Hybrid Entrepreneurship and Sexual Orientation: A Replication and Extension of Folta et al. (2010)

Erwan Dujeancourt, Lucia Naldi, and Samuel Mann*

January 2026

Abstract:

We replicate and theoretically extend Folta et al.'s (2010) influential study on hybrid entrepreneurship using matched employer-employee data from Sweden (2002–2021). Replicating their core findings in a broader and more recent sample, we find that hybrid entrepreneurship remains a substantial entry path into entrepreneurial activity, accounting for the majority of transitions out of wage work. Extending their framework, we reveal important variations by gender and sexual orientation: women and sexual minority men enter hybrid entrepreneurship more frequently than heterosexual men. Hybrid entrepreneurship also serves multiple rationales among sexual minority men, providing income security and pursuing expressive and value-driven work.

Keywords: self-employment, entrepreneurship

* Dujeancourt [corresponding author] is an Economist at the Institute of Social Research (SOFI), Stockholm University; erwan.dujeancourt@sofi.su.se. Naldi is Professor of Business Administration at Jönköping International Business School; lucia.naldi@ju.se. Mann is an Associate Economist at RAND Corporation; mann@rand.org. The authors are grateful to seminar participants at Jönköping International Business School and Stockholm University, and are grateful to Dr Wennberg for sharing replication materials for the original study. Dujeancourt gratefully acknowledges funding from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare (FORTE, grant nr. 2023-00053). The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. 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.

1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, scholars have increasingly recognized that individuals often enter entrepreneurship not by fully abandoning wage work, but by engaging in both simultaneously—a phenomenon known as hybrid entrepreneurship (Adom et al., 2018; Folta et al., 2010; Schulz et al., 2016, 2021). This form of entrepreneurial engagement is not only widespread but also theoretically significant, as it challenges traditional dichotomies between wage labor and self-employment and has its own distinct rationales, including make an additional income (income supplementation), pursue an interest (non-monetary benefits), and test the entrepreneurial waters (transition to self-employment) (Raffiee & Feng, 2014; Thorgren et al., 2016).

Fundamental to advancing this understanding of hybrid entrepreneurship has been the seminal contribution by Folta et al. (2010) (hereafter FDW). Using employer-employee match data on Swedish men in high-tech sectors (1994–2001), FDW show that that hybrid entrepreneurship 1) represents a substantial share of entrepreneurial activity, and 2) systematically differs from direct entrants into self-employment, typically displaying higher capabilities (human capital) as well as greater opportunity costs, and lower entrepreneurial experience—characteristics consistent with the rationale of entrepreneurship as a transition path.

These findings were derived from a specific demographic: the sample is limited to Swedish men in high-tech industries between 1994–2001. Although this scope allows for analytic clarity, it limits the generalizability of the results beyond men in high-tech sectors. Additionally, while FDW acknowledged the coexistence and potential variability of the three rationales, their study did not empirically explore sources of heterogeneity influencing these rationales, thus opening avenues for further investigation. We propose that one such source is sexual orientation. In more detail, building on gender-structure theory (Risman & Davis, 2013), we question the implicit assumption that entrepreneurial pathways are universally structured by human capital or risk preferences and argue that organizational contexts and institutional arrangements produce different opportunity structures for sexual minorities, where hybrid entry may be a strategy of navigating heteronormative and gendered constraints. Existing literature indicates that sexual minorities often face structural disadvantages in both wage employment and entrepreneurship, ranging from salary penalties and restricted career progression (Badgett et al., 2009; Tilcsik, 2011) to exclusion from funding networks and

pressures to conceal identity to maintain legitimacy in client or investor interactions (Galloway, 2012; Rumens & Ozturk, 2019). These constraints may influence how sexual minorities perceive hybrid entrepreneurship, not solely as a transition stage but also as an arrangement providing both security and expressive value.

Motivated by renewed attention to replication as a foundation for knowledge accumulation in management and entrepreneurship scholarship (Bergh et al., 2017; Crawford et al., 2022), this study replicates and theoretically extends some of the analyses of FDW to explore this possibility (Hubbard et al., 1998; Köhler & Cortina, 2023). Our aim is twofold: *first*, to assess whether the transition rationale is supported in the study holds across a more recent and broader (more inclusive) demographic population; and *second,* to extend their framework by investigating whether hybrid entrepreneurship differs among sexual minority men and women relative to heterosexual men and women, ever in legal unions, and whether, for these individuals, hybridity also serves as a mechanism for income supplementation and access to nonmonetary benefits.

Our study closely follows FDW's empirical strategy and utilizes the same comprehensive Swedish employer-employee matched datasets, updated to cover the period from 2002 to 2021. By including both men and women aged 25 to 50 in our starting risk set, and extending the analysis beyond high-tech industries, we significantly broaden the demographic scope of FDW's study. Moreover, leveraging Sweden's population registers, we uniquely identify sexual minority individuals through observed legal same-sex unions, allowing us to explicitly examine gender and sexual orientation as a source of heterogeneity.

We offer several key findings. Replicating FDW in a broader and more recent dataset confirms that hybrid entrepreneurship remains a substantial pathway into entrepreneurial activity and accounts for a large share of transitions out of wage work. Our extension reveals meaningful heterogeneity by gender and sexual orientation. Among men, sexual minority status is associated with greater reliance on hybrid entrepreneurship relative to direct self-employment compared with heterosexual men. Among women, entrepreneurial entry is more concentrated in hybrid than in direct self-employment across groups, and the hybrid-to-self-employment transition gradient is especially pronounced, particularly for sexual minority women. For sexual minority men, additional analyses indicate that hybrid entrepreneurship is concentrated among those employed outside the public sector, consistent with hybridity serving as a

response to employment-related insecurity rather than low income per se. Finally, sector-specific analyses show that sexual minorities are more likely to engage in hybrid entrepreneurship in advocacy and social impact work, consistent with nonmonetary (expressive) motivations. Together, these findings suggest that hybrid entrepreneurship can serve multiple rationales, especially for sexual minorities, combining risk management with opportunities for value-driven and identity-expressive work.

1.1. Rationales for Hybrid Entrepreneurship

Recent scholarship has emphasized that individuals engage in hybrid entrepreneurship for multiple reasons. These rationales reflect, in important ways, the motivations documented in the literature on multiple jobholding, which include income supplementation, personal fulfillment, and skill and career development (Campion et al., 2020).

A first rationale is grounded in the need to supplement income. In this view, hybrid entrepreneurship offers a means of financial stabilization, particularly under conditions of economic insecurity, stagnant wages, or limited institutional support. This aligns with the earnings-constraint hypothesis, which suggests that individuals pursue additional income streams when their primary earnings are insufficient (Hirsch et al., 2016), as well as the precautionary savings hypothesis, which frames hybrid entrepreneurship as a protective response to perceived job insecurity (Guariglia & Kim, 2006; Hlouskova et al., 2017). Empirical evidence from diverse contexts supports this income-based rationale. Adom et al. (2023), studying hybrid entrepreneurs in Ghana, show that continued engagement in entrepreneurial activity is partly shaped by the extent to which it meets individuals' financial needs, while Schulz (2017) finds that individuals who pursue self-employment as a secondary activity earn significantly more from that role than those holding two wage-paying jobs, suggesting that hybrid entrepreneurship may be a more effective strategy for income enhancement.

A second rationale centers on the pursuit of nonmonetary benefits, such as autonomy, personal fulfillment, and identity expression. Similar to the psychological fulfillment motive observed in multiple jobholding literature (Campion et al., 2020), some individuals turn to hybrid entrepreneurship to engage in work that aligns more closely with their passions, values, or creative interests. This perspective emphasizes hybridity as a deliberate and sustained way of

organizing work to achieve meaning beyond economic utility, including well-being (Ardianti et al., 2022).

A third rationale treats hybrid entrepreneurship as a strategy for managing uncertainty associated with full entrepreneurial commitment. Here, individuals use hybrid status to test the viability of their venture, assess market demand, and learn about their own capabilities before deciding whether to leave employment. Raffiee and Feng (2014) find that individuals who transition from hybrid to full-time entrepreneurship are more likely to survive than those who enter directly, suggesting that hybridity enables a process of information acquisition and staged decision-making. Their work also shows that hybrid entrepreneurship may be particularly attractive to risk-averse individuals who would otherwise be deterred from entrepreneurial entry altogether. FDW, as we summarize next, laid important theoretical groundwork for this third rationale.

1.2. Summary of FDW

Using matched employer-employee data for Swedish male earners in high-tech industries for the period 1994–2001, FDW shows that hybrid entrepreneurship represents a substantial proportion of overall entrepreneurial activity, comprising over 44% of all self-employment by 2001 (as reprinted from the original study in Appendix Table 1). Moreover, hybrid entrepreneurship accounts for approximately 58% of all entrepreneurial entries during this period, indicating frequent transitions into and out of hybrid status compared to direct entry into self-employment. Additionally, their analysis reveals that more than 21% of self-employment entries are preceded by hybrid activity. Transitions from hybrid to full-time self-employment are particularly pronounced among those with higher levels of hybrid entrepreneurial intensity, defined as the proportion of self-employment income relative to salary income, highlighting that increased entrepreneurial engagement within hybrid status significantly correlates with subsequent transition to full-time entrepreneurship.

Then, FDW tests the differences in determinants of entry into self-employment, hybrid entrepreneurship, or non-entrepreneurial entry. Their analysis shows that hybrid entrepreneurs systematically differ from those directly entering self-employment and those who remain wage workers, supporting their theoretical distinction of hybrid entrepreneurship as a separate labor category. In more detail, their analyses highlight that hybrid entrepreneurs typically possess higher human capital, face greater switching costs, and experience higher uncertainty around

the entrepreneurial context—findings that FDW (p. 258) note provide "most evidence in support of the transitional rationale."

1.3. Revisiting FDW

This study revisits FDW with two main aims. First, we assess whether the transition rationale they identify, particularly the idea that hybrid entrepreneurship serves as a path to full-time self-employment, holds across a more recent and broader demographic population, including both men and women and industries beyond high-tech. Second, we theoretically extend their original framework by introducing gender and sexual orientation as additional sources of individual-level heterogeneity. Specifically, we examine whether, among those ever in legal unions, hybrid entrepreneurship differs among sexual minority men and women relative to heterosexual men and women, and whether, for these individuals, hybridity also serves as a mechanism for income supplementation and access to nonmonetary benefits.

Much of the entrepreneurship literature implicitly assumes a neutral entrepreneur—one whose social identity aligns with dominant norms of gender and sexuality unless explicitly labeled as "other", thereby reproducing heteronormativity (Marlow et al., 2018). Gender-structure theory offers a useful point of departure for revisiting this assumption. It conceptualizes gender not as an individual attribute but as a multilevel structure—embedded in individual identities, interactional expectations, and institutional arrangements—that organizes social life and distributes opportunities and constraints (Risman & Davis, 2013). Thus, heteronormativity in entrepreneurship research not only makes sexual minority entrepreneurs less visible but also limits the examination of how sexual orientation and gender may structure access, motivation, and meaning within entrepreneurial engagement (Marlow et al., 2018). Building on these insights, we revisit and extend the Folta et al. (2010) study through a queer lens and propose that hybrid entrepreneurship and its rationales may vary by gender and sexual orientation.

In traditional employment settings, research has shown that sexual minorities may face discrimination affecting their salaries, career opportunities, and job security. Tilcsik (2011) in an experimental study shows that openly gay men receive fewer callbacks for interviews, particularly in sectors emphasizing stereotypically masculine attributes. Marlow et al. (2018)

describe this as part of the "heterosexual foundation" of organizational life, wherein deviations from normative gender and sexuality attract both overt and subtle exclusionary practices. Partly related, research shows that sexual minorities—especially men—earn less on average compared to heterosexual counterparts (Badgett et al., 2009) and are disproportionately found in lower-paid or precarious sectors like the arts and education (Plug et al., 2014; Tilcsik et al., 2015).

Yet entrepreneurship itself is not necessarily free from the tensions created by heteronormativity; rather, it may replicate or exacerbate them. Galloway (2012) documents instances where gay entrepreneurs strategically conceal their identity to maintain commercial legitimacy due to homophobic attitudes from clients and peers. Shepherd et al. (2015) further reveal that ventures led by gay entrepreneurs are judged more harshly following failure, underscoring pervasive stigma. Empirical evidence confirms these biases: Backman et al. (2025) show significantly lower entrepreneurial activity among sexual minority men and lower survival rates among sexual minority women in Sweden, despite similar resource availability. Ahmed and Hammarstedt (2022) find in Sweden that individuals were less positive if the business owners were lesbians, and they were less interested in an available job if the business owners were gay. In addition, the participants had higher reservation wages if the owners were lesbians. Rumens and Ozturk (2019) similarly indicate that entrepreneurial norms often compel sexual minorities to suppress visibly queer traits to align with dominant heteromasculine ideals of leadership and legitimacy. Against this backdrop, Marlow et al. (2018) suggest that gay men and lesbian women may choose a particular type of self-employment, which is not full-time entrepreneurship. As they explain, “Instead of being a director of a limited company (a well-established proxy for a growth-oriented business: Storey & Greene, 2010), they may be more likely to be freelancers or working as a self-employed”.

Building on this logic, hybrid entrepreneurship may be an attractive choice, enabling sexual minorities to mitigate concerns related to salary constraints and job security that they could experience if only wage-employed or self-employed, while also offering opportunities to enhance job satisfaction through diversified and personally meaningful tasks. In fact, recent research underscores the importance of nonpecuniary motivations for holding multiple jobs, such as exploring new occupations or enabling authentic self-expression (Campion & Csillag, 2022). Further, a recent study demonstrates that sexual minorities are drawn to value driven work (see e.g. Burn & Martell, 2020). While value driven work (e.g. work in NGO’s and the

healthcare sector) generally accrues lower wages, hybrid entrepreneurship (and indeed multiple job holding more broadly) can afford individuals to satisfy preferences, while capitalizing on higher wages in other sectors, i.e. balancing both monetary and non-monetary benefits across job roles. In sum, for sexual minorities, hybrid entrepreneurship could also be a path to supplementary income and a path to non-monetary benefits. However, to date, there is a lack of studies assessing differential rates of hybrid entrepreneurship among sexual minority men and women, and their rationales for engaging in it.

Part of this scarcity may also reflect persistent data constraints in quantitative research on sexual minorities. As Yang et al. (2025) note, surveys that include direct measures often have too few observations per wave for disaggregated analyses, while large-scale labor datasets frequently lack measures altogether. In Scandinavian countries, the availability of same-sex union records in population registers has made it possible to begin studying differences by sexual orientation using administrative data (Aldén et al., 2015; Andersson et al., 2006; Möllborn & Kolk, 2024). Building on this tradition, in our study, we leverage gender recorded in the Swedish registers and observed entry into legal same-sex unions to identify sexual minorities within the matched employer–employee register data used by FDW. While valuable for an extension of FDW, it is important to recognize that this approach operationalizes gender and sexual orientation through administratively reported categories shaped by institutional recognition and disclosure, capturing only the subset of sexual minorities observable through legal union formation. We revisit this in the discussion.

