



Still a man's world?

Still a man's
world?

The influence of gender and gender role type on income in two business school graduate cohorts over time

65

Thomas M. Schneidhofer, Michael Schiffinger and
Wolfgang Mayrhofer

*Interdisciplinary Group for Management and Organisational Behaviour,
Vienna University of Economics and Business, Vienna, Austria*

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to analyse the effects of gender and gender role type on objective career success over time from a career practices perspective.

Design/methodology/approach – Based on a relational perspective on gender shifting attention to a field, habitus, and capital-based view on careers, the paper analyses the interrelation of gender, gender role type (GRT) and income with a longitudinal two-cohort design of business school graduates (1990, 2000), using mixed linear models.

Findings – In line with the authors' argumentation, female or undifferentiated GRT earn less than masculine or androgynous GRT in both cohorts over time, and relative income of androgynous compared to masculine men is higher in the 2000 cohort than in the 1990 cohort. Contrary to the authors' hypotheses, the income gap between women and men has widened rather than narrowed, and masculine women of the 2000 cohort do not attain a higher proportion of the androgynous women's mean income compared to the 1990 cohort.

Research limitations/implications – Career success is based on self-report data (income) and partially based on retrospective evaluations thereof. As the idea of connecting masculinity and femininity to gender and career outcomes arose after data collection, the authors had to rely on the psychometric items and scales already contained in the questionnaire.

Originality/value – Instead of (re- or de-)constructing gender as bipolar object, but as realisation of historical acting including the context within which practical actions take place, the concept of GRT is applied to objective career success from a longitudinal perspective, owing to the relational nature of gender and the temporal nature of careers, as well as its embeddedness in the context within which trajectories unfold. In doing so, it shifts attention to career practices, emerging from the interplay of career field, career habitus, and career capital.

Keywords Careers, Longitudinal study, Equal opportunities, Sex and gender issues, Income

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

I realised quickly when I knew I should
That the world was made up of this brotherhood of man
For whatever that means
(Linda Perry, 4 Non Blondes, "What's up?").

According to the *Gender Gap Report*, inequality between women and men is decreasing slightly: Taken together, the gender gap scores of all 134 countries listed in 2010, indicating each country's overall performance in closing the gender gap on a scale of 0 (= inequality) to 1 (= equality), mean sum scores increased from 0.662 in 2006 to



0.678 in 2009 (own calculation based on Zahidi and Ibarra, 2010). However, the boot is far from being on the other foot: As far as income difference as another aspect of gender inequality is concerned, European women still earn on average 17.6 per cent less than men (Eurostat, 2010). For a sample of Austrian business school graduates, this results in a cumulative income gap of about €73,000 in favour of men during the first ten career years (Strunk and Hermann, 2009, p 251).

The fact that women basically come off badly in objective career success terms all over the world is well documented in the literature (see, for example, the Special Issue of this journal edited by Ronald J. Burke, 2006; Eagly and Carley, 2007; Lyness and Thompson, 1997, 2000). However, it is interesting to notice that in empirical research, the distinction between being male or female has rather been identified as a moderator than as an antecedent of career success (Ng *et al.*, 2005; Dreher and Cox, 2000; Melamed, 1995). From a relational point of view (see, for example, Kyriakidou and Özbilgin, 2006; Emirbayer, 1997) it is rather the symbolic capital associated with gender and gender role type and its role in awarding positions within the field focused which has to be considered instead. Hence, this paper uses a field, habitus and capital oriented career practices approach (see, for example, Iellatchitch *et al.*, 2003; Mayrhofer *et al.*, 2005; Schneidhofer *et al.*, 2009) inspired by Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 2001; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) in order to address objective career success issues.

In essence, this paper contributes to the literature in a two-fold manner. First, it uses (the concept of) gender not as object, but as realisation of historical acting including the context within which practical actions take place (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1996, p. 160). Hence, gender (and gender role type) is regarded both as the result of the interplay between capital, habitus and field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 126) and as a sort of capital in the field of career (something that Bourdieu did not consider; see Huppertz, 2009, p. 46). In putting emphasis on the latter, the paper enlarges the focus to the concept of gender role types (GRT; see Bem, 1993; Spence and Helmreich, 1978) and takes a look at the context within which career relevant practices unfold, which is often called for (e.g., Peiperl and Gunz, 2007, p. 52; Mayrhofer *et al.*, 2007). In doing so, it draws from insights of applying Bourdieu's theoretical work to organisational analysis (Emirbayer and Johnson, 2008; Swartz, 2008; Özbilgin and Tatli, 2005).

