year observations	7,302,576	7,303,092	7,299,142	7,296,163	7,129,982	7,129,982	7,129,982
Men							
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.043***	0.069***	0.089***	0.106***	-0.022***	0.023***	-0.066***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Sample mean	0.308	0.233	0.244	0.260	0.274	0.175	0.410
Adj-R-squared	0.040	0.021	0.014	0.018	0.308	0.380	0.050
Number of individual-year observations	6,809,836	6,809,487	6,803,806	6,804,909	7,112,843	7,112,843	7,112,843
Year fixed effects?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Demographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Geographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan.

Table 5: The Role of Self-Insurance in Explaining the Higher Likelihood of Multiple Job Holding Among Sexual Minority Individuals

	(1) **Primary Job = Public Sector**	(2) **Primary Job Does Not = Public Sector**	(3) **Any Labor Turnover in t-1**	(4) **2% or more Labor Turnover in t-1**	(5) **5% or more Labor Turnover in t-1**	(6) **10% or more Labor Turnover in t-1**
Women						
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.036***	0.029***	0.030***	0.030***	0.032***	0.031***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Firm reduced no. employees			-0.055***	-0.013***	0.028***	0.066***
			(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Firm reduced no. employees * ever in a legal same-sex union			0.001	0.000	-0.008***	-0.008**
			(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Sample mean	0.231	0.249	0.244	0.244	0.244	0.244
Adj-R-squared	0.040	0.039	0.042	0.039	0.040	0.041
Number of individual-year observations	8,289,644	20,911,329	29,200,973	29,200,973	29,200,973	29,200,973
Men						
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.062***	0.075***	0.076***	0.070***	0.068***	0.070***
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Firm reduced no. employees			-0.065***	-0.053***	-0.038***	-0.016***
			(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Firm reduced no. employees * ever in a legal same-sex union			0.001	0.016***	0.029***	0.038***
			(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Sample mean	0.310	0.254	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261
Adj-R-squared	0.025	0.022	0.028	0.026	0.024	0.023
Number of individual-year observations	3,681,628	23,546,410	27,228,038	27,228,038	27,228,038	27,228,038
Year fixed effects?	X	X	X	X	X	X
Demographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X	X
Geographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan.

Table 6: The Role of Career Mobility in Explaining the Higher Likelihood of Multiple Job Holding Among Sexual Minority Men

	(1) **Change in Industry**	(2) **Change in Occupation**	(3) **Firm Change**	(4) **Entrepreneur**	(5) **MJ = Primary Job**
Panel A: t+1					
Ever in a legal same-sex union	-0.036***	-0.014**	-0.014*	-0.001	-0.013*
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.007)
Sample mean	0.292	0.195	0.444	0.030	0.284
Adj-R-squared	0.043	0.032	0.017	0.008	0.007
Number of individual observations	916,132	916,132	916,132	916,132	916,132
Panel B: t+3					
Ever in a legal same-sex union	-0.058***	-0.018**	-0.018**	-0.009***	-0.016**
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.008)
Sample mean	0.433	0.372	0.613	0.052	0.277
Adj-R-squared	0.081	0.053	0.042	0.008	0.008
Number of individual observations	833,136	833,136	833,136	833,136	833,136
Panel C: t+5					
Ever in a legal same-sex union	-0.062***	-0.027***	-0.020**	-0.008**	-0.014*
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.008)
Sample mean	0.530	0.470	0.693	0.064	0.275
Adj-R-squared	0.084	0.067	0.053	0.007	0.009
Number of individual observations	761,005	761,005	761,005	761,005	761,005
Year fixed effects?	X	X	X	X	X
Demographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X
Geographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan. In consideration of the limited sample size, we used the one-digit industry classification encompassing agriculture, construction, healthcare, manufacturing, public sectors and administration, service, and other sectors.