2. Method

We sought to follow FDW's work as closely as possible across all key dimensions of the research. Accordingly, the research design, core variables, and analytical strategy largely mirror those of the original study. We reviewed the original command files, generously shared by the authors, to ensure consistency in coding and variable construction. Any differences in variables are described in detail in Table 1 and are driven by data inconsistencies in our later sample frame. At the same time, our study is best described as a replication with extension rather than a reproduction (Hubbard et al., 1998). Our study keeps the original institutional context (Sweden) and exact same research design. First, we provide an update to their original results, covering the time period 2002–2021. Second, we extend the original study by

examining the full population of male entrepreneurs (i.e., beyond high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services). Third, we expand our sample to include women. Finally, we theoretically extend the original framework by explicitly incorporating gender and sexual orientation as additional sources of heterogeneit**y.**

3. Data Sources and Sample

Our study replicates and extends FDW's work by using the same underlying administrative data sources—Sweden's population register and business register—updated to cover a longer time frame and expanded to include a broader segment of the population. Specifically, we use population register data from 1995 to 2021 and firm-level data from 2002 to 2021, paralleling FDW's use of these same data sources for the 1994–2001 period.

Like FDW, we use the Swedish population register to track all adult legal residents, including their employment history, demographic attributes, and legal union status. In parallel, we draw on the same firm registry data used by FDW, which provides comprehensive records on new and existing businesses in Sweden, collected for tax purposes. We begin our firm-level analysis in 2002, when improved industry classification systems were introduced. Our core variables are described in detail in Table 1 and any discrepancies with FDW's original construction of these variables are discussed. Table 1 indicates that there are very few differences in our variable construction, relative to the original variable construction in FDW.

<<Insert Table 1 Here>>

We build a risk set consistent with FDW's approach, identifying individuals aged 25-50 who entered the labor market as employees in 2002, and excluding those initially self-employed or hybrid. However, we broaden the scope by including both men and women and covering all industries rather than restricting to high-tech sectors. To account for this broader coverage, we include controls for industry affiliation in all estimations.

Our key extension is to use this rich and longitudinal data to identify sexual minority individuals via observed legal same-sex unions—a method now commonly used in research using Swedish register data (Aldén et al., 2015; Backman et al., 2025; Carpenter et al., 2025;

Dujeancourt et al., 2024). Individuals who have ever entered a legal same-sex union are referred to as 'sexual minority individuals' or 'likely sexual minority individuals,' following the convention used in prior research using Swedish register data (Aldén et al., 2015; Backman et al., 2025; Carpenter et al., 2025; Dujeancourt et al., 2024). Individuals who have entered only different-sex legal unions are referred to as 'heterosexual individuals' or 'likely heterosexual individuals.' This classification is supported by prior studies showing that most individuals in same-sex unions identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or use other non-heterosexual terms (Badgett et al., 2021).[1] 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 self-employment outcome. However, our results should be interpreted as the associations among those that are ever in a legal union.

Constructing our data in the same way as FDW ways allows us to develop numerous analytic datasets. FDW's original dataset comprised 44,613 men working in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services over the period 1994 who were not initially self-employed or hybrid. Comparatively, we identify 104,533 men and 279,487 women working in these industries in 2002. Expanding our sample across all industries allows us to identify around 2.5 million individuals who were working in 2002 and were not hybrid or self-employed, of which 430,440 men and 381,424 women have unknown sexual orientation (as sexual orientation can only be captured for people who have ever been legally partnered). Among those that were ever been legally partnered, we identify 832,346 heterosexual men, 870,518 heterosexual women, 3,455 sexual minority men, and 4,074 sexual minority women. As in FDW, individuals remain in the risk set until they transition out of employment, emigrate, die, or reach the end of the observation period.

3.1. Dependent Variables

We aim to follow the original FDW study as closely as possible with respect to variable construction (see Table 1). Individuals' labor market status is identified using the occupational

[1] Because our identification of sexual orientation relies on those observed in legal unions, we exclude individuals who have never entered into a registered partnership or marriage of any kind. Excluding them ensures a more consistent comparison across groups who have formed legal unions, allowing for more accurate inferences about differences between sexual minority and heterosexual populations.

classification scheme developed by Statistics Sweden, which categorizes each income source during a calendar year as either "employed," "not employed," or "self-employed." Unlike FDW, who determine labor status based on the occupation reported in November of each year, we use annual earnings, which one may consider as more accurate, in terms of identifying an individual's primary labor market activity.

Wage workers. Individuals are defined as wage workers if they were "employed" and had no income or losses from self-employment.
Self-employed. Individuals are defined as self-employed if their primary classification is either "self-employed" or "self-employed in incorporation."
Hybrids. Individuals are defined as *hybrid entrepreneurs* if, in a given year,
(1) their primary classification is "employed,"
(2) they have a secondary classification where they are "self-employed" or "self-employed in incorporation" or report self-employment losses, and
(3) they are "employed" in the same firm as they were in the prior year.

This third criterion, used both in our study and in FDW, is essential to distinguish true hybrid entrepreneurs—those simultaneously engaged in wage work and self-employment—from individuals who transition between the two statuses sequentially within the same year. Without this restriction, it would be difficult to differentiate between simultaneous and sequential transitions. With criterion (3), it becomes highly unlikely that sequential transitions are captured, as it would require a person to leave a wage job, enter self-employment, and then return to the same employer, all within a single year.

3.2. Independent Variables

As already mentioned, we closely follow FDW in constructing our variables, with modifications where necessary due to data availability and broader sample coverage. The complete list of variables is detailed in Table 1. These variables are chosen to align with the key theoretical rationales for hybrid entrepreneurship: supplemental income, nonmonetary benefits, and transitional motivations.

The supplemental income rationale emphasizes individuals' financial situations from FDW. We include measures of salary income, negative changes in salary income, non-salary income, and negative changes in non-salary income. Unfortunately, due to a gap in wealth data

following the repeal of the Swedish wealth tax, we are unable to include measures of personal wealth between 2002 and 2021. We also include basic family structure indicators, such as marital status and number of children as FDW.

The nonmonetary benefits rationale centers on opportunity costs and individual capabilities. We proxy opportunity costs using income and indicators of human capital, including education percentiles, total number of jobs held since 1995, and a dummy for unemployment in the previous year (replacing the number of days unemployed in the previous year in FDW).

The transitional rationale relates to entrepreneurial experience and switching costs. Following FDW, we include prior self-employment experience and parental self-employment experience. To capture switching costs, we include measures such as industry tenure, employer tenure, employer size, and employer age. Following FDW, employer age is categorized using three dummy variables. Larger and older firms are assumed to provide greater seniority-based benefits and perks, increasing the cost of leaving employment.

Applying FDW's methodology, we also include several additional controls to improve comparability across groups. These include age dummies, prior hybrid experience, Swedish-born dummy (replacing citizenship in FDW), and indicators related to personal partners (having a partner, whether the partner is self-employed, and the partner's income).

To account for the broader range of industries in our sample (unlike FDW, who focus on a single sector), we include detailed industry dummies in all models. Lastly, we include region dummies like FDW. Summary statistics are provided in Table 2. Broadly, Table 2 indicates that sexual minority men and women are relatively similar to their heterosexual counterparts. However, we observe that, on average, sexual minority men are slightly more likely to be hybrid entrepreneurs or in wage work, and slightly less likely to be self-employed. Additionally, sexual minority men enjoy marginally greater salaries but have lower non-salary incomes. On the other hand, heterosexual women have slightly lower salaries than their sexual minority counterparts, and lower non-salary incomes.

Sexual minorities are, on average, less likely to be currently married, have fewer children, and are slightly younger. Sexual minorities have had a greater number of jobs, but less self-employed and hybrid experience, and hold slightly less tenure in the industry in which they

work and the employer for whom they work for. Finally, sexual minority women are much less likely to have a partner that is self-employed, while sexual minority men are more likely to have a partner that is self-employed, compared to their heterosexual counterparts, and the partners of sexual minorities earn substantially less than the partners of their heterosexual counterparts.

<<Insert Table 2 Here>>

4. Results

Following FDW, we first examine the prevalence of hybrid entrepreneurship relative to wage work and self-employment, replicating the original analysis for men in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services, but covering our 2002-2020 sample frame. Next, we expand our coverage by re-estimating these results for men across all industries. We then provide new results for women, before estimating disaggregated results for heterosexual men, heterosexual women, sexual minority men, and sexual minority women. We *then* assess whether the predictors of entry into hybrid versus self-employment differ systematically, as in the original study, and extend this analysis to include sexual minority status and gender. We also explore potential rationales.

4.1. Transition Rates, Hybrid Entrepreneurship, and Self-Employment

As in FDW, our main analyses are based on three primary classifications: wage work, self-employed, and hybrid. Table 3 displays the distribution of labor classifications over the years 2002 to 2020 for men in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services, while FDW's original results are reprinted in Appendix Table 1.

<<Insert Table 3 Here>>

In 2002, the sample consisted of only wage workers. By 2020, 3.04% of the sample were self-employed and 3.02% were hybrid. These values are broadly consistent with FDW, who report that by 2001, 3.23% of individuals were self-employed, and 2.55% were hybrid (see Appendix Table 1). This suggests that, at the aggregate level, the relative distribution between hybrid and self-employed has remained stable across time and samples.

FDW shows that hybrid entrepreneurship accounts for approximately 58% of all entrepreneurial entries between 1994 and 2001. Our results indicate that over the longer and more recent time frame, hybrid entrepreneurship accounts for approximately 72% of all entrepreneurial entries (2002-2020). Our results indicate that hybrid entrepreneurship accounts for a greater share of all entrepreneurial entries across years, suggesting that hybrid entrepreneurial activity may have increased in share, relative to the original time frame in FDW.[2]

Next, we expand our sample to cover all industries. Results for men are reported in Table 4. We find that, by 2020, 5.11% of the sample were self-employed and 1.71% were hybrid. In total, hybrid entrepreneurship accounts for approximately 57% of all entrepreneurial entries (2002-2020). Our results imply that restricting the analysis to those men working in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services leads to an underrepresentation of self-employment, and an over-representation of hybrid activity.

<<Insert Table 4 Here>>

Similar patterns are also documented for women (Table 5). Among women, 1.78% of the sample were self-employed and 1.60% were hybrid, by 2020, with hybrid entrepreneurship accounting for around 71% of all female entrepreneurial entries (2002-2020). These results again indicate that, for women, restricting the analysis to those women working in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services leads to an underrepresentation of self-employment, but for women, more consistent representation of hybrid activity (see Appendix Table 2 for female high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services results). Additionally, these results indicate that entrepreneurial activity is consistently lower among women than men, which is consistent with prior studies (Backman et al., 2025). Our results also indicate slightly greater hybrid entrepreneurship engagement among women, consistent with prior studies in other contexts (Liu & Wu, 2022).

[2] Synonymous results are provided for women in Appendix Table 2. By 2020, 1.07% of the women were self-employed and 1.65% were hybrid. These results indicate that women are substantially less likely to be self-employed but are particularly reliant on hybrid forms of entrepreneurship. In fact, for women, hybrid entrepreneurship accounts for nearly 80% of all entrepreneurial entries, again demonstrating high levels of hybrid entrepreneurship, among women working in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services.

<<Insert Table 5 Here>>

Next, we disaggregate patterns by sexual minority status, and gender, focusing on those individuals with identifiable sexual orientation based on legal partnership.[3] Results for men are presented in Tables 6 (heterosexual) and 7 (sexual minority) while results for women are presented in Table 8 (heterosexual) and 9 (sexual minority).

<<Insert Tables 6 and 7 Here>>

By 2020, 3.06% of sexual minority men were self-employed, compared to 5.36% of heterosexual men; 2.18% of sexual minority women were self-employed, compared to 1.91% of heterosexual women. These results indicate that, relative to the full population of men and women, observably heterosexual men and women have similar engagement in self-employment. However, sexual minority men are less likely to be self-employed (relative to heterosexual men), and sexual minority women are slightly more likely to be self-employed (relative to heterosexual women), consistent with prior evidence (Backman et al., 2025).

<<Insert Tables 8 and 9 Here>>

Next, we examine the share of hybrid entrepreneurs among all self-employed individuals within each group. Among sexual minority men, hybrids represented around 42% of all entrepreneurial activity for sexual minorities in 2020, compared to around 25% for heterosexual men, indicating a greater reliance on hybrid forms of engagement among sexual minority men. Among women, by contrast, the proportions were nearly identical: 46% of self-employed sexual minority women were hybrids in 2020, compared to 47% of heterosexual women. Overall, the relative prevalence of hybrid entrepreneurship within self-employment is lower among heterosexual men, with greater rates among women and sexual minorities.

[3] Synonymous results for those individuals whom sexual orientation is not identifiable are presented in Appendix Tables 3 and 4. Results for those with unknown sexual orientation are largely consistent with those results for the full sample of men and women.

These tables also display the share of entries into self-employment that were preceded by a period in hybrid entrepreneurship. Between 2002 and 2020, 14–17% of all self-employment entries followed a hybrid status, with marginally higher rates among sexual minority women. FDW reports a higher figure of 21%.

<<Insert Table 10 Here>>

In Table 10,[4] we also examine whether hybrid status increases the likelihood of entry into self-employment, compared to wage work. FDW finds that the probability of transitioning to self-employment is over 12 times higher for individuals in hybrid than for those in wage work. In our data, we observe a similar pattern: overall, individuals in hybrid are substantially more likely to become self-employed than those in wage work, replicating the core dynamic identified by FDW.

We extend this analysis by disaggregating the transition rates by gender and sexual orientation. Among men, the transition to self-employment is around 8 times more likely for heterosexual men (6.24% to 0.80%) and sexual minority men (4.55% to 0.58%) in hybrid than in wage work. Among women, the difference is even greater: over 14 times more likely for sexual minority women (4.89% to 0.36%) and 10 times more likely for heterosexual women (3.04% to 0.30%). These results suggest that while the general pattern holds across groups, the magnitude of the effect is especially pronounced for women, and notably so for sexual minority women.

We also examine the persistence of hybrid status and the likelihood of returning to wage work. FDW reports that 36.6% of individuals in hybrid return to wage work, and 54.9% remain in hybrid the following year.[5] In our sample, return rates are higher (around 45%) and persistence lower (around 48%). However, heterosexual women have noticeably higher rates of persistence, relative to sexual minority women, and men, at around 53%. These patterns indicate that hybrid is a relatively less stable category in our sample than in FDW.