Second, owing to the fact that this resulting system of relations is presumably subject to change over time, let alone that the very concept of career is temporal in nature (Katz, 1980; Roth, 1968), the study uses a longitudinal cohort design, analysing the interrelation of gender, GRT, and objective career success within two cohorts of business school graduates of a large Central European University. Hence, the paper also responds to the call for inclusion of time into the analyses of careers (e.g. Judge and Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007, p. 74).

Theory lens: career practices

The “pillar concepts” (Swartz, 2008, p. 46) of Bourdieu's theory of practice may be defined as field, habitus, and capital, which can be seen as the macro-, meso-, and micro-level of analysis (Özbilgin and Tatli, 2005), respectively. No Bourdieu exegesis shall be provided here, for there are already good “translations” in the literature available (see, for example, Özbilgin and Tatli, 2005), so we just briefly describe our development of his framework.

Any field (for more details see, for example, Martin, 2003) is a mediation between the practices of those who partake of it and the context, like social and economic conditions (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 105), and may be constructed at different levels of aggregation (see, for example, Bourdieu, 1988, Bourdieu *et al.*, 1990). In this paper, we focus on a managerial career field within which careers unfold, because the gendered nature of leadership and management careers is especially salient here, as the “think manager – think male” phenomenon still exists in actors’ minds and bodies (Wood, 2008, p. 625), and business school graduates arguably act therein. Within this field of career, managerial trajectories unfold, and it emerged due to the fact that something was (and is) at stake – in this case, career advancement (Iellatchitch *et al.*, 2003).

On the micro-level of analysis, by contrast, we find several sorts of capital – for example, economic, cultural, social, or symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) – which actors are equipped with. Accumulating capital (and/or influencing the “exchange rates” between different sorts of capital) promote advancement within a field, and actors struggle (in both ways) to increase the face value of their “capital portfolio”. Depending on the amount and the distribution of capital (over time), actors take and get positions within the managerial career field. Especially in the managerial career field, economic capital (mostly represented by income as a measure of objective career success; e.g. Heslin, 2005) is of paramount importance, since it serves as powerful part of symbolic capital reflecting the combination of the basic forms of capital valued within the managerial field of career (Iellatchitch *et al.*, 2003, p. 734), awarding prestige and reputation within the field. Another reflection of symbolic capital which is of particular relevance here is masculine domination (Bourdieu, 2001), pointing at gender and gender role types (GRT) as potential determinants of the actor’s capital development within the managerial field. Career capital, consequently, “consists of the different modes of support the individual obtains and has at his/her disposal and may invest for his/her further career success” (Iellatchitch *et al.*, 2003, p. 733).

Besides the fact that actors continuously respond to their situation in the field with a struggle for relevant capital, as well as over the recognition thereof, they develop a strategy for their advancement (and, vice versa, the field “imposes” a certain “strategy corridor”). This strategy is not fully rational, however. Rather, it is a logic of adjustment of dispositions to position within the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 81). Since a relational theory intends to favour neither structuralistic nor individualistic explanations, it needs another concept on the meso-level of analysis to serve as “mediator” between field and capital: habitus.

Habitus is embodied history of the field, which is internalised as second nature, but forgotten as history (Bourdieu, 1990: 56). It creates, and is reinforced by, a set of dispositions the actors develop (Lahire, 2003). Career habitus (see Mayrhofer *et al.*, 2005) thus allows actors to “act intentionally without strategic intention” within the field of career, in order to play the career game upon the logic of capital implied (and/or to struggle for alternative exchange rates), like a duck takes to water. Career habitus enables and restricts (career) practices, which are neither determined nor completely voluntary. Like career capital, habitus implies a symbolic dimension as well. With the concept of gendered and gendering habitus (see, for example, Engler, 2004), the symbolic violence of masculine domination (Bourdieu, 2001) gets a physical and behavioural equivalence here: “The masculinization of male bodies and feminization of female bodies effects a somatization of the cultural arbitrary which is the durable construction of the unconscious” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 172).

This is the reason for adding GRT as an additional concept to gender in analysing actors' trajectories: Gender Role Orientations as basis of GRT are aspects of one's self concept (Eckes, 2004) and are not dichotomised. Instead of conceptualising gender in a bipolar and unifactorial manner, GRT refers to the degree to which actors describe themselves in terms of instrumental (i.e. masculine) or expressive (i.e. feminine) characteristics, enabling "neither ... nor" (i.e. undifferentiated) and "both ... and" (i.e. androgynous) combinations as well (Hoffmann, 2001, p. 476). Hence, masculinity and femininity are recognised as two independent dimensions.