Table 7: The Role of Career Mobility in Explaining the Higher Likelihood of Multiple Job Holding Among Sexual Minority Women

	(1) **Change in Industry**	(2) **Change in Occupation**	(3) **Firm Change**	(4) **Entrepreneur**	(5) **MJ = Primary Job**
Panel A: t+1					
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.014**	-0.009*	0.026***	0.001	-0.003
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.001)	(0.006)
Sample mean	0.234	0.184	0.409	0.014	0.261
Adj-R-squared	0.043	0.032	0.021	0.004	0.005
Number of individual observations	906,624	906,624	906,624	906,624	906,624
Panel B: t+3					
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.004	-0.003	0.024***	0.002	-0.003
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.006)
Sample mean	0.346	0.346	0.567	0.023	0.252
Adj-R-squared	0.079	0.057	0.060	0.004	0.005
Number of individual observations	824,326	824,326	824,326	824,326	824,326
Panel C: t+5					
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.001	0.003	0.024***	0.001	-0.007
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.006)
Sample mean	0.419	0.441	0.640	0.028	0.250
Adj-R-squared	0.087	0.077	0.078	0.003	0.005
Number of individual observations	757,539	757,539	757,539	757,539	757,539
Year fixed effects?	X	X	X	X	X
Demographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X
Geographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan. In consideration of the limited sample size, we use the one-digit industry classification encompassing agriculture, construction, healthcare, manufacturing, public sectors and administration, service, and other sectors.

Table 8: The Role of Job Heterogeneity in Explaining the Higher Likelihood of Multiple Job Holding Among Sexual Minority Individuals

	(1) **Primary and Secondary Jobs are in the Same Industry**	(2) **MJH + Industry and Occupation FE's**
Women		
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.012*** (0.002)	0.027*** (0.001)
Sample mean	0.222	0.243
Adj-R-squared	0.012	0.049
Number of individual-year observations	7,129,982	27,708,771
Men		
Ever in a legal same-sex union	0.022*** (0.002)	0.038*** (0.001)
Sample mean	0.205	0.259
Adj-R-squared	0.011	0.044
Number of individual-year observations	7,112,843	25,755,923
Year fixed effects?	X	X
Demographic characteristics?	X	X
Geographic characteristics?	X	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan. Occupation data initiates from the year 2002. Consequently, the estimations presented in Column 2 of Table 8 are concentrated on the period from 2002 to 2021. Industry is in two-digits classification (e.g., accommodation; food beverage service activities; retail; wholesale trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles; education; creative, arts and entertainment activities; sports activities and amusement and recreation activities).

Table 9: Association Between Multiple Job Holding and the Labor Market Outcomes of Sexual Minority Individuals

	(1) **Unemployment in t+1**	(2) **Unemployment in t+3**	(3) **Unemployment in t+5**	(4) **Labor Income Growth t+1**	(5) **Labor Income Growth t+3**	(6) **Labor Income Growth t+5**
Women						
Ever in a legal same-sex union	-0.001	-0.005	-0.008**	0.017	0.081	0.292***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.029)	(0.059)	(0.085)
Sample mean	0.036	0.078	0.087	1.547	2.093	2.619
Adj-R-squared	0.010	0.021	0.026	0.026	0.037	0.049
Number of individual-year observations	936,402	882,309	814,678	906,624	824,326	757,539
Men						
Ever in a legal same-sex union	-0.002	-0.001	0.001	0.027	0.061	-0.010
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.036)	(0.086)	(0.097)
Sample mean	0.039	0.085	0.100	1.405	1.930	2.423
Adj-R-squared	0.008	0.018	0.023	0.036	0.054	0.072
Number of individual-year observations	940,941	879,295	806,621	916,132	833,136	761,005
Year fixed effects?	X	X	X	X	X	X
Demographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X	X
Geographic characteristics?	X	X	X	X	X	X

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. Education base: uncompleted secondary school education. Regional category base: metropolitan.