[4] FDWs results are re-printed in Appendix Table 5. Synonymous results are presented for men and women in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services in Appendix Table 6, and for all men and women (irrespective of sexual orientation) in Appendix Table 7.
[5] Reprinted in Appendix Table 5.

<<Insert Table 11 Here>>

Table 11 divides the hybrid into three categories based on intensity, defined as the percentage of an individual's total income that comes from self-employment.[6] FDW finds that transitions to self-employment are particularly high among individuals with high hybrid intensity. In our sample, we observe the same pattern: individuals with higher hybrid intensity are substantially more likely to transition to self-employment than those with low hybrid intensity, indicating that the transition rationale advocated by FDW holds in our extended context. However, we document variation across sexual orientation and gender. The transition to self-employment is about 8 times more likely for sexual minority men with high hybrid intensity relative to low hybrid intensity (11.74% to 1.44%), and 14 times more likely for heterosexual men (18.94% to 1.38%). Among women, the transition is about 51 times greater for sexual minority women (13.87% to 0.27%) and 10 times greater for heterosexual women (7.18% to 0.74%). These differences suggest that while higher hybrid intensity is generally associated with increased likelihood of transitioning to self-employment, the strength of this relationship varies across groups. The weaker associations observed for sexual minority men and heterosexual women indicate that, for these groups, hybrid may be less strongly tied to entrepreneurial transition and potentially serve alternative functions. By contrast, for sexual minority women, high-intensity hybrid status appears more directly associated with entry into self-employment.

4.2. Explaining entry into Hybrid Entrepreneurship and Self-Employment: Multivariate analysis

Table 12 presents estimates from a multinomial logit model that mirrors the core design of FDW for men in Columns (1) and (2) and women in Columns (3) and (4).[7] These results compare individuals who enter self-employment directly, those who transition via hybrid, and

[6] FDWs results are re-printed in Panel B of Appendix Table 5. Synonymous results are presented for men and women in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services in Panel B of Appendix Table 6, and for all men and women (irrespective of the industry or sexual orientation) in Panel B of Appendix Table 7.
[7] FDWs results are re-printed in Appendix Table 8. Synonymous results are presented for men and women in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services in Appendix Table 9, and for all men and women (irrespective of the industry or sexual orientation) in Appendix Table 10.

those who remain in wage work. Consistent with FDW, we use "no entry" as the base outcome and report coefficients for the likelihood of self-employment and hybrid entry.[8]

<<Insert Table 12 Here>>

The multinomial logit results confirm the findings reported by FDW but with some differences. In their study, FDW show that hybrid entry is preferred to direct self-employment by individuals who are more capable (more education, less time in unemployment, and fewer jobs), face higher switching costs (longer industry tenure, and working in larger firms), and have less self-employment experience (see Appendix Table 8). These patterns are interpreted as supporting the transitional rationale: hybrid entrepreneurship allows individuals to explore entrepreneurial opportunities while maintaining the stability of wage work.

As shown in Table 12, our results partly confirm FDW's findings with some differences. Starting with capability, we find that education percentile is positively associated with both hybrid and self-employment entry, with similar magnitudes. FDW find that individuals with higher human capital may prefer hybrid entrepreneurship to maintain flexibility, with greater positive magnitudes for hybrid entry. We do not replicate this here.[9] This lack of replication indicates that human capital has likely become a less important factor in explaining hybrid relative to direct self-employment entry.

Time unemployed shows a pattern that is broadly consistent with FDW. For men, the coefficient is positive for self-employment ($\beta = 1.526$) and negative for hybrid entry ($\beta = -0.159$), indicating that self-employment is more common among those who recently experienced unemployment, while hybrid entrants tend to have more stable employment. For women, both coefficients are positive, but the association is much stronger for self-employment ($\beta = 1.673$) than for hybrid entry ($\beta = 0.022$). This suggests that, even among women, hybrid

[8] In additional results (available upon request) we additionally included controls for children under the age of 3 and receipt of sickness benefits. Results remain remarkably similar.

[9] Results reported in Appendix Tables 9 and 10 indicate that coefficients are marginally greater for hybrid entry, relative to self-employment entry, for the samples of men and women in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services, and all industries. However, the magnitude size is relatively small, especially relative to the size documented by FDW (see Appendix Table 8). This remains in line with human capital being less effective in the more recent sample.

entry is less strongly tied to recent unemployment than direct self-employment, which aligns with FDW's interpretation. However, our results diverge from FDW with respect to employment history. FDW suggests that hybrid entrants tend to have more stable employment, reflected in fewer prior jobs than self-employment. In our data, we find the opposite: the total number of jobs since 1995 is negatively associated with self-employment and positively with hybrid entry for both men (−0.045 vs. 0.042) and women (−0.022 vs. 0.048). This indicates that hybrid entrants in our sample tend to have more varied work histories than self-employment entrants.

Looking at switching costs, industry tenure offers only partial support for FDW's expectations. FDW theorize that individuals with higher tenure in a given industry are more likely to pursue hybrid entrepreneurship than self-employment, using it as a lower-risk entry strategy that preserves accumulated sector-specific capital. In our data, while industry tenure is also negatively associated with both hybrid and self-employment entry, the magnitude of the coefficient is, however, more negative for hybrid entry (β = –0.118 for men; –0.153 for women) than for self-employment (β = –0.067 and –0.081, respectively). Employer size aligns more closely with FDW. Entry into hybrid is less negatively associated with employer size (β = –0.069 for men; –0.077 for women) than is direct self-employment (β = –0.443 and –0.3915, indicating that hybrid entrepreneurs may be more embedded in larger organizations. Finally, our findings on self-employment experience differ in sign from those reported by FDW but follow a comparable logic. FDW find that self-employment experience is negatively associated with hybrid entry and interpret this as evidence that individuals with less entrepreneurial experience are more likely to pursue hybridity. In our results, self-employment experience is positively associated with both hybrid and direct self-employment entry, but the effect is substantially larger for the latter (β = 1.283 for men and 1.462 for women, compared to β = 0.222 and 0.397 for hybrid, respectively). In short, the larger coefficient for direct self-employment suggests that hybrid entry remains the preferred path for those with less experience, consistent with the transitional rationale.

Our findings on salary income and negative income shocks also align with FDW's interpretation of the transitional rationale, though with some qualifications. In both studies, higher salary income is associated with greater likelihood of hybrid entry, but the association is stronger for direct self-employment (β = 0.552 vs. 0.317 for men; 0.454 vs. 0.259 for women). This suggests that individuals with higher earnings may be more inclined to pursue

hybrid entrepreneurship as a lower-risk option, but those with the highest earnings may still opt for self-employment entry. With respect to negative income shocks, our results clearly mirror FDW: large negative income changes are strongly associated with self-employment entry (β = 4.798 for men; 3.992 for women) and only modestly associated with hybrid entry (β = 0.251 and 0.483, respectively). This confirms that hybrid entrepreneurs are less likely to be motivated by financial distress.

In sum, our multivariate results partially replicate the patterns reported by FDW and provide continued support for the transitional rationale. As in the original study, we find that hybrid entry is preferred to direct self-employment by individuals with less time in unemployment, and less self-employment experience. These findings are consistent with the idea that hybrid status offers a lower-risk option for capable individuals to explore entrepreneurship. However, we do not replicate their findings regarding prior education, job stability, and industry tenure.

Most importantly, our findings are also generally consistent across genders, which suggests that the transitional rationale identified by FDW applies not only to men—as in the original study—but also to women, albeit with some differences in magnitude. In addition to the differences already outlined above, a few other differences are worth discussing. Having a self-employed partner is more strongly associated with hybrid entry for women than for men. One possible explanation for this pattern is that it reflects household-level considerations regarding income stability and risk diversification. For women, when their partner (who are often the main breadwinner, even in dual breadwinner models cf. Khamis & Ayuso, 2022) is already self-employed—and thus exposed to income uncertainty—it may be more attractive to maintain a stable wage income while engaging in entrepreneurship, rather than both partners relying mainly on self-employment. In this way, hybrid entrepreneurship can serve as a strategy for families to balance risk and maintain economic security, particularly when one partner is already fully self-employed. Interestingly, we do not observe the same pattern for men. Additionally, Swedish-born individuals display a unique pattern: while it is positively associated with hybrid entry for both genders, it is negatively associated with self-employment entry for men and not significant for women.

Next, in line with our prior analysis, we extend FDW's analysis by incorporating a measure of sexual minority status, captured by the variable "ever in same-sex legal union" to assess whether entry pathways differ systematically for sexual minorities.

For men, the results suggest a meaningful effect. The coefficient for same-sex legal union is positive for both self-employment ($\beta = 0.014$) and hybrid entry ($\beta = 0101$, $p < 0.05$), but only the latter is statistically significant in the baseline specification. This pattern indicates that sexual minority men are more likely to pursue hybrid rather than direct self-employment pathways, even after accounting for salary income, prior experience, and employment characteristics.

For women, we document a different pattern. The coefficient for same-sex legal union is positive for both self-employment ($\beta = 0.231$, $p < 0.05$) and hybrid entry ($\beta = 0.047$), but only the former is statistically significant in the baseline specification. This indicates that sexual minority women are more likely than heterosexual women to enter self-employment directly, but do not exhibit a significantly higher likelihood of hybrid entry relative to heterosexual women. However, these findings for women should be interpreted in light of the earlier descriptive results (Tables 3-5), which showed that overall, women (both sexual minority and heterosexual women) entered hybrid status more frequently than self-employment, and documented particularly pronounced transitions for sexual minority women. Taken together, these results imply that accounting for other factors (e.g., salary income, prior experience, and employment characteristics) is particularly important in accounting for hybrid transitions between heterosexual and sexual minority women.

To better understand why sexual minority men may prefer hybrid over direct self-employment, we conducted additional analyses focusing on the role of hybrid entrepreneurship as a path to supplementary income and as a path to non-monetary benefits for this subgroup of our study population. We also replicated the same analyses for sexual minority women.

4.3. Understanding Hybrid Entry Among Male Sexual Minorities

To evaluate the supplementary income rationale, we carried out two sets of analyses. First, we tested whether the association between sexual minority status and hybrid entry is moderated by salary level, by including an interaction between same-sex legal union and salary. The results from these interaction models (Columns 1, 2, 5, and 6, Table 13) show no significant

moderation, suggesting that the effect of sexual minority status on hybrid entry does not vary by income level.[10]

<<Insert Table 13 Here>>

Second, in Table 13, Columns 3, 4, 7, and 8, we examined job insecurity by interacting sexual minority status with whether the individual is employed in the public sector—a sector in Sweden associated with high levels of job security. This interaction yields a negative and statistically significant coefficient ($\beta = -0.177$, $p < .1$), indicating that sexual minority men who are employed in the public sector are less likely to engage in hybrid entrepreneurship.

For sexual minority women, the findings diverge from those observed among men and are consistent with earlier patterns, which showed that sexual minority women do not exhibit a greater tendency to enter hybrid status compared to heterosexual women. The interaction analyses show no significant evidence that hybrid entrepreneurship serves as a response to salary constraints or employment insecurity for this group.

Together, these findings suggest that for sexual minority men, hybrid entrepreneurship may function as a path to supplementary income primarily in response to employment-related insecurity, rather than as a strategy to offset low income.

To further investigate the rationales behind hybrid entrepreneurship, we explore whether hybridity may serve as a path to nonmonetary benefits. Drawing on recent work emphasizing intrinsic and expressive motivations for multiple jobholding (Campion & Csillag, 2022), we focus on a sector commonly associated with identity expression, personal meaning, and social engagement, the advocacy and social impact sector. The advocacy and social impact sectors encompass organizations and professional activities aimed at promoting social justice, influencing public policy, and supporting marginalized communities.[11]

[10] It is notable however that including these interactions makes the coefficient larger in magnitude, but statistically insignificant.

[11] This sector includes in particular the following industries: nonprofits, grassroots movements, human rights organizations, think tanks, and NGOs engaged in advocacy, policy reform, and community-based interventions.

<<Insert Table 14 Here>>

To explore the role of nonmonetary benefits we estimate a sector-specific mode for the activism sector, where hybrid entry is regressed on sexual minority status (see Table 14). The results for both men and women reveal a positive and statistically significant association between sexual minority status and hybrid entrepreneurship in these fields. Specifically, sexual minority men ($\beta = 0.039$, $p < .01$) and women ($\beta = 0.032$, $p < .01$) are more likely to enter hybrid status if they are active in the advocacy and social impact sector. These patterns suggest that hybrid entrepreneurship may offer a valuable platform for engaging in personally meaningful or socially driven work.

5. Discussion

We revisited a foundational contribution to the study of hybrid entrepreneurship by FDW, who examined its prevalence, the extent to which it reflects unique determinants compared to wage employment and direct entry into self-employment, and its role in facilitating transition into full-time entrepreneurship. Our study retained their core theoretical and empirical framework, while updating the analysis with more recent data and a demographically broader sample. In addition, we theoretically extend their work by exploring whether gender and sexual orientation (captured by same-sex unions among individuals entering any legal union) introduce systematic variation in how individuals engage with hybrid entrepreneurship. This theoretical extension rests on the premise that sexual minorities—who often face structural barriers in both wage employment and entrepreneurship, two domains shaped by persistent heteronormative norms (Marlow et al., 2018)—may turn to hybrid entrepreneurship not only as a transitional phase, but also as a more stable or expressive form of labor market participation.

Our updated results largely reproduce the aggregate patterns reported by FDW, while also showing that the *composition* of entrepreneurial entry has shifted in meaningful ways over the longer and more recent 2002–2020 period. In the FDW-replication sample of men in high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services, the 2020 prevalence of self-employment and hybrid status is close to FDW's 2001 benchmarks, indicating that the overall

Work in this sector is often mission-driven and centered on creating systemic change or amplifying underrepresented voices.

balance between hybrid and self-employment remains broadly stable across cohorts. However, hybrid entrepreneurship now accounts for a larger share of entrepreneurial entries: approximately 72% of transitions out of wage work between 2002 and 2020, compared with roughly 58% in FDW. Expanding the sample to all industries reduces the prevalence and entry share of hybrid entrepreneurship among men, implying that restricting attention to high-tech and knowledge-intensive sectors overrepresents hybrid activity and underrepresents self-employment. New results for women display parallel patterns. Overall, entrepreneurial activity remains lower among women than men, consistent with prior work, while women's entry appears modestly more concentrated in hybrid entrepreneurship in our data.