Career practices, then, emerge due to the interplay of career field, career habitus, and career capital. Symbolic capital associated with gendered and gendering career habitus plays a special role in the managerial career field. On a micro-level, focused here, this means as a result that researchers have not only to take a look on female/male capital (gender), but also on masculine/feminine/androgynous/undifferentiated capital (GRT) in order to capture a broader picture of practical action in career terms.

Hypotheses

A relational perspective calls for an inclusion of history. Hence, we have to recall what Eagly and Carley (2007, p. 2) called the "concrete wall": Women used to face absolute barriers preventing them from entering the labour market and consequently the managerial career field, until the beginning of the twentieth century. Right at the time when the managerial career field emerged, it was a male (and masculine) career field. Hence, the rules of the game initially were masculine, and the games were based upon masculine definitions of domination.

However, in contemporary societies, changes occur: Besides the abolition of explicit rules and norms restricting access to the labour market and thus the managerial career field, equal opportunity legislation took place (for example, in GB in the 1970s, Özbilgin and Woodward, 2004, p. 669). Additionally, birth rates have decreased substantially (Józwiak and Kotowska, 2008), enabling women to work outside their homes. Today, the EU average birth rate is currently 1.5 (Eurostat; cited from Mayrhofer and Schneidhofer, 2009, p. 724), compared to about 2.5 in 1960 (Leasure, 1962). Alongside changes in actors' attitudes (from the "organisation man" to the "dual career couple"), medical technology facilitating control over reproduction supported this development. On top of this, occupations have changed: nowadays there are only few high-status occupations that still favour men's greater size and strength, thus removing one of women's former impediments to gaining power and status (Eagly and Carley, 2007). It should be clear, however, that these contextual changes do not directly influence the cohorts analysed here, for these developments started to take place in the middle of the last century.

Consequently, we concentrate on early and mid-career stage represented by about the first career decade, for a number of concepts and studies indicate that this is an important period in the overall career (e.g. Aryee *et al.*, 1994; Gould and Hawkins, 1978). Similar to biosocial origin theory (Wood and Eagly, 2002) we claim that the symbolic capital associated with gender and GRT capital has changed in favour of women. As a consequence, the income gap between women and men should have decreased for younger generations.

- H1.* Women who started their careers more recently attain a higher proportion of male income during early- and mid-career stage.

One might argue that every field is masculine *per se*, for Bourdieu stresses the concept of symbolic violence in general, dividing the social world in “hegemonic” men and “heretic” women, *together* with a blending of “agency” with “men” (Bourdieu, 2001). Agentic behaviour is stereotyped as “masculine”, conveying assertion and control (like aggressiveness, ambitiousness, dominance, self-confidence, self-reliance, and individualism). Even in fields that seem femininely dominated, Williams (1992) identifies a glass escalator privileging men. On top of this, Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) structure a field over something at stake, which all agents are striving for. Hence, the concept of “upward mobility” and advancing within a field is stressed in (all) actor’s habitus, which again valorises instrumental over communion based strategies (Schneidhofer *et al.*, 2009, 2010; see also Bourdieu, 2005, p. 17). From this perspective, it comes no wonder that, for example, “leadership is ordinarily conflated with men *and* masculinity” (Eagly and Carley, 2007, p. 90, italics added). Apparently, a masculine element reflected in actors’ career practices pays off.

By contrast, feminine or undifferentiated GRT capital should therefore show an unfavourable exchange rate in career success terms. This should be the case regardless of gender, and for earlier as well as more recent careers. However, since we claim that gender, and gender role type, sprout in accordance with the career field and hence reflect the adoption of the rules of this field in terms of career habitus, its consequences for objective career success develop over time. Therefore, this relationship is likely to appear over time only rather than from the outset.

H2. During early and mid-career stage feminine or indifferent GRT attain less income over time than masculine or androgynous GRT.

Facing the structure of this field reflecting existing inequality, “(w)omen respond [...] to their disadvantageous situation by acting more competitively” (Emirbayer, 1997, p. 307). Thus, it is likely that women develop instrumental strategies in order to catch up. Although a meta-analysis of leadership behaviour suggests that female leaders showing their instrumental side are resented (Eagly *et al.*, 1992), a career practices approach suggests that women trying to play the game according to the rules of the field get valued. This line of thought is supported by psychological research, indicating that women nowadays describe themselves as having more instrumental qualities than they did in the past (Twenge, 1997), and that this has advantages at least under certain contextual circumstances (Ashleigh and Tost, 2010; Vinnicombe and Singh, 2002; Fateri and Kleiner, 1992). This has to be especially the case for the managerial field of career, where “men have predominated in leadership roles for so long that leadership itself is perceived as a masculine domain” (Eagly and Carley, 2007, p. 84). This, then, should be reflected in the development of masculine women’s income compared to their androgynous counterparts, which should be comparatively higher in more recent careers, because their career practices change due to gendered and gendering career habitus accomodation.

H3. Masculine women who started their careers more recently attain a higher proportion of androgynous women’s income during early- and mid-career stage.

By contrast, men are presumably subject to a different change (Duehr and Bono, 2006). In times where the “sole-breadwinner-model” is at least in retreat, new roles prevail.

Men are deemed to include “feminine and soft” characteristics as reflected in numerous popular books about reconciling the sexes, the increasing availability of successful female role models in business and in politics, or the calls for alternative ways of doing business in terms of sustainability requiring different competencies beyond the “masculine and hard” approach of “higher-faster-farther”. For example, in the leadership literature, the necessity of leaders being coaches is underlined (Fuimano, 2004). “Male leaders can show their warm, feminine side without penalty” (Eagly and Carley, 2007, p. 105), and they do so because it increasingly pays off in the managerial career field, as the symbolic capital associated with “men” is increasingly androgynous, which is then reflected in male actor’s career habitus and the symbolic capital valued within the field of career.

H4. Androgynous men who started their careers more recently attain a higher proportion of masculine men’s income during early- and mid-career stage.

Data collection and sample

The analyses rest on two samples of business school graduates from a major European university who graduated around 1990 and 2000 and are members of the Vienna Career Panel Project (ViCaPP; see www.vicapp.at). The 1990 sample consists of 175 persons (35 per cent women, mean age 45 ± 3.4 years). The 2000 sample comprises 159 persons (44 per cent women, mean age 36 ± 3.2 years). In both cohorts, the women are on average about one year younger than the men. Concerning age and gender proportions, both cohorts are representative for the respective graduates of the whole university.

The data collection was rather time-consuming for the participants, so it was split into two phases. As the project started in 2000, different approaches were necessary for the two cohorts. Both were sent a questionnaire containing psychometric scales about career aspiration, career tactics, personality and job-related personality as well as sociodemographic data concerning the upbringing, for example urban versus rural environment, parents’ education and occupation, leisure activities during childhood and youth. The initial response rate for the 2000 cohort was close to 20 per cent. For the 1990 cohort, sample size was fixed before, so an “attained” response rate cannot be sensibly reported here; based on the total number of graduates around 1990 the proportion of participants was around 8.5 per cent. Additional information on GRT proportions and mean income can be found in the appendix.

The actual career survey was conducted separately. For the 1990 cohort, it consisted of questionnaire-based interviews with a resumé of all jobs since graduation and several ratings for each year (number of subordinates, job centrality, income, job satisfaction etc.) as well as additional information on each job (e.g. type of contract, amount of weekly work hours, type of organisation). For the 2000 cohort, the same information was gathered with annual surveys from 2002 on. For the 1990 cohort the following analyses include the first ten career years and up to eight years for the 2000 cohort, with participants of who data for less than four career years were available excluded from the sample.

Measures

There are some questionnaires measuring gender roles (for a detailed review, see Hoffmann, 2001), such as the “Adjective Check List” (Williams and Bennett, 1975), the “Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire” (Rosenkrantz *et al.*, 1968), the “(Extended)

Personal Attributes Questionnaire” (Spence *et al.*, 1979), and the “Bem Sex Role Inventory” (Bem, 1974) (cf. Eckes, 2004, p. 166). The idea of including gender role types (GRT) into our research came only after the project was started, so we tried to construct scales measuring GRT based on the psychometric items and scales contained in the questionnaire (see below). Still, we followed a theory-driven approach, taking dimensions of feminine and masculine behaviour identified in the literature (Spence and Helmreich, 1978; Runge *et al.*, 1981; Spence and Buckner, 2000) and looking for items available in the ViCaPP questionnaire from two scales of the German NEO-FFI (emotional stability and conscientiousness; Borkenau and Ostendorf, 1993), the Bochumer Inventory of job-related personality (leadership motivation, achievement orientation, team orientation, flexibility, etc.; Hossiep and Paschen, 1998), a self-monitoring scale (Snyder, 1974; Schiefle, 1990) as well as five scales measuring career-oriented political behaviour and four scales measuring career aspirations (Schiffinger and Strunk, 2003).