Our multinomial logit results partially replicate FDW's findings and continue to support the transitional rationale, though several associations differ in magnitude and, in a few cases, direction. Consistent with FDW, hybrid entry is less strongly tied to labor market distress than direct self-employment: time in unemployment and negative income shocks are much more predictive of self-employment entry, while hybrid entry is comparatively weakly related to these indicators, suggesting that hybridity remains a lower-risk mode of entrepreneurial experimentation. We also replicate the core pattern for self-employment experience: this experience predicts both entry modes, but is substantially more strongly associated with direct self-employment, implying that hybridity remains a relatively more common pathway among those with less entrepreneurial experience. However, we do not reproduce FDW's sharper distinction in capability and stability—education is similarly predictive of hybrid and self-employment entry, and hybrid entrants exhibit more varied work histories than self-employment entrants—and our estimates for industry tenure run counter to FDW's switching-cost interpretation. Importantly, the broad support for the transitional rationale is evident for both men and women, with gender differences primarily in magnitude and a small number of covariates (e.g., the association between having a self-employed partner and women's hybrid entry).

However, once we disaggregate labor market states and transitions by gender and sexual orientation among individuals who form legal unions, we observe meaningful heterogeneity in both the prevalence and interpretation of hybrid entrepreneurship. Descriptively, sexual minority men are less likely to be self-employed than heterosexual men and exhibit a greater reliance on hybrid entrepreneurship within entrepreneurial activity. Among women, overall entrepreneurial participation is lower than among men, but hybridity represents a large share

of women's entrepreneurial activity in all groups, with only modest differences by sexual minority status. Consistent with FDW's core dynamic, hybrid status strongly predicts subsequent self-employment for every subgroup: compared with wage work, being hybrid is associated with roughly an 8-fold higher probability of transition into self-employment for men and an even larger relative increase for women (about 10-fold for heterosexual women and 14-fold for sexual minority women). This stronger "hybrid-to-self-employment" gradient among women is reinforced when we stratify by hybrid intensity: moving from low- to high-intensity hybridity is associated with substantially larger increases in transitions to self-employment for sexual minority women than for other groups. At the same time, the strength of the intensity–transition relationship varies across groups (and is weaker for sexual minority men and heterosexual women), suggesting that while the transition rationale remains broadly relevant, hybridity may serve additional functions beyond transition for some subpopulations. This heterogeneity in descriptive and transition patterns is mirrored in the multivariate entry models: same-sex legal union status is more strongly associated with hybrid entry among men, but with direct self-employment among women, indicating that the pathways into entrepreneurship differ by gender and sexual minority status even after conditioning on observed characteristics.

To assess whether hybrid entrepreneurship reflects distinct rationales across groups, we evaluated two theoretically motivated mechanisms: supplementary income and nonmonetary benefits. First, to test the supplementary income rationale, we examined whether the association between sexual minority status and hybrid entry varies by earnings, by interacting same-sex legal union status with salary. The interaction estimates show no significant moderation, indicating that the relationship between sexual minority status and hybrid entry does not differ systematically across the income distribution. We then tested the role of employment insecurity by interacting same-sex legal union status with public-sector employment—a setting in Sweden typically associated with relatively high job security. Among men, this interaction is negative and statistically significant, and subgroup models indicate that the positive association between sexual minority status and hybrid entry is concentrated among those employed outside the public sector. By contrast, for women we find no evidence that hybrid entry is moderated by public-sector employment, consistent with earlier results showing no elevated propensity for hybrid entry among sexual minority women relative to heterosexual women, once covariates are accounted for. Taken together, these findings suggest that for sexual minority men, hybrid entrepreneurship may function as a

pathway to supplementary income primarily in response to employment-related insecurity rather than low earnings per se.

Second, we assess whether hybrid entrepreneurship may also reflect nonmonetary motivations, focusing on sectors associated with identity expression, personal meaning, and social engagement. Using a sector-specific model for the advocacy and social impact sector, we find a positive and statistically significant association between sexual minority status and hybrid entrepreneurship for both men and women. These results suggest that, for sexual minorities, hybrid entrepreneurship may serve not only as a transitional stage toward self-employment but also as a mechanism for engaging in socially oriented or personally meaningful work.

Our findings contribute to both entrepreneurship literature and the LGBTQ labor literature. First, by replicating FDW foundational work on more recent and demographically inclusive data, we reaffirm the continued salience of hybrid entrepreneurship. In addition, consistent with transition rationale, we find that hybrid entry remains a lower-risk option preferred by *men* and *wome*n seeking to explore self-employment.

Second, we contribute to a growing body of work that seeks to move beyond descriptive accounts of LGBTQ entrepreneurship by conceptually engaging with heteronormativity as a structuring force in entrepreneurial contexts (Rumens, 2025). Responding to calls in the entrepreneurship literature for more intersectional and gender-informed theorizing, we build on the perspective that entrepreneurship is a socially embedded phenomenon shaped by institutionalized asymmetries and symbolic hierarchies (Marlow et al., 2018). Our study integrates this perspective into the framework proposed by FDW and shows that hybrid entrepreneurship may constitute a space, especially for sexual minority men who enter same-sex legal unions, to engage with entrepreneurship while navigating the constraints of heteronormative and gendered labor markets (Marlow et al., 2018). More importantly, by showing how sexual minority men disproportionately opt for hybrid over full-time entrepreneurial entry—and how they engage in value-based forms of hybridity—we highlight how heteronormative expectations of risk-taking, independence, and masculine-coded autonomy may be reconfigured through hybrid entrepreneurship.

Third, we contribute to the LGBTQ labor economics literature. Our rationales-based analysis demonstrates the important role of value-based work for sexual minorities, at least within the

subset we can identify in the data—namely, individuals entering same-sex unions. Some recent studies (see e.g. Burn & Martell, 2020) have provided suggestive evidence that sexual minorities will accept lower earnings to engage in value-based work or for a better non-pecuniary package, which is consistent with our findings that hybrid entrepreneurship facilitates engagement in value driven work. Our findings significantly reinforce this perspective, showing strong empirical evidence that hybrid entrepreneurship facilitates such engagement. These findings provide important context in understanding how sexual minorities' labor market and entrepreneurial decisions are made and warrant further exploration.

Fourth, anchoring our theoretical extension in a close replication of FDW is timely in light of renewed concerns about the replication crisis in management and entrepreneurship scholarship (Bergh et al., 2017; Crawford et al., 2022). A key concern is that extensions and boundary-condition tests are difficult to implement because key analytical decisions—such as sample construction, variable selection and construction, and the treatment of outliers—are not fully accessible, calling for greater communality around replication materials and practices (Crawford et al., 2022). By re-implementing FDW's empirical strategy in the Swedish employer–employee matched register for 2002–2021 and explicitly documenting the minor SCB variable harmonizations required, we hope to support cumulative evidence on hybrid entrepreneurship.

Overall, our study provides important new findings on the prevalence of hybrid entrepreneurship and, as the first empirical paper to examine hybrid entrepreneurship across sexual orientation, opens new doors to understanding the entrepreneurial activity of sexual minorities—a vastly understudied population within the entrepreneurship literature.

Limitations and Future Research

Our study presents some key limitations that need to be acknowledged. First, although replicating FDW (2010) within the same country context (Sweden) ensures conceptual alignment and analytical consistency, it also limits the broader applicability of our findings. This applies not only to the results that replicate the original study but also to our theoretical extension concerning gender and sexual orientation. For example, Sweden's progressive legal framework and relatively high levels of social acceptance toward sexual minorities could affect

some of the patterns we observed. Therefore, future research should examine whether our findings hold in countries with different institutional and cultural conditions.

Second, our identification of sexual minority individuals relies on administrative records of entry into legal same-sex unions. This approach ensures high confidence in identification but inherently excludes individuals who never formalize their same-sex relationships legally or those who enter different-sex relationships, notably bisexual individuals who often engage in different-sex unions. In addition, entry into a legal same-sex union requires the formal registration—and thus disclosure—of a same-sex relationship. Because disclosure may carry costs in some contexts (e.g., experienced or anticipated discrimination), it may intersect with the very rationales that motivate hybrid entrepreneurship. As such, our results should be interpreted as reflective of those individuals in legal relationships and future studies that are able to use alternative approaches to study the experiences of a broader range of sexual minority individuals (e.g., sexual identity) would help to further elucidate the underlying relationship between sexual orientation and hybrid entrepreneurship, including the incidence of hybrid entrepreneurship among sexual minorities that are not in legal unions.

Relatedly, sexual orientation may correlate with negative income shocks through, for example, occupational sorting, discrimination, household specialization, or other factors that influence job stability. If sexual minorities experience more frequent or larger negative shocks, then estimated relationships between shocks and hybrid entry may partly reflect differential exposure to instability rather than a uniform "push" mechanism, and such selection could bias comparisons across groups. If sexual minorities face systematically higher baseline instability, then the same observed 'shock' may represent a different underlying risk environment, potentially attenuating evidence that hybrid entry is primarily transitory, thus our estimates may be lower bound. We therefore interpret earnings shocks as descriptive indicators of instability rather than causal triggers. Future work could strengthen causal interpretation by exploiting quasi-exogenous shocks to job stability or policy-driven changes that affect outside employment opportunities.

Finally, due to how register data is constructed, gender is observed as a binary category in the registers. We interpret these differences by gender in line with gender-structure theory as reflecting differences in opportunities, constraints, and expectations that shape entry into wage work, hybrid entrepreneurship, and self-employment. However, future studies would benefit

from qualitative and mixed-methods research that can provide more fine-grained insights into how individuals negotiate disclosure and identity in both wage employment and entrepreneurial settings, and how these processes shape the rationales for hybrid entrepreneurship.

6. References

Adom, K., Asare-Yeboa, I. T., Quaye, D. M., & Ampomah, A. O. (2018). A Critical Assessment of Work and Family Life of Female Entrepreneurs in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *25*(3), 405–427. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-02-2017-0063

Adom, K., Tettey, L. N., & Acheampong, G. (2023). Understanding Relationship Marketing Strategy in Ghana's Informal Economy: a Case of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, *25*(2), 253–269. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRME-03-2022-0033

Ahmed, A., & Hammarstedt, M. (2022). Customer and Worker Discrimination Against Gay and Lesbian Business Owners: A Web-Based Experiment among Students in Sweden. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *69*(9), 1621–1630. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2021.1919478

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

Ardianti, R., Obschonka, M., & Davidsson, P. (2022). Psychological Well-Being of Hybrid Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *17*, e00294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2021.e00294

Backman, M., Carpenter, C. S., Dujeancourt, E., & Mann, S. (2025). Sexual Orientation, Entrepreneurship, and Firm Survival. *Small Business Economics*, *64*(4), 2105–2132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-024-00976-2

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

Bergh, D. D., Sharp, B. M., Aguinis, H., & Li, M. (2017). Is There a Credibility Crisis in Strategic Management Research? Evidence on the Reproducibility of Study Findings. *Strategic Organization*, *15*(3), 423–436. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127017701076

Burn, I., & Martell, M. E. (2020). The Role of Work Values and Characteristics in the Human Capital Investment of Gays and Lesbians. *Education Economics*, *28*(4), 351–369. https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2020.1758039

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

Campion, E. D., & Csillag, B. (2022). Multiple Jobholding Motivations and Experiences: A Typology and Latent Profile Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *107*(8), 1261–1287. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000920

Carpenter, C. S., Dujeancourt, E., Mann, S., & Naldi, L. (2025). Sexual Orientation and Multiple Job Holding. *Journal of Human Resources*, 0324-13477R1. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.0324-13477R1

Crawford, G. C., Skorodziyevskiy, V., Frid, C. J., Nelson, T. E., Booyavi, Z., Hechavarria, D. M., Li, X., Reynolds, P. D., & Teymourian, E. (2022). Advancing Entrepreneurship Theory Through Replication: A Case Study on Contemporary Methodological Challenges, Future Best Practices, and an Entreaty for Communality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *46*(3), 779–799. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211057422

Dujeancourt, E., Boschini, A., & Nordén, A. (2024). Wealth, Gender and Sexual Orientation—Evidence from Siblings. *Socio-Economic Review*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwae041

Folta, T. B., Delmar, F., & Wennberg, K. (2010). Hybrid Entrepreneurship. *Management Science*, *56*(2), 253–269. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1090.1094

Galloway, L. (2012). The Experiences of Male Gay Business Owners in the UK. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, *30*(8), 890–906. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242610391324

Guariglia, A., & Kim, B. (2006). The Dynamics of Moonlighting in Russia. *Economics of Transition*, *14*(1), 1–45. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0351.2006.00233.x

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

Hlouskova, J., Tsigaris, P., Caplanova, A., & Sivak, R. (2017). A Behavioral Portfolio Approach to Multiple Job Holdings. *Review of Economics of the Household*, *15*(2), 669–689. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-015-9293-x

Hubbard, R., Vetter, D. E., & Little, E. L. (1998). Replication in Strategic Management: Scientific Testing for Validity, Generalizability, and Usefulness. *Strategic Management Journal*, *19*(3), 243–254. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199803)19:3<243::AID-SMJ951>3.0.CO;2-0

Khamis, N., & Ayuso, L. (2022). Female Breadwinner: More Egalitarian Couples? An International Comparison. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *43*(3), 534–545. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-021-09784-2

Köhler, T., & Cortina, J. M. (2023). Constructive Replication, Reproducibility, and Generalizability: Getting Theory Testing for JOMSR right. *Journal of Management Scientific Reports*, *1*(2), 75–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/27550311231176016

Liu, Z., & Wu, G. (2022). Gendered Motives Towards Hybrid Entrepreneurial Intentions: Empirical Evidence from China. *International Studies of Economics*, *17*(1), 36–64. https://doi.org/10.1002/ise3.3

Marlow, S., Greene, F. J., & Coad, A. (2018). Advancing Gendered Analyses of Entrepreneurship: A Critical Exploration of Entrepreneurial Activity among Gay Men and Lesbian Women. *British Journal of Management*, *29*(1), 118–135. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12221

Möllborn, S., & Kolk, M. (2024). *Same-Sex Marriage in Sweden 1995-2021: A Research Note on Changing Patterns in Gender, Parenthood, and Socioeconomic Composition*. https://doi.org/10.17045/sthlmuni.26779633

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

Raffiee, J., & Feng, J. (2014). Should I Quit My Day Job?: A Hybrid Path to Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(4), 936–963. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0522

Risman, B. J., & Davis, G. (2013). From Sex Roles to Gender Structure. *Current Sociology*, *61*(5–6), 733–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479315

Rumens, N. (2025). Annual Review Article: Rethinking Heteronormativity in Entrepreneurship Studies Research. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*. https://doi.org/10.1177/02662426251323861

Rumens, N., & Ozturk, M. B. (2019). Heteronormativity and the (Re)construction of Gay Male Entrepreneurial Identities. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, *37*(7), 671–688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242619846609

Schulz, M., Schwens, C., & Fisch, C. (2021). Bankruptcy Regulation and Self-Employment Entry: The Moderating Roles of Income Share, Parenthood, and Hybrid Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *45*(6), 1522–1549. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211026856