The goals for scale construction were good face validity, decent consistency values and little scale inter-correlation. The sample used for the scale analyses was much larger than the abovementioned two cohorts and consisted of almost 1,400 persons (40 per cent female). Cronbach’s α values are 0.77 for masculinity and 0.67 for femininity, which is below desirable standards but still above the consistency values reported for the original scales (Runge *et al.*, 1981, p. 153). Scale inter-correlation was a moderate 0.23, and explorative as well as confirmative factor analyses were rather supportive of the scale properties as well. For more details on the scales, including items and more detailed results of the factor analyses see Schneidhofer *et al.* (2009, 2010).

Following Spence *et al.* (1979), GRT was assigned by a median split of the femininity (fem) and masculinity (mas) scales, resulting in four types:

- (1) undifferentiated (low fem, low mas):
- (2) feminine (high fem, low mas);
- (3) masculine (low fem, high mas); and
- (4) androgynous (high fem, high mas).

The loss of information compared to keeping the scales notwithstanding, the median split follows the literature on GRT (Helmreich *et al.*, 1981; Spence *et al.*, 1974, 1979; Spence, 1991; Spence and Buckner, 2000), fits better with the hypotheses and facilitates interpretation of the results. The median split was done separately for each of the two cohorts as they had different median values; taking the same value for both cohorts would have resulted in an excessively unequal distribution and too few cases for some GRT.

Income is the gross yearly income as reported by the participants (in Euro). Although self-reported measures, especially single-item ones, are susceptible to biases, Podsakoff and Organ (1986, pp. 532f.) find that variables which can be reality checked rarely suffer from significant bias. Judge *et al.* (1995) report a mere 1 per cent difference between self- and archival reports of salary in a sample of 1,338 executives (see also Seibert and Kraimer, 2001, p. 8). Outliers were filtered out for each cohort and each work year, separately for women and men, before conducting the analyses. In addition, all periods of professional time-outs, for example parental leave, were excluded, so that only career years spent in gainful employment were entered into the analyses. The control variables were also asked directly from the participants for each job and/or

year: full-time or part-time contract, actual weekly hours worked, organisation size (recoded into SME versus larger enterprises at the threshold of 250 employees defined by the EU), private company versus other organisation, and whether the organisation was part of the top 10 per cent within the branch or not.

Data analysis

Due to the longitudinal nature of our research, we tested our hypotheses with the mixed linear models procedure (e.g. McCulloch and Searle, 2001) incorporated in SPSS, with career years not only included as a fixed effect but also as an autoregressive (AR1) term in all models. While the purpose of this method and interpretation of the results are similar to general linear models and/or linear regression, it can handle data correlation stemming from repeated measures per case even for unbalanced longitudinal data (e.g. Jennrich and Schluchter, 1986, p. 806) and is therefore well suited to our data structure.

The testing procedures vary a little, as each hypothesis demands a slightly different approach. *H2* only includes an intra-cohort comparison of GRT, so raw income could be used as the dependent variable. By contrast, *H1*, *H3* and *H4* aim at a comparison of cohorts, requiring a way of excluding other cohort effects than those postulated in the hypotheses, such as inflation. The approach chosen here consists of calculating the mean income of the reference group for each cohort and career year and making the attained percentage of this mean income the dependent variable. *H1* is therefore tested by comparing the proportion of mean male income attained by the women of the 1990 versus the 2000 cohort. The procedure for testing *H3* and *H4* is similar, contrasting the proportion of androgynous women's mean income (calculated per cohort and career year) attained by the masculine women of the 1990 cohort versus the 2000 cohort (*H3*) and the proportion of masculine men's income attained by the androgynous men of either cohort (*H4*).

Results

H1 postulates a smaller income gap between men and women for more recent careers. As already mentioned, to correct for inflation and other biases that may make the incomes of the 1990 and 2000 cohort difficult to compare directly, the percentage of mean male income (calculated separately for each cohort and year) attained by the female sample(s) was taken as the dependent variable. According to *H1*, the women of the 2000 cohort should therefore attain a higher percentage of mean male income than their 1990 counterparts. Actually, we found the reverse to be the case. Table I shows the results of this analysis; the coefficients can be read analogous to regression terms. The estimates yield the same income as men at the outset for the 1990 cohort women (based on 46 weekly hours which is the overall sample mean for the observed period), while being in the 2000 cohort lowers the attained proportion of mean male income by an estimated 6 per cent ($p < 0.10$). Therefore, *H1* was not supported by our data, instead our results suggest that the income gap between women and men may have widened rather than narrowed.

According to *H2*, female or undifferentiated GRT earn less than masculine or androgynous GRT in both cohorts. Unlike for *H1*, the income could be taken directly here, as the hypothesis involves no comparison between cohorts. This effect is predicted to develop over time only and not show from the outset. As can be seen in

Predictor term	Women in sample (<i>n</i> = 138)		<i>F</i> value of effect
	Par. estimate	(SE)	
(Constant)	70.62	(6.77)	150.10**
Per weekly hour	0.64	(0.11)	32.17**
Per career year	- 2.21	(0.45)	24.41**
2000 cohort (versus 1990 cohort)	- 6.25	(3.72)	2.83*
SME (versus large company)	- 1.73	(2.30)	0.57
Private company (versus other organisations)	2.04	(2.27)	0.81
Top 10 per cent organisation	1.05	(1.67)	0.39
Part-time contract	- 13.83	(4.02)	11.81**

Notes: **p* < 0.10; ***p* < 0.01

Table I.
Proportion of mean male income (per cent): model estimates and effect tests for *H1*

Table II, *H2* is supported by the data. While the initial income estimates for the androgynous/masculine GRT are slightly lower than for the undifferentiated/feminine GRT (not statistically significant), this effect is very soon offset by the significant GRT × career year term, and after one year (2000 cohort) and two years (1990 cohort) respectively, the androgynous/masculine GRT are better off regarding income. In addition to the results shown, another explorative model was calculated, including cohort and gender in (longitudinal) interaction with GRT to see whether this observed effect is only based on one sex and/or one cohort, but the development suggested by the results shown here is stable across both cohorts and sexes. Table III shows the results separately for the 1990 and 2000 cohorts.

H3 posits that the income attainment of masculine compared to androgynous women favours the 2000 cohort during early and mid-career stage. Testing was done in a similar way as for *H1* by calculating the mean income of androgynous women for each cohort and career year and taking the percentage of this mean income attained by masculine women as the dependent variable. The results do not support our hypothesis: the masculine women of the 2000 cohort even attain a slightly lower proportion of the androgynous women's mean income compared to the 1990 cohort, but this effect is insignificant.

Analogously, according to *H4* the relative income of androgynous compared to masculine men should be higher in the 2000 cohort than in the 1990 cohort. This assumption is corroborated by the data; the estimate for the 2000 cohort is higher than for the 1990 cohort with *p* < 0.01. The other results are rather inconspicuous again, except maybe that unlike for the women where the career year had no effect on the masculine versus androgynous income proportions (see Table III), androgynous men appear to gradually fall back compared to their masculine counterparts as the career progresses by an estimated 3 per cent per career year; still, for the 2000 cohort, the results suggest that androgynous men have a slight edge over their masculine counterparts even at the end of the observed career duration; for the 1990 cohort, this is not the case, as can be seen from the parameter estimates for career year and 2000 cohort in Table IV.

Not surprisingly, the AR(1) term is significant in all models, with coefficients between 0.75 and 0.89. Although the purpose of these models was to test specific effects for significance rather than predicting income, we looked at the amount of explained variance as well. Although *R*² values for mixed linear models are far less common than

Table II.
Income (€): model
estimates and effect tests
for H_2 (separately for
1990 and 2000 cohort)

Predictor term	1990 cohort ($n = 158$)		2000 cohort ($n = 157$)		F value of effect
	Par. estimate	(SE)	Par. estimate	(SE)	
(Constant)	11,380.92	(3,164.28)	12,513.99	(4,683.33)	0.96
Per weekly hour	144.32	(46.02)	292.57	(67.58)	18.74**
Per career year	3,902.37	(287.57)	5,525.55	(570.32)	308.12**
Female (versus male)	1,493.14	(2,836.32)	1,111.71	(3,653.10)	0.09
Androgynous/masculine (versus undifferentiated/feminine)	-2,828.24	(2,697.10)	-1,553.86	(3,633.29)	0.18
Female per career year	-1,552.51	(382.52)	-2,276.28	(641.86)	12.58**
Androgynous/masculine per career year	1,339.64	(356.46)	2,278.56	(634.28)	12.91**
SME (versus large company)	-1,071.98	(1,032.28)	-1,860.83	(1,227.70)	2.30
Private company (versus other organisations)	503.73	(1,402.14)	1,430.96	(1,178.53)	1.47
Top 10 per cent organisation	909.17	(832.36)	-1,061.84	(896.62)	1.40
Part-time contract	-4,724.63	(1,705.65)	-16,891.91	(2,774.89)	37.06