Schulz, M., Urbig, D., & Procher, V. (2016). Hybrid Entrepreneurship and Public Policy: The Case of Firm Entry Deregulation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *31*(3), 272–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.01.002

Schulz, M., Urbig, D., & Procher, V. (2017). The Role of Hybrid Entrepreneurship in Explaining Multiple Job Holders' Earnings Structure. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *7*, 9–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2016.12.002

Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. (2015). Harsh Evaluations of Entrepreneurs Who Fail: The Role of Sexual Orientation, Use of Environmentally Friendly Technologies, and Observers' Perspective Taking. *Journal of Management Studies*, *52*(2), 253–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12103

Storey, D. J., & Greene, F. G. (2010). *Entrepreneurship and Small Business* (G. Saridakis & J. Mitra (eds.)). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-72190-8

Thorgren, S., Sirén, C., Nordström, C., & Wincent, J. (2016). Hybrid Entrepreneurs' Second-Step Choice: The Nonlinear Relationship Between Age and Intention to Enter Full-Time Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *5*, 14–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2015.12.001

Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, *117*(2), 586–626. https://doi.org/10.1086/661653

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

Yang, C. W., Denier, N., St-Denis, X., & Waite, S. (2025). Studying Individuals in Same-Sex Couples Using Longitudinal Administrative Data from Canadian Tax Records. *Demographic Research*, *52*, 25–70. https://doi.org/0.4054/DemRes.2025.52.2

Table 1: Detailed Description of Data and Variables

Variables	Description	Differences with FDW
Wage workers	Individual has a primary classification of "employed" and has no secondary classifications in self-employment	Same definition. Based on the annual source of income in our paper, while FDW is based on the November source of income.
Self-employed	Individual has a primary classification of "self-employed" or "self-employed in incorporation"	Same definition. Based on the annual source of income in our paper, while FDW is based on the November source of income.
Hybrid	Individual has a primary classification of "employed," at least one secondary classification of "self-employed" or "self-employed in incorporation, and is employed with the same firm as the previous year	Same definition. Based on the annual source of income in our paper, while FDW is based on the November source of income.
Ever-in same-sex legal union	Dummy variable= 1 if the individual has ever been in a same-sex legal union.	New variable.
Age 25–30	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 25 and 30 years old.	Same variable.
Age 30–35	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 30 and 35 years old.	Same variable.
Age 35–40	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 35 and 40 years old.	Same variable.
Age 40-45	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 40 and 45 years old.	Same variable.
Age 45-50	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 45 and 50 years old.	Same variable.
Age 50-55	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 50 and 55 years old.	We adopt the same initial age restriction (25–50) as FDW. Owing to the longer observation period in our study (19 years versus 8 years in FDW), some individuals in our sample exceed age 58 in subsequent years. We disaggregate the "over 50" age group into three dummy variables: ages 50–55, 55–60, and over 60.
Age 55-60	Dummy variable= 1 if individual is between 55 and 60 years old.	See above.
Age >60	Dummy variable=1 if individual is over age 60.	See above.
Number of children	Number of children under 18 in the household.	Same variable.
Married	Dummy variable=1 if individual is married or currently in legal union.	Same variable.
Education percentile	Individual's percentile rank in years of education in the sample.	Same variable.
Swedish born	Dummy variable= 1 if the individual is born in Sweden.	FDW have Swedish citizen, but in our data, we cannot identify citizenship, so we instead identify whether someone was born in Sweden.
Salary income	Log of income from "employed" status. The salary income is denominated in SEK and adjusted for inflation to 2020.	No differences except adjusted for inflation.
Negative change in salary income (ln)	$\log(1+(\text{salary income}_t - \text{salary income}_{t-1})/\text{salary income}_{t-1})$ if<0, 0 otherwise. Note that salary income was not logged. Incomes are denominated in SEK and adjusted for inflation to 2020.	No differences except adjusted for inflation.
Household wealth	Log of total household wealth.	Wealth data does not exist after 2007, so the variable is not included.

Household wealth dummy	Dummy variable=1 if individual's household wealth is>500,000 kronor.	Wealth data does not exist after 2007, so the variable is not included.
Nonsalary income	Yearly income or loss from capital gains. The variable is denominated in SEK and adjusted for inflation to 2020.	No differences except adjusted for inflation.
Nonsalary income change (ln)	Log(1+(nonsalary $income_t$−nonsalary $income_{t-1}$)/nonsalary $income_{t-1}$) nonsalary income if<0, 0 otherwise. Incomes are denominated in SEK and adjusted for inflation to 2020.	No differences except adjusted for inflation.
Total job numbers	Number of different firm individuals has been employed with since 1995.	We count from 1995 instead of 1989 in FDW.
Time unemployed	Dummy variable= 1 if the individual is not working in year t-1.	We do not have data on the number of days unemployed like FDW. We use a dummy variable if the person has been unemployed for at least 1 day.
Self-employment experience	Dummy variable= 1 if individual has at least one episode of self-employment in primary labor status classification.	Same variable.
Industry tenure	Log of number of years an individual has worked in their current industry.	Same variable.
Employer tenure	Consecutive years individual has worked with current company.	Same variable.
Employer size	Log of the number of employees in the firm in which the individual works.	Same variable.
Employer age 0-2	Dummy variable= 1 if employer is between 0 and 2 years old.	Same variable.
Employer age 3-6	Dummy variable= 1 if employer is between 3 and 6 years old.	Same variable.
Employer age 6+	Dummy variable= 1 if employer is>6 years old	Same variable.
Hybrid experience	Dummy variable= 1 if individual has at least one episode in self-employment in a secondary labor status classification.	Same variable.
Partner	Dummy variable=1 if individual has a partner.	Same variable.
Partner self-employed	Dummy variable= 1 if partner is self-employed.	Same variable.
Partner income	Log of the partner's total income.	Same variable.
Parental self-employment experience	Dummy variable= 1 if at least one parent was previously self-employed.	Same variable.
Hybrid intensity	Hybrid self-employment income/salary income.	Same variable.
Low hybrid intensity	Dummy variable= 1 if hybrid intensity<0.05. Note: Due to data limitations, negative self-employment income values are recorded as 0.	FDW can distinguish between negative self-employment income and zero self-employment income. Due to data limitations, negative self-employment income values are recorded as 0.
Medium hybrid intensity	Dummy variable= 1 if 0.05≤hybrid intensity<0.20.	Same variable.
High hybrid intensity	Dummy variable= 1 if 0.20≤hybrid intensity.	Same variable.
Activism	Dummy variable= 1 if the individual is working in an organization primarily engaged in collective representation, advocacy, or membership-based activities related to	New variable.

	economic, professional, political, religious, or social interests.	

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	(1) Heterosexual men	(2) Sexual minority men	(3) Heterosexual women	(4) Sexual minority women
Wage work	0.939	0.952	0.970	0.971
Self-employed	0.042	0.026	0.014	0.015
Hybrid	0.019	0.022	0.016	0.015
Salary income (ln)	12.338	12.476	12.332	12.390
Negative change in salary income (ln)	0.050	0.053	0.060	0.066
Nonsalary income	14,157.880	5,950.271	-759.235	-59.398
Negative change in nonsalary income (ln)	0.240	0.281	0.239	0.290
Married	0.706	0.470	0.717	0.490
Number of children	1.018	0.065	0.933	0.503
Education percentile	48.454	59.841	49.906	58.243
Total number of jobs	5.576	7.629	4.963	7.263
Time unemployed (previous year)	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.003
Age 25-30 in year 2002	0.173	0.219	0.174	0.352
Age 30-35 in year 2002	0.198	0.193	0.194	0.235
Age 35-40 in year 2002	0.215	0.247	0.211	0.204
Age 40-45 in year 2002	0.187	0.188	0.190	0.123
Age 45-50 in year 2002	0.189	0.126	0.193	0.077
Age 50+ in year 2002	0.038	0.027	0.038	0.010
Self-employment experience	0.082	0.064	0.041	0.037
Parental self-employment experience	0.214	0.183	0.214	0.256
Industry tenure (ln)	1.943	1.915	1.887	1.880
Employer tenure	8.026	7.262	9.323	7.396
Employer size (ln)	6.088	7.088	7.517	7.510
Firm age 0-2	0.036	0.035	0.023	0.028
Firm age 3-6	0.093	0.089	0.062	0.074
Firm age +6	0.871	0.876	0.915	0.898
Hybrid experience	0.110	0.103	0.079	0.070
Swedish born	0.886	0.848	0.879	0.897
Partner	0.808	0.474	0.807	0.513
Partner self-employed	0.042	0.050	0.107	0.035
Partner income (ln)	9.090	5.258	9.286	5.933
Agricultural	0.009	0.003	0.003	0.004
Manufacturing	0.238	0.054	0.080	0.070
Construction	0.095	0.010	0.009	0.010
Service	0.402	0.430	0.266	0.290
Healthcare	0.075	0.182	0.315	0.243
Public and administration	0.131	0.265	0.293	0.336
Other sectors	0.049	0.054	0.034	0.048
Number of unique individuals	832,346	3,455	870,518	4,074
Number of individual-year observations	13,175,966	53,557	13,554,455	64,345

Author calculations from Sweden population register from 2002 to 2021.

Table 3: Number and Percentage of Men in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020) for High-Technology Manufacturing and Knowledge-Intensive Services Industries

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	104533	99041	92043	88316	85568	84664	82877	81251	79232	78235	76999	75847	74501	73329	72082	70640	66793	63196	59542	1508689
	100	98,62	95,15	94,39	94,05	95,03	94,73	94,56	93,76	94,11	94,03	94,05	93,88	93,95	93,98	93,97	93,92	94,08	93,94	94,89
Self employed	0	317	1514	1758	1803	1867	1968	2081	2164	2132	2158	2187	2183	2192	2155	2167	2104	1988	1928	34666
	0	0,32	1,57	1,88	1,98	2,10	2,25	2,42	2,56	2,56	2,64	2,71	2,75	2,81	2,81	2,88	2,96	2,96	3,04	2,18
Hybrid	0	1068	3175	3493	3613	2557	2647	2592	3108	2766	2734	2611	2672	2530	2466	2365	2222	1988	1916	46523
	0	1,06	3,28	3,73	3,97	2,87	3,03	3,02	3,68	3,33	3,34	3,24	3,37	3,24	3,21	3,15	3,12	2,96	3,02	2,93
Total	104533	100426	96732	93567	90984	89088	87492	85924	84504	83133	81891	80645	79356	78051	76703	75172	71119	67172	63386	1589878
Hybrid %	0	76,81	67,63	66,49	66,72	57,75	57,39	55,51	58,97	56,54	55,85	54,45	55,07	53,55	53,32	52,24	51,32	50,00	49,83	57,34
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		317	1343	682	593	535	517	508	484	441	440	426	360	387	318	355	336	289	263	8594
		22,89	33,12	25,25	23,48	30,29	28,72	29,86	22,67	26,39	27,67	28,96	25,33	30,40	25,52	28,38	29,24	29,40	26,14	27,61
Hybrid		1068	2712	2019	1933	1231	1283	1193	1651	1230	1150	1045	1061	886	928	896	813	694	743	22536
		77,11	66,88	74,75	76,52	69,71	71,28	70,14	77,33	73,61	72,33	71,04	74,67	69,60	74,48	71,62	70,76	70,60	73,86	72,39
Total		1385	4055	2701	2526	1766	1800	1701	2135	1671	1590	1471	1421	1273	1246	1251	1149	983	1006	31130
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		317	1262	572	499	447	424	420	403	371	355	353	309	306	270	290	279	236	212	7325
		100,00	93,97	83,87	84,15	83,55	82,01	82,68	83,26	84,13	80,68	82,86	85,83	79,07	84,91	81,69	83,04	81,66	80,61	85,23
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	81	110	94	88	93	88	81	70	85	73	51	81	48	65	57	53	51	1269
		0,00	6,03	16,13	15,85	16,45	17,99	17,32	16,74	15,87	19,32	17,14	14,17	20,93	15,09	18,31	16,96	18,34	19,39	14,77

Table 4: Number and Percentage of Men in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020), All Industries

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	1266241	1211657	1125092	1085449	1052579	1042884	1020700	998597	971974	958802	942198	925503	907994	890882	872341	851460	811019	770968	731068	18437408
	100	98,85	94,59	93,85	93,28	94,27	93,91	93,74	93,10	93,41	93,35	93,32	93,28	93,28	93,28	93,27	93,27	93,30	93,19	94,29
Self employed	0	5599	34054	39304	41418	43748	46302	47634	47886	48026	48118	48019	47352	46829	46052	45336	43415	41664	40057	760813
	0	0,46	2,86	3,40	3,67	3,95	4,26	4,47	4,59	4,68	4,77	4,84	4,86	4,90	4,92	4,97	4,99	5,04	5,11	3,89
Hybrid	0	8473	30280	31843	34354	19615	19913	19049	24157	19573	18988	18258	18069	17329	16761	16118	15117	13727	13406	355030
	0	0,69	2,55	2,75	3,04	1,77	1,83	1,79	2,31	1,91	1,88	1,84	1,86	1,81	1,79	1,77	1,74	1,66	1,71	1,82
Total	1266241	1225729	1189426	1156596	1128351	1106247	1086915	1065280	1044017	1026401	1009304	991780	973415	955040	935154	912914	869551	826359	784531	19553251
Hybrid %	0	60,00	47,13	44,72	45,31	30,94	30,05	28,59	33,48	28,98	28,27	27,54	27,68	26,97	26,68	26,26	25,85	24,78	25,07	31,87
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		5599	30384	12026	11056	9955	9703	8428	7345	7559	6995	6159	5614	5347	5061	5158	4837	4284	3880	149390
		39,79	52,54	38,56	35,34	49,32	47,26	46,48	33,63	44,09	43,84	42,87	41,35	42,17	41,45	42,93	43,28	43,23	39,77	43,45
Hybrid		8473	27449	19162	20225	10228	10830	9705	14495	9586	8962	8208	7962	7334	7149	6858	6340	5626	5875	194467
		60,21	47,46	61,44	64,66	50,68	52,74	53,52	66,37	55,91	56,16	57,13	58,65	57,83	58,55	57,07	56,72	56,77	60,23	56,55
Total		14072	57833	31188	31281	20183	20533	18133	21840	17145	15957	14367	13576	12681	12210	12016	11177	9910	9755	343857
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		5599	28889	10117	9167	8213	7874	6815	6045	6207	5741	5168	4716	4522	4250	4342	4043	3549	3233	128490
		100,00	95,08	84,13	82,91	82,50	81,15	80,86	82,30	82,11	82,07	83,91	84,00	84,57	83,98	84,18	83,58	82,84	83,32	86,01
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	1495	1909	1889	1742	1829	1613	1300	1352	1254	991	898	825	811	816	794	735	647	20900
		0,00	4,92	15,87	17,09	17,50	18,85	19,14	17,70	17,89	17,93	16,09	16,00	15,43	16,02	15,82	16,42	17,16	16,68	13,99