Note: ** $p < 0.01$

for OLS models, we chose a measure for fixed effect models (as employed here) proposed by Liu *et al.* (2008, p. 1083), with similar properties and interpretation as the usual R^2 and the values for the analyses just presented ranging between 0.29 and 0.38.

Still a man's world?

Limitations

Most of the shortcomings of the present study have already been mentioned: the use of self-report measures, the difference in survey design between the two cohorts (real-time versus retrospective, although this should not result in any gender- or GRT-specific biases), and the potentially debatable properties of our scales measuring gender role orientation, despite their fair characteristics according to the scale analyses. Income as sole measure of objective career success may be contestable as well (Heslin, 2005), on the other hand it is – unlike hierarchical status, promotions or number of subordinates – arguably a criterion of objective career success that is comparable across diverse industries and functions.

Discussion

This analysis again confirms that gender is a relevant variable, which is hardly surprising given the ample evidence in previous literature. However, using a more

Predictor term	Masculine women (<i>n</i> = 23)		<i>F</i> value of effect
	Par. estimate	(SE)	
(Constant)	37.50	(18.33)	5.38*
Per weekly hour	1.27	(0.29)	19.75**
Per career year	−0.54	(1.23)	0.17
2000 cohort (versus 1990 cohort)	−4.33	(9.79)	0.20
SME (versus large company)	−3.58	(7.30)	0.24
Private company (versus other organisations)	8.23	(7.04)	1.37
Top 10 per cent organisation	−6.53	(4.53)	2.08
Part-time contract	−6.87	(10.15)	0.46

Notes: **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01

Table III.
Proportion of androgynous women's mean income (per cent): model estimates and effect tests for H3

Predictor term	Androgynous men (<i>n</i> = 57)		<i>F</i> value of effect
	Par. estimate	(SE)	
(Constant)	76.38	(11.69)	67.86*
Per weekly hour	0.79	(0.19)	18.08*
Per career year	−2.89	(0.85)	11.56*
2000 cohort (versus 1990 cohort)	22.09	(8.01)	7.61*
SME (versus large company)	−2.88	(3.85)	0.47
Private company (versus other organisation)	−0.34	(4.34)	0.01
Top 10 percent organisation	3.86	(2.79)	1.91
Part-time contract	−21.48	(7.19)	8.93*

Note: **p* < 0.01

Table IV.
Proportion of masculine men's mean income in %: model estimates and effect tests for H4

differentiated concept of gender beyond the mere male/female dichotomy adds to the depth of the analysis.

Our main theoretical assumptions were that the managerial career field was inherently dominated by masculine qualities, putting women at a disadvantage, but that these rules slowly change, decreasing the gender gap in income and increasingly admitting masculine behaviour for women playing in the managerial field and a touch of feminine behaviour for their male counterparts. The results represent rather mixed evidence for these assumptions and draw a somewhat sinister picture of the postulated change in rules, at least from a gender equality point of view.

First, the slow reduction of the income gap mentioned in the introduction completely failed to materialise for our sample. Quite the reverse, the women in the 2000 sample appeared to be even slightly worse off than their 1990 counterparts. This could at least partly be the result of our sample coming from Austria, a country which not only was/is found to rate very high on Hofstede's masculinity index (Hofstede, 2010) and "shaped by patterns of inequality" (Bendl *et al.*, 2010, p. 28), but also (consequently?) performs rather poorly in terms of equal pay: As far as the Gender Gap Report is concerned, Austria ranks 42nd out of 134 countries (Zahidi and Ibarra, 2010: 20), and women earn on average 25.5 per cent less than men (Eurostat, 2010). The latter is especially interesting since the European Union's (EU) average wage difference is 17.6 per cent, with 25 of 27 participating countries – all but Estonia – denoting a more favourable division of earnings (Eurostat, 2010). Nonetheless, it might suggest even on an international level that lip service to equal pay is still well ahead of its actual implementation.