Table 5: Number and Percentage of Women in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020), All Industries

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	1256016	1198839	1134004	1095172	1063326	1050197	1030540	1011845	990769	979264	966511	953574	939611	924503	907710	888166	844933	803219	760850	18799049
	100	99,33	97,47	97,12	96,78	97,39	97,21	97,12	96,63	96,84	96,80	96,75	96,72	96,70	96,69	96,69	96,65	96,69	96,63	97,25
Self employed	0	2219	9830	11598	12397	12855	13653	14343	14914	15243	15557	15726	15741	15671	15464	15543	15217	14607	13996	244574
	0	0,18	0,84	1,03	1,13	1,19	1,29	1,38	1,45	1,51	1,56	1,60	1,62	1,64	1,65	1,69	1,74	1,76	1,78	1,27
Hybrid	0	5841	19601	20881	23000	15244	15914	15677	19689	16709	16431	16321	16131	15918	15649	14889	14114	12924	12567	287500
	0	0,48	1,68	1,85	2,09	1,41	1,50	1,50	1,92	1,65	1,65	1,66	1,66	1,66	1,67	1,62	1,61	1,56	1,60	1,49
Total	1256016	1206899	1163435	1127651	1098723	1078296	1060107	1041865	1025372	1011216	998499	985621	971483	956092	938823	918598	874264	830750	787413	19331123
Hybrid %	0	72,73	66,67	64,24	64,91	54,23	53,76	52,08	56,97	52,22	51,40	50,92	50,61	50,30	50,30	48,94	48,06	46,99	47,34	53,99
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		2219	8617	4230	4012	3414	3406	3388	3121	3204	3022	2725	2557	2451	2348	2483	2423	2078	2062	57760
		27,53	32,98	26,39	23,68	32,01	30,21	31,59	22,44	30,32	29,76	28,51	27,91	27,55	27,38	30,09	30,66	30,03	29,11	28,76
Hybrid		5841	17510	11799	12933	7253	7867	7336	10789	7364	7134	6833	6603	6447	6227	5769	5479	4842	5021	143047
		72,47	67,02	73,61	76,32	67,99	69,79	68,41	77,56	69,68	70,24	71,49	72,09	72,45	72,62	69,91	69,34	69,97	70,89	71,24
Total		8060	26127	16029	16945	10667	11273	10724	13910	10568	10156	9558	9160	8898	8575	8252	7902	6920	7083	200807
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		2219	8173	3583	3358	2847	2817	2767	2612	2648	2535	2297	2175	2046	1926	2044	2023	1731	1697	49498
		100,00	94,85	84,70	83,70	83,39	82,71	81,67	83,69	82,65	83,88	84,29	85,06	83,48	82,03	82,32	83,49	83,30	82,30	85,70
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	444	647	654	567	589	621	509	556	487	428	382	405	422	439	400	347	365	8262
		0,00	5,15	15,30	16,30	16,61	17,29	18,33	16,31	17,35	16,12	15,71	14,94	16,52	17,97	17,68	16,51	16,70	17,70	14,30

Table 6: Number and Percentage of Heterosexual Men in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	832346	801414	745639	721696	701763	697036	683493	670435	654227	646280	636179	625944	615179	604354	592406	578409	549538	521027	492722	12370087
	100	98,74	94,10	93,30	92,76	93,79	93,42	93,26	92,65	92,95	92,92	92,91	92,90	92,89	92,91	92,88	92,90	92,94	92,83	93,88
Self employed	0	3926	25187	28981	30261	31856	33613	34488	34577	34640	34649	34508	33955	33625	33019	32565	31135	29710	28433	549128
	0	0,48	3,18	3,75	4,00	4,29	4,59	4,80	4,90	4,98	5,06	5,12	5,13	5,17	5,18	5,23	5,26	5,30	5,36	4,17
Hybrid	0	6275	21560	22813	24477	14309	14512	13942	17311	14352	13851	13281	13079	12647	12200	11755	10892	9895	9600	256751
	0	0,77	2,72	2,95	3,24	1,93	1,98	1,94	2,45	2,06	2,02	1,97	1,98	1,94	1,91	1,89	1,84	1,76	1,81	1,95
Total	832346	811615	792386	773490	756501	743201	731618	718865	706115	695272	684679	673733	662213	650626	637625	622729	591565	560632	530755	13175966
Hybrid %	0	61,60	46,10	44,03	44,75	31,03	30,14	28,78	33,33	29,26	28,53	27,79	27,85	27,29	26,94	26,54	25,92	24,93	25,24	31,86
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		3926	22579	8745	7950	7199	6968	6039	5233	5464	5062	4447	4036	3894	3682	3820	3616	3115	2839	108614
		38,49	53,73	38,95	35,77	49,25	47,03	46,04	33,91	44,02	43,87	42,88	41,36	42,16	41,36	43,06	44,21	43,40	40,20	43,73
Hybrid		6275	19441	13706	14278	7418	7847	7079	10198	6948	6476	5925	5723	5343	5221	5051	4563	4062	4223	139777
		61,51	46,27	61,05	64,23	50,75	52,97	53,96	66,09	55,98	56,13	57,12	58,64	57,84	58,64	56,94	55,79	56,60	59,80	56,27
Total		10201	42020	22451	22228	14617	14815	13118	15431	12412	11538	10372	9759	9237	8903	8871	8179	7177	7062	248391
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		3926	21496	7379	6545	5928	5610	4894	4294	4473	4153	3711	3397	3315	3076	3202	3022	2592	2360	93373
		100,00	95,20	84,38	82,33	82,34	80,51	81,04	82,06	81,86	82,04	83,45	84,17	85,13	83,54	83,82	83,57	83,21	83,13	85,97
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	1083	1366	1405	1271	1358	1145	939	991	909	736	639	579	606	618	594	523	479	15241
		0,00	4,80	15,62	17,67	17,66	19,49	18,96	17,94	18,14	17,96	16,55	15,83	14,87	16,46	16,18	16,43	16,79	16,87	14,03

Table 7: Number and Percentage of Sexual Minority Men in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	3455	3334	3141	3021	2931	2876	2807	2726	2667	2636	2598	2542	2502	2465	2414	2366	2279	2167	2073	51000
	100	99,14	96,29	95,39	95,07	95,39	95,06	94,06	93,68	94,11	94,44	93,94	94,27	94,34	94,08	94,11	94,41	93,93	94,74	95,23
Self employed	0	9	58	70	72	76	77	92	89	94	86	89	82	88	86	85	77	77	67	1374
	0	0,27	1,78	2,21	2,34	2,52	2,61	3,17	3,13	3,36	3,13	3,29	3,09	3,37	3,35	3,38	3,19	3,34	3,06	2,57
Hybrid	0	20	63	76	80	63	69	80	91	71	67	75	70	60	66	63	58	63	48	1183
	0	0,59	1,93	2,40	2,59	2,09	2,34	2,76	3,20	2,53	2,44	2,77	2,64	2,30	2,57	2,51	2,40	2,73	2,19	2,21
Total	3455	3363	3262	3167	3083	3015	2953	2898	2847	2801	2751	2706	2654	2613	2566	2514	2414	2307	2188	53557
Hybrid %	0	68,60	52,02	52,06	52,54	45,34	47,27	46,54	50,55	42,95	43,81	45,71	46,07	40,56	43,41	42,61	42,93	44,98	41,71	46,23
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		9	52	31	25	19	18	27	17	22	15	18	7	15	12	14	8	13	9	331
		31,03	48,15	39,24	31,25	32,76	30,00	38,03	24,29	37,29	33,33	32,14	21,88	42,86	27,91	33,33	25,00	33,33	39,13	34,44
Hybrid		20	56	48	55	39	42	44	53	37	30	38	25	20	31	28	24	26	14	630
		68,97	51,85	60,76	68,75	67,24	70,00	61,97	75,71	62,71	66,67	67,86	78,13	57,14	72,09	66,67	75,00	66,67	60,87	65,56
Total		29	108	79	80	58	60	71	70	59	45	56	32	35	43	42	32	39	23	961
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment		9	50	27	17	16	15	23	13	16	12	16	5	13	11	10	8	11	8	280
entry not preceded by hybrid		100,00	96,15	87,10	68,00	84,21	83,33	85,19	76,47	72,73	80,00	88,89	71,43	86,67	91,67	71,43	100,00	84,62	88,89	84,59
Self-employment		0	2	4	8	3	3	4	4	6	3	2	2	2	1	4	0	2	1	51
entry preceded by hybrid		0,00	3,85	12,90	32,00	15,79	16,67	14,81	23,53	27,27	20,00	11,11	28,57	13,33	8,33	28,57	0,00	15,38	11,11	15,41

Table 8: Number and Percentage of Heterosexual Women in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	870518	833261	789281	763410	742277	733983	720971	708718	694795	687276	678770	670201	660892	650446	638380	623984	592694	562596	531966	13154419
	100	99,26	97,27	96,88	96,55	97,18	97,00	96,91	96,41	96,62	96,57	96,52	96,50	96,48	96,47	96,47	96,43	96,48	96,41	97,05
Self employed	0	1674	7544	8818	9338	9764	10276	10768	11178	11415	11695	11823	11838	11815	11628	11709	11377	10927	10519	184106
	0	0,20	0,93	1,12	1,21	1,29	1,38	1,47	1,55	1,60	1,66	1,70	1,73	1,75	1,76	1,81	1,85	1,87	1,91	1,36
Hybrid	0	4510	14614	15748	17150	11549	12012	11834	14676	12614	12416	12363	12164	11942	11700	11146	10558	9625	9309	215930
	0	0,54	1,80	2,00	2,23	1,53	1,62	1,62	2,04	1,77	1,77	1,78	1,78	1,77	1,77	1,72	1,72	1,65	1,69	1,59
Total	870518	839445	811439	787976	768765	755296	743259	731320	720649	711305	702881	694387	684894	674203	661708	646839	614629	583148	551794	13554455
Hybrid %	0	72,97	65,93	64,10	64,83	54,26	54,00	52,43	56,82	52,52	51,60	51,15	50,71	50,28	50,14	48,73	48,18	46,88	46,94	53,90
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		1674	6655	3104	2955	2579	2499	2479	2299	2374	2273	2009	1920	1874	1762	1884	1786	1590	1602	43318
		27,07	33,87	25,89	0,00	31,99	30,09	31,22	22,53	30,10	29,95	28,19	28,03	28,03	27,53	30,28	30,34	30,68	30,32	28,90
Hybrid		4510	12995	8885	9502	5482	5805	5461	7904	5514	5317	5118	4931	4811	4639	4338	4100	3593	3681	106586
		72,93	66,13	74,11	76,28	68,01	69,91	68,78	77,47	69,90	70,05	71,81	71,97	71,97	72,47	69,72	69,66	69,32	69,68	71,10
Total		6184	19650	11989	12457	8061	8304	7940	10203	7888	7590	7127	6851	6685	6401	6222	5886	5183	5283	149904
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		1674	6336	2640	2470	2144	2058	2026	1906	1959	1920	1692	1637	1554	1450	1527	1478	1319	1308	37098
		100	95,21	85,05	83,59	83,13	82,35	81,73	82,91	82,52	84,47	84,22	85,26	82,92	82,29	81,05	82,75	82,96	81,65	85,64
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	319	464	485	435	441	453	393	415	353	317	283	320	312	357	308	271	294	6220
		0	4,79	14,95	16,41	16,87	17,65	18,27	17,09	17,48	15,53	15,78	14,74	17,08	17,71	18,95	17,25	17,04	18,35	14,36

Table 9: Number and Percentage of Sexual Minority Women in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	4074	3916	3714	3622	3514	3488	3419	3347	3264	3221	3179	3136	3093	3052	3001	2967	2892	2821	2730	62450
	100	99,39	97,58	97,68	97,13	97,70	97,05	96,99	96,34	96,29	96,36	96,52	96,39	96,58	96,12	96,39	95,67	96,02	95,99	97,05
Self employed	0	7	35	35	39	41	53	56	59	62	62	62	64	56	59	59	65	60	62	936
	0	0,18	0,92	0,94	1,08	1,15	1,50	1,62	1,74	1,85	1,88	1,91	1,99	1,77	1,89	1,92	2,15	2,04	2,18	1,45
Hybrid	0	17	57	51	65	41	51	48	65	62	58	51	52	52	62	52	66	57	52	959
	0	0,43	1,50	1,38	1,80	1,15	1,45	1,39	1,92	1,85	1,76	1,57	1,62	1,65	1,99	1,69	2,18	1,94	1,83	1,49
Total	4074	3940	3806	3708	3618	3570	3523	3451	3388	3345	3299	3249	3209	3160	3122	3078	3023	2938	2844	64345
Hybrid %	0	70,49	61,98	59,48	62,50	50,00	49,15	46,18	52,46	50,00	48,35	45,11	44,88	48,25	51,29	46,81	50,35	48,74	45,64	50,68
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		7	31	11	16	16	23	13	13	17	14	16	17	5	11	11	14	9	13	257
		29,17	36,47	27,50	27,59	40,00	40,35	32,50	25,00	35,42	33,33	39,02	37,78	17,24	28,21	42,31	33,33	33,33	37,14	33,38
Hybrid		17	54	29	42	24	34	27	39	31	28	25	28	24	28	15	28	18	22	513
		70,83	63,53	72,50	72,41	60,00	59,65	67,50	75,00	64,58	66,67	60,98	62,22	82,76	71,79	57,69	66,67	66,67	62,86	66,62
Total		24	85	40	58	40	57	40	52	48	42	41	45	29	39	26	42	27	35	770
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not		7	30	11	15	13	15	10	11	13	9	12	13	5	8	11	11	7	12	213
preceded by hybrid		100,00	96,77	100,00	93,75	81,25	65,22	76,92	84,62	76,47	64,29	75,00	76,47	100,00	72,73	100,00	78,57	77,78	92,31	82,88
Self-employment entry preceded		0	1	0	1	3	8	3	2	4	5	4	4	0	3	0	3	2	1	44
by hybrid		0,00	3,23	0,00	6,25	18,75	34,78	23,08	15,38	23,53	35,71	25,00	23,53	0,00	27,27	0,00	21,43	22,22	7,69	17,12

Table 10: Work Status Transition Frequencies

Status	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into hybrid (%)
HM			
From wage work	98.00	0.80	1.20
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	45.88	6.24	47.88
SMM			
From wage work	98.10	0.58	1.31
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	46.17	4.55	49.29
HW			
From wage work	98.83	0.30	0.86
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	43.48	3.04	53.48
SMW			
From wage work	98.76	0.36	0.87
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	45.49	4.89	49.61

Table 11: Work Status Transition Frequencies based on Intensity

	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into low hybrid intensity (%)	Into medium hybrid intensity (%)	Into high hybrid intensity (%)
HM					
From wage work	98.00	0.80	0.58	0.34	0.28
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	53.73	1.38	33.15	9.50	2.25
From medium hybrid intensity	39.61	4.71	17.43	28.90	9.36
From high hybrid intensity	37.47	18.94	4.84	10.80	27.95
SMM					
From wage work	98.10	0.58	0.56	0.42	0.33
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	54.83	1.44	32.44	9.45	1.85
From medium hybrid intensity	38.70	3.11	18.64	28.53	11.02
From high hybrid intensity	40.57	11.74	6.05	9.61	32.03
HW					
From wage work	98.83	0.30	0.37	0.27	0.23
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	53.21	0.74	32.70	10.58	2.77
From medium hybrid intensity	38.54	2.27	15.72	31.90	11.58
From high hybrid intensity	35.44	7.18	5.58	12.30	39.50
SMW					
From wage work	98.76	0.36	0.36	0.27	0.24
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	53.51	0.27	31.62	12.70	1.89
From medium hybrid intensity	41.58	3.44	18.56	25.77	10.65
From high hybrid intensity	37.82	13.87	5.46	13.03	29.83

Notes: Low hybrid intensity, hybrid intensity <5%; medium hybrid intensity: 5%≤hybrid intensity<20%; high hybrid intensity: 20%≤hybrid intensity.

Table 12: Multinomial Logit (No entry, Self-Employment Entry, and Hybrid Entry) for Men and Women

	(1) SE entry preferred to no entry for men	(2) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for men	(3) SE entry preferred to no entry for women	(4) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for women
Ever in same-sex legal union	0.014	0.101**	0.231***	0.047
	(0.064)	(0.046)	(0.066)	(0.048)
Salary income (ln)	0.552***	0.317***	0.454***	0.259***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Negative change in salary income (ln)	4.798***	0.251***	3.992***	0.483***
	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.032)	(0.026)
Nonsalary income	-0.000***	0.000**	0.000**	0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Negative change in nonsalary inc (ln)	0.031***	0.058***	0.025***	0.051***
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.005)
Married	-0.007	0.029***	0.132***	0.107***
	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.018)	(0.012)
Number of children	0.029***	0.046***	0.015**	0.046***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.004)
Education percentile	0.002***	0.002***	0.005***	0.005***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Total job numbers since 1995	-0.045***	0.042***	-0.022***	0.048***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Time unemployed (previous year)	1.526***	-0.159	1.673***	0.022
	(0.085)	(0.124)	(0.091)	(0.102)
Self-employment experience	1.283***	0.222***	1.462***	0.397***
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.012)
Parental self-employment experience	0.211***	0.323***	0.212***	0.372***
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.008)
Industry tenure (ln)	-0.067***	-0.118***	-0.081***	-0.153***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.008)
Employer tenure	0.048***	-0.024***	0.002	-0.031***
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Employer tenure squared	-0.003***	0.001***	-0.001***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employer size (ln)	-0.443***	-0.069***	-0.395***	-0.077***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Employer age 0-2	1.404***	0.329***	1.316***	0.474***
	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.015)
Employer age 3-6	0.448***	-0.006	0.351***	-0.023*
	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.015)	(0.012)
Hybrid experience	1.072***	1.827***	1.173***	1.918***
	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.015)	(0.008)
Swedish born	-0.037***	0.113***	0.002	0.155***
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.013)
Partner	-0.042**	0.023	0.066**	0.188***
	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.027)	(0.017)
Partner self-employed	0.402***	0.336***	0.250***	0.429***
	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.009)
Partner income (log)	0.012***	-0.002**	-0.010***	-0.016***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Agricultural	0.290***	0.497***	0.138***	0.275***
	(0.028)	(0.023)	(0.049)	(0.038)
Manufacturing	-0.002	-0.093***	-0.056**	-0.302***
	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.028)	(0.019)
Construction	0.659***	-0.013	0.186***	-0.151***
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.041)	(0.032)
Service	0.411***	-0.069***	0.339***	-0.206***
	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.019)	(0.016)
Healthcare	0.968***	0.399***	0.402***	0.018
	(0.026)	(0.016)	(0.024)	(0.016)
Public	0.312***	0.356***	0.018	0.007
	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.016)
Number of ind-year obs	13,229,523	13,229,523	13,618,800	13,618,800
Number of individuals	835,801	835,801	874,592	874,592
Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level are presented in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p,0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register.

Table 13: Multinomial Logit (No entry, Self-Employment Entry, and Hybrid Entry)

	(1) Self-employment entry preferred to no entry for men	(2) A hybrid entry preferred to no entry for men	(3) Self-employment entry preferred to no entry for men	(4) A hybrid entry preferred to no entry for men	(5) Self-employment entry preferred to no entry for women	(6) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for women	(7) Self-employment entry preferred to no entry for women	(8) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for women
Ever in same-sex legal union	-0.069	0.176	0.058	0.154***	0.279**	0.065	0.180**	0.053
	(0.121)	(0.113)	(0.068)	(0.053)	(0.121)	(0.107)	(0.074)	(0.059)
Salary income of the main income (1000 SEK)	-0.000***	-0.000***			-0.000***	-0.000***		
	(0.000)	(0.000)			(0.000)	(0.000)		
Interaction with Ever in SSLU and Salary income of the main income (1000 SEK)	0.000	-0.000			-0.000	-0.000		
	(0.000)	(0.000)			(0.000)	(0.000)		
Public			0.315***	0.357***			0.016	0.007
			(0.022)	(0.015)			(0.024)	(0.016)
Interaction with Ever in SSLU and public			-0.374*	-0.177*			0.280*	-0.016
			(0.203)	(0.094)			(0.154)	(0.097)
Number of individual-year observations	13,229,523	13,229,523	13,229,523	13,229,523	13,618,800	13,618,800	13,618,800	13,618,800
Number of individuals	835,801	835,801	835,801	835,801	874,592	874,592	874,592	874,592
Demographics characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level are presented in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p,0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register.

Table 14: Hybrid Entry as a Path to Non-Monetary Benefits for Sexual Minority

	(1) Activism Hybrid male workers	(3) Activism Hybrid female workers
Ever in same-sex legal union	0.039***	0.032***
	(0.010)	(0.010)
Number of individual-year observations	718,406	559,656
Dep variable mean	0.032	0.042
Adjusted R-squared	0.033	0.043
Demographics	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes
Geographical characteristics	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	No	No

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level are presented in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p,0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register. This table shows the likelihood (LPM) for sexual minority hybrid workers to be a hybrid worker in an industry primarily engaged in collective representation, advocacy, or membership-based activities related to economic, professional, political, religious, or social interests.

Appendices

Appendix Table 1: Number and Percentage of Men in Each Labor Classification per Year (1994-2001), Reprinted from FDW's Original Study

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
Labor classification									
Wage work	44,613	42,985	41,275	39,904	38,605	37,537	36,587	35,757	317,263
	100.00	97.74	96.66	95.95	95.34	94.80	94.53	94.23	96.25
Self employed	0	311	599	914	1,058	1,191	1,219	1,225	6,517
	0.00	0.71	1.40	2.20	2.61	3.01	3.15	3.23	1.98
Hybrid	0	684	827	772	830	866	899	966	5,844
	0.00	1.56	1.94	1.86	2.05	2.19	2.32	2.55	1.77
Total	44,613	43,98	42,701	41,59	40,493	39,594	38,705	37,948	329,624
Entry into labor classification									
Self employed		311	362	443	350	341	284	236	2,327
		31.26	42.09	53.18	44.19	45.71	42.39	36.20	41.94
Hybrid		684	498	390	442	405	386	416	3,221
		68.74	57.91	46.82	55.81	54.29	57.61	63.80	58.06
Total		995	860	833	792	746	670	652	5,548
		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Self-employment entry not		311	272	349	289	269	232	199	1,921
preceded by hybrid		100.00	66.91	73.07	78.89	73.23	77.59	81.41	78.87
Self-employment entry		0	90	94	61	72	52	37	406
preceded by hybrid		0.00	33.09	26.93	21.11	26.77	22.41	18.59	21.13

Appendix Table 2: Number and Percentage of Women in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020) for High-Technology Manufacturing and Knowledge-Intensive Services Industries

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	279487	267354	254251	246065	239022	236588	232304	228596	224513	222325	219903	217331	214557	211576	208203	204041	193545	183577	173335	4256573
	100	99,37	97,91	97,59	97,26	97,88	97,72	97,67	97,16	97,38	97,34	97,26	97,25	97,26	97,28	97,32	97,29	97,34	97,28	97,72
Self employed	0	303	1077	1329	1480	1604	1760	1867	1927	2041	2131	2191	2169	2176	2149	2177	2130	2013	1908	32432
	0	0,11	0,41	0,53	0,60	0,66	0,74	0,80	0,83	0,89	0,94	0,98	0,98	1,00	1,00	1,04	1,07	1,07	1,07	0,74
Hybrid	0	1380	4340	4746	5258	3524	3671	3594	4647	3942	3870	3935	3902	3785	3682	3445	3259	2999	2944	66923
	0	0,51	1,67	1,88	2,14	1,46	1,54	1,54	2,01	1,73	1,71	1,76	1,77	1,74	1,72	1,64	1,64	1,59	1,65	1,54
Total	279487	269037	259668	252140	245760	241716	237735	234057	231087	228308	225904	223457	220628	217537	214034	209663	198934	188589	178187	4355928
Hybrid %	0	82,26	80,29	78,01	78,10	68,87	67,54	65,81	70,77	66,03	64,53	64,23	64,36	63,50	63,24	61,19	60,52	59,77	60,66	67,54
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		303	921	605	581	534	526	506	439	520	476	443	387	387	368	395	369	305	304	8369
		18,00	19,52	18,58	16,68	24,75	23,16	23,92	14,79	23,46	22,52	21,33	20,08	21,16	20,48	23,98	23,22	21,82	20,60	20,55
Hybrid		1380	3797	2652	2902	1624	1745	1609	2530	1697	1638	1634	1540	1442	1429	1252	1220	1093	1172	32356
		82,00	80,48	81,42	83,32	75,25	76,84	76,08	85,21	76,54	77,48	78,67	79,92	78,84	79,52	76,02	76,78	78,18	79,40	79,45
Total		1683	4718	3257	3483	2158	2271	2115	2969	2217	2114	2077	1927	1829	1797	1647	1589	1398	1476	40725
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		303	869	509	479	438	437	402	371	438	378	372	327	313	304	322	309	253	248	7072
		100,00	94,35	84,13	82,44	82,02	83,08	79,45	84,51	84,23	79,41	83,97	84,50	80,88	82,61	81,52	83,74	82,95	81,58	84,50
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	52	96	102	96	89	104	68	82	98	71	60	74	64	73	60	52	56	1297
		0,00	5,65	15,87	17,56	17,98	16,92	20,55	15,49	15,77	20,59	16,03	15,50	19,12	17,39	18,48	16,26	17,05	18,42	15,50

Appendix Table 3: Number and Percentage of Unknown Sexual Orientation Men in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	430440	406909	376312	360732	347885	342972	334400	325436	315080	309886	303421	297017	290313	284063	277521	270685	259202	247774	236273	6016321
	100	99,06	95,56	94,94	94,34	95,26	94,91	94,74	94,04	94,38	94,27	94,19	94,09	94,12	94,09	94,10	94,06	94,06	93,91	95,14
Self employed	0	1664	8809	10253	11085	11816	12612	13054	13220	13292	13383	13422	13315	13116	12947	12686	12203	11877	11557	210311
	0	0,41	2,24	2,70	3,01	3,28	3,58	3,80	3,95	4,05	4,16	4,26	4,32	4,35	4,39	4,41	4,43	4,51	4,59	3,33
Hybrid	0	2178	8657	8954	9797	5243	5332	5027	6755	5150	5070	4902	4920	4622	4495	4300	4167	3769	3758	97096
	0	0,53	2,20	2,36	2,66	1,46	1,51	1,46	2,02	1,57	1,58	1,55	1,59	1,53	1,52	1,49	1,51	1,43	1,49	1,54
Total	430440	410751	393778	379939	368767	360031	352344	343517	335055	328328	321874	315341	308548	301801	294963	287671	275572	263420	251588	6323728
Hybrid %	0	56,38	49,55	46,64	46,91	30,80	29,67	27,76	33,84	27,94	27,53	26,68	26,90	26,02	25,72	25,25	25,42	24,07	24,51	31,62
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		1664	7753	3250	3081	2737	2717	2362	2095	2073	1918	1694	1571	1438	1367	1324	1213	1156	1032	40445
		43,31	49,37	37,54	34,34	49,69	48,02	47,78	33,05	44,35	43,85	43,01	41,51	42,18	41,88	42,67	40,90	42,91	38,65	42,80
Hybrid		2178	7952	5408	5892	2771	2941	2582	4244	2601	2456	2245	2214	1971	1897	1779	1753	1538	1638	54060
		56,69	50,63	62,46	65,66	50,31	51,98	52,22	66,95	55,65	56,15	56,99	58,49	57,82	58,12	57,33	59,10	57,09	61,35	57,20
Total		3842	15705	8658	8973	5508	5658	4944	6339	4674	4374	3939	3785	3409	3264	3103	2966	2694	2670	94505
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		1664	7343	2711	2605	2269	2249	1898	1738	1718	1576	1441	1314	1194	1163	1130	1013	946	865	34837
		100,00	94,71	83,42	84,55	82,90	82,78	80,36	82,96	82,88	82,17	85,06	83,64	83,03	85,08	85,35	83,51	81,83	83,82	86,13
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	410	539	476	468	468	464	357	355	342	253	257	244	204	194	200	210	167	5608
		0,00	5,11	15,82	14,86	16,71	16,89	19,38	16,82	16,91	17,41	14,92	16,13	16,66	14,83	14,32	15,97	18,47	16,48	13,68