The result that a lack of male and/or masculine capital denotes a disadvantage in the managerial career field (at least in terms of income as arguably the "strongest" and most versatile form of career capital) was in line with our hypothesis, and this appears to be the case in both cohorts and for either gender. It was also apparent that "doing gender" (West and Zimmerman, 1987) in career fields is based on the interplay of capital, habitus, and field, its consequences therefore only developing over time (as was already found in Strunk and Hermann, 2009, and also reflected in our analyses). These results suggest that – put in a very simplistic way – the "smell of oestrogen", be it by gender or gender role, tends to hamper career progression compared to a distinct testosterone odour (that the latter may be more than unduly overvalued – e.g. Baron and Newman, 1990 – and lead to results that are far from "male rationality" – Coates and Herbert, 2008 – is a discussion beyond the scope of this paper).

From this perspective, the results for the last two hypotheses appear as a mixed blessing. On the one hand, the results for *H4* suggest that the field increasingly accepts and even rewards men who adopt an increasingly feminine gender role (as long as they do not relinquish their masculinity). Theoretically, this might imply that the exchange rate of feminine capital to symbolic capital is approximating the exchange rate of masculine capital to symbolic capital, at least in connection with male capital. On the other hand, this sort of "leaning towards the other gender" does not pay off for women in the same manner, at least not if one lets the less successful GRT (feminine and/or undifferentiated) aside. This insight is supported by psychological literature, indicating that women do not describe themselves as less feminine nowadays, as they used to do in the past (Eagly and Carley, 2007, p. 38).

By and large, our findings suggest that even for a highly educated sample of persons who have already overcome many initial barriers by virtue of their social origin (Meyer and Iellatchitch, 2005) and their educational achievements, therefore starting on a high and rather homogeneous level concerning initial career capital, female and male as well as their interplay with feminine and masculine capital has significant effects on the accumulation of economic capital as the actors make their way through the field. They also suggest that within ten years, these effects have changed somewhat, though ultimately not in a favourable way from an equal opportunities perspective despite political efforts and changing gender roles and stereotypes. Future research will hopefully be able to shed light on the question whether and to which extent this is just owing to the inertia of the field as opposed to a sustained dominance of masculine patterns that, due to the basic rules of the game, will never be satisfactorily overcome.

References

- Aryee, S., Chay, Y.W. and Chef, J. (1994), "An investigation of the predictors and outcomes of career commitment in three career stages", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Ashleigh, S.R. and Tost, L.P. (2010), "Agentive women and communal leadership: how role prescriptions confer advantage to top women leaders", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95 No. 2, pp. 221-35.
- Baron, J.N. and Newman, A.E. (1990), "For what it's worth: organizations, occupations, and the value of work done by women and nonwhites", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 155-75.
- Bem, S.L. (1974), "The measurement of psychological androgyny", *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 155-62.
- Bem, S.L. (1993), *The Lenses of Gender*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Bendl, R., Hanappi-Egger, E. and Hofmann, R. (2010), "Austrian perspectives on diversity management and equal treatment: regulations, debates, practices and trends", in Klarsfeld, A. (Ed.), *International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work. Country Perspectives on Diversity and Equal Treatment*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 27-44.
- Borkenau, P. and Ostendorf, F. (1993), *NEO-Fünf-Faktoren Inventar (NEO-FFI) nach Costa und McCrae*, Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie, Göttingen.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977), *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986), "The forms of capital", in Richardson, J.G. (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Greenwood Press, New York, NY, pp. 241-58.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988), *Homo Academicus*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990), *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001), *Masculine Domination*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005), *Die männliche Herrschaft*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt a. Main.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J.D. (1996), *Reflexive Anthropologie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt a. Main.
- Bourdieu, P., Bouhedja, S., Christin, R. and Givry, C. (1990), "Un placement de père de famille. La maison individuelle: spécificité du produit et logique du champ de production", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, Vol. 81 Nos 81/82, pp. 6-33.

- Burke, R.J. (2006), "Women's career development: recent international research", *Equal Opportunities International*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 233-5.
- Coates, J.M. and Herbert, J. (2008), "Endogenous steroids and financial risk taking on a London trading floor", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 105 No. 16, pp. 6167-72.
- Dreher, G.F. and Cox, T.H.J. (2000), "Labor market mobility and cash compensation: the moderating effects of race and gender", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 5, pp. 890-900.
- Duehr, E.