Appendix Table 4: Number and Percentage of Unknown Sexual Orientation Women in Each Labor Classification per Year (2002-2020)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Labor classification																				
Wage work	381424	361662	341009	328140	317535	312726	306150	299780	292710	288767	284562	280237	275626	271005	266329	261215	249347	237802	226154	5582180
	100	99,49	97,94	97,67	97,30	97,90	97,71	97,62	97,14	97,37	97,35	97,31	97,26	97,23	97,20	97,22	97,17	97,20	97,16	97,72
Self employed	0	538	2251	2745	3020	3050	3324	3519	3677	3766	3800	3841	3839	3800	3777	3775	3775	3620	3415	59532
	0	0,15	0,65	0,82	0,93	0,95	1,06	1,15	1,22	1,27	1,30	1,33	1,35	1,36	1,38	1,41	1,47	1,48	1,47	1,04
Hybrid	0	1314	4930	5082	5785	3654	3851	3795	4948	4033	3957	3907	3915	3924	3887	3691	3490	3242	3206	70611
	0	0,36	1,42	1,51	1,77	1,14	1,23	1,24	1,64	1,36	1,35	1,36	1,38	1,41	1,42	1,37	1,36	1,33	1,38	1,24
Total	381424	363514	348190	335967	326340	319430	313325	307094	301335	296566	292319	287985	283380	278729	273993	268681	256612	244664	232775	5712323
Hybrid %	0	70,59	68,60	64,81	65,56	54,55	53,71	51,88	57,34	51,71	50,94	50,56	50,55	50,90	50,71	49,28	48,06	47,33	48,42	54,39
Entry into labor classification																				
Self employed		538	1931	1115	1041	819	884	896	809	813	735	700	620	572	575	588	623	479	447	14185
		29,05	30,21	27,88	23,50	31,92	30,36	32,65	22,13	30,89	29,12	29,29	27,39	26,19	26,93	29,34	31,56	28,01	25,33	28,29
Hybrid		1314	4461	2885	3389	1747	2028	1848	2846	1819	1789	1690	1644	1612	1560	1416	1351	1231	1318	35948
		70,95	69,79	72,13	76,50	68,08	69,64	67,35	77,87	69,11	70,88	70,71	72,61	73,81	73,07	70,66	68,44	71,99	74,67	71,71
Total		1852	6392	4000	4430	2566	2912	2744	3655	2632	2524	2390	2264	2184	2135	2004	1974	1710	1765	50133
		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Self-employment entry not preceded by hybrid		538	1807	932	873	690	744	731	695	676	606	593	525	487	468	506	534	405	377	12187
		100,00	93,58	83,59	83,86	84,25	84,16	81,58	85,91	83,15	82,45	84,71	84,68	85,14	81,39	86,05	85,71	84,55	84,34	85,91
Self-employment entry preceded by hybrid		0	124	183	168	129	140	165	114	137	129	107	95	85	107	82	89	74	70	1998
		0,00	6,42	16,41	16,14	15,75	15,84	18,42	14,09	16,85	17,55	15,29	15,32	14,86	18,61	13,95	14,29	15,45	15,66	14,09

Appendix Table 5 Panel A: Work Status Transition Frequencies, Reprinted from FDW's Original Study

Status	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into hybrid (%)
Men			
From wage work	98.1	0.7	1.2
From self-employed	0.0	100.0	0.0
From hybrid	36.6	8.5	54.9

Notes: reprinted from FDW.

Appendix 5 Panel B: Work Status Transition Frequencies based on Intensity, Reprinted from FDW's Original Study

	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into Hybrid intensity <−0.05 (%)	Into −0.05 ≤ hybrid intensity<0 (%)	Into low hybrid intensity (%)	Into medium hybrid intensity (%)	Into high hybrid intensity (%)
Men							
From wage work	98.1	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1
From self-employed	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
From Hybrid intensity <−0.05	34.6	3.4	53.7	4.7	1.6	1.4	0.7
From −0.05 ≤ hybrid intensity<0	43.7	2.0	10.9	30.4	8.8	2.7	1.5
From low hybrid intensity	39.3	4.6	3.7	10.5	31.7	7.8	2.5
From medium hybrid intensity	29.0	13.0	3.9	4.1	17.2	24.5	8.4
From high hybrid intensity	30.7	38.5	1.2	0.6	3.8	10.2	15.0

Notes: Low hybrid intensity, hybrid intensity <5%; medium hybrid intensity: 5%≤hybrid intensity<20%; high hybrid intensity: 20%≤hybrid intensity. Reprinted from FDW.

Appendix Table 6 Panel A: Work Status Transition Frequencies, High-Technology Manufacturing and Knowledge-Intensive Services Industries

Status	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into hybrid (%)
Men			
From wage work	97.89	0.52	1.59
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	42.70	2.89	54.41
Women			
From wage work	99.01	0.18	0.81
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	43.36	2.05	54.59

Appendix Table 6 Panel B: Work Status Transition Frequencies based on Intensity, High-Technology Manufacturing and Knowledge-Intensive Services Industries

	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into low hybrid intensity (%)	Into medium hybrid intensity (%)	Into high hybrid intensity (%)
Men					
From wage work	97.89	0.52	0.79	0.47	0.33
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	51.33	0.81	34.34	11.09	2.43
From medium hybrid intensity	34.97	2.17	19.32	32.70	10.84
From high hybrid intensity	35.58	8.44	5.74	14.14	36.10
Women					
From wage work	99.01	0.18	0.35	0.25	0.21
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	52.91	0.49	33.06	10.85	2.69
From medium hybrid intensity	38.34	1.41	16.44	32.30	11.50
From high hybrid intensity	35.01	5.18	6.37	13.24	40.20

Notes: Low hybrid intensity, hybrid intensity <5%; medium hybrid intensity: 5%≤hybrid intensity<20%; high hybrid intensity: 20%≤hybrid intensity.

Appendix Table 7 Panel A: Work Status Transition Frequencies, All Industries

Status	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into hybrid (%)
Men			
From wage work	98.14	0.74	1.12
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	46.25	6.20	47.55
Women			
From wage work	98.91	0.28	0.81
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00
From hybrid	43.85	3.04	53.11

Appendix Table 7 Panel B: Work Status Transition Frequencies based on Intensity, All Industries

	Into wage work (%)	Into self-employed (%)	Into low hybrid intensity (%)	Into medium hybrid intensity (%)	Into high hybrid intensity (%)
Men					
From wage work	98.14	0.74	0.53	0.32	0.26
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	54.04	1.34	32.83	9.51	2.29
From medium hybrid intensity	40.26	4.65	17.13	28.59	9.37
From high hybrid intensity	38.05	18.57	4.87	10.86	27.64
Women					
From wage work	98.91	0.28	0.35	0.25	0.22
From self-employed	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
From low hybrid intensity	53.24	0.74	32.74	10.53	2.75
From medium hybrid intensity	38.88	2.21	15.88	31.57	11.45
From high hybrid intensity	36.04	7.33	5.56	12.23	38.84

Notes: Low hybrid intensity, hybrid intensity <5%; medium hybrid intensity: 5%≤hybrid intensity<20%; high hybrid intensity: 20%≤hybrid intensity.

Appendix Table 8: Multinomial Logit (No entry, Self-Employment Entry, and Hybrid Entry), Reprinted from FDW's Original Study

	(1) SE entry preferred to no entry for men	(2) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for men
Salary income (ln)	0.270***	0.259***
	(0.02)	(0.03)
Negative change in salary income (ln)	2.953***	0.713***
	(0.17)	(0.18)
Nonsalary income	−0.062	−1.120
	(0.42)	(1.68)
Negative change in nonsalary inc (ln)	0.071*	0.061*
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Household wealth	−0.272	−0.270
	(0.16)	(0.15)
Household wealth dummy	3.890	3.721
	(2.24)	(2.15)
Currently in legal union	0.099	0.089
	(0.08)	(0.06)
Number of children	0.065*	0.058*
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Education percentile	0.001	0.285***
	(0.09)	(0.08)
Total job numbers since 1995	0.134***	0.055**
	(0.02)	(0.02)
Time unemployed (previous year)	0.270***	0.259***
	(0.02)	(0.03)
Self-employment experience	−0.140	−0.582***
	(0.12)	(0.10)
Parental self-employment experience	0.718***	0.917***
	(0.09)	(0.07)
Industry tenure (ln)	−0.317***	−0.077**
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Employer tenure	−0.172**	−0.498***
	(0.06)	(0.04)
Employer tenure squared	0.024***	0.047***
	(0.01)	(0.00)
Employer size (ln)	−0.229***	−0.018
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Employer age 0-2	0.066*	−0.004
	(0.07)	(0.05)
Employer age 3-6	−0.039	−0.215**
	(0.10)	(0.08)
Hybrid experience	0.842***	1.501***
	(0.08)	(0.05)
Swedish citizen	−0.057	0.014
	(0.10)	(0.07)
Partner	−0.111	0.105
	(0.13)	(0.09)
Partner self-employed	0.549**	0.623***
	(0.17)	(0.13)
Partner income (log)	−0.003	−0.016**
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Number of ind-year obs	259,856	259,856
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes
Year dummies	Yes	Yes
Age dummies	Yes	Yes
Region dummies	Yes	Yes

Notes: Reprinted from FDW. Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level are presented in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p,0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register.

Appendix Table 9: Multinomial Logit (No entry, Self-Employment Entry, and Hybrid Entry) in High-Technology Manufacturing and Knowledge-Intensive Services Industries

	(1) SE entry preferred to no entry for men	(2) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for men	(3) SE entry preferred to no entry for women	(4) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for women
Salary income (ln)	0.483***	0.282***	0.422***	0.250***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Negative change in salary income (ln)	4.562***	0.171**	4.186***	0.551***
	(0.078)	(0.068)	(0.072)	(0.048)
Nonsalary income	-0.000***	-0.000	0.000*	0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Negative change in nonsalary inc (ln)	-0.039*	0.038***	-0.011	0.049***
	(0.021)	(0.011)	(0.020)	(0.009)
Currently in legal union	-0.012	0.024	0.173***	0.087***
	(0.033)	(0.021)	(0.034)	(0.018)
Number of children	0.019	0.029***	-0.019	0.026***
	(0.014)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.007)
Education percentile	0.000	0.003***	0.003***	0.006***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Total job numbers since 1995	-0.032***	0.047***	-0.016***	0.055***
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Time unemployed (previous year)	2.011***	-0.520*	2.168***	0.002
	(0.249)	(0.281)	(0.187)	(0.180)
Self-employment experience	1.208***	0.316***	1.534***	0.462***
	(0.033)	(0.025)	(0.034)	(0.022)
Parental self-employment experience	0.133***	0.238***	0.148***	0.381***
	(0.028)	(0.017)	(0.028)	(0.014)
Industry tenure (ln)	0.012	-0.150***	-0.097***	-0.184***
	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.026)	(0.018)
Employer tenure	0.011	-0.021***	-0.032***	-0.026***
	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.004)
Employer tenure squared	-0.001**	0.001***	0.001*	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employer size (ln)	-0.415***	-0.050***	-0.352***	-0.061***
	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.003)
Employer age 0-2	1.147***	0.357***	1.360***	0.629***
	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.033)
Employer age 3-6	0.399***	0.006	0.400***	0.015
	(0.032)	(0.027)	(0.035)	(0.027)
Hybrid experience	1.027***	1.845***	1.335***	1.998***
	(0.031)	(0.017)	(0.034)	(0.015)
Swedish born	-0.056	0.127***	0.048	0.147***
	(0.039)	(0.026)	(0.038)	(0.023)
Partner	0.044	0.105***	0.153***	0.239***
	(0.059)	(0.037)	(0.052)	(0.027)
Partner self-employed	0.406***	0.241***	0.282***	0.395***
	(0.048)	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.017)
Partner income (log)	0.003	-0.001	-0.016***	-0.017***
	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Agricultural	0.427***	0.186	0.175	0.225**
	(0.124)	(0.130)	(0.129)	(0.111)
Manufacturing	0.206**	-0.248***	0.258***	-0.392***
	(0.081)	(0.059)	(0.087)	(0.061)
Construction	0.629***	-0.142*	0.026	-0.238***
	(0.077)	(0.077)	(0.116)	(0.091)
Service	0.513***	-0.099**	0.428***	-0.278***
	(0.054)	(0.044)	(0.046)	(0.037)
Healthcare	0.593***	0.082*	0.242***	-0.215***
	(0.078)	(0.047)	(0.057)	(0.036)
Public	0.373***	0.232***	0.153***	-0.149***
	(0.060)	(0.045)	(0.051)	(0.037)
Number of ind-year obs	1,589,878	1,589,878	4,355,928	4,355,928
Number of individuals	104,533	104,533	279,487	279,487
Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level are presented in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p,0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register.

Appendix Table 10: Multinomial Logit (No entry, Self-Employment Entry, and Hybrid Entry) for all Men and Women

	(1) SE entry preferred to no entry for men	(2) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for men	(3) SE entry preferred to no entry for women	(4) Hybrid entry preferred to no entry for women
Salary income (ln)	0.562***	0.327***	0.452***	0.262***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Negative change in salary income (ln)	4.793***	0.191***	3.960***	0.450***
	(0.020)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.023)
Nonsalary income	-0.000***	0.000**	0.000**	0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Negative change in nonsalary inc (ln)	0.037***	0.062***	0.032***	0.049***
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.004)
Currently in legal union	0.021***	0.015**	0.171***	0.088***
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.008)
Number of children	0.029***	0.042***	0.010*	0.037***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Education percentile	0.002***	0.003***	0.005***	0.006***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Total job numbers since 1995	-0.040***	0.042***	-0.020***	0.048***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Time unemployed (previous year)	1.440***	-0.176*	1.588***	0.032
	(0.070)	(0.099)	(0.081)	(0.088)
Self-employment experience	1.332***	0.241***	1.514***	0.417***
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.010)
Parental self-employment experience	0.242***	0.354***	0.225***	0.390***
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)
Industry tenure (ln)	-0.081***	-0.124***	-0.076***	-0.151***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.007)
Employer tenure	0.049***	-0.022***	-0.001	-0.031***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Employer tenure squared	-0.003***	0.001***	-0.001***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employer size (ln)	-0.448***	-0.070***	-0.396***	-0.078***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Employer age 0-2	1.412***	0.318***	1.304***	0.465***
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.013)
Employer age 3-6	0.439***	-0.015*	0.338***	-0.021**
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.010)
Hybrid experience	1.116***	1.881***	1.205***	1.994***
	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.013)	(0.007)
Swedish born	-0.046***	0.122***	-0.011	0.148***
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.011)
Partner	0.036**	0.087***	0.063***	0.215***
	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.013)
Partner self-employed	0.378***	0.324***	0.229***	0.403***
	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.008)
Partner income (log)	0.011***	-0.003***	-0.010***	-0.016***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Agricultural	0.294***	0.491***	0.125***	0.262***
	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.041)	(0.032)
Manufacturing	-0.015	-0.090***	-0.076***	-0.288***
	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.024)	(0.017)
Construction	0.634***	-0.021	0.180***	-0.124***
	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.035)	(0.028)
Service	0.402***	-0.077***	0.321***	-0.198***
	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.013)
Healthcare	0.912***	0.374***	0.352***	0.008
	(0.023)	(0.014)	(0.021)	(0.014)
Public	0.346***	0.344***	0.015	0.002
	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.020)	(0.014)
Number of ind-year obs	19,553,251	19,553,251	19,331,123	19,331,123
Number of individuals	1,266,241	1,266,241	1,256,016	1,256,016
Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the individual level are presented in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p,0.1. Author calculations from Sweden population register linked to Sweden business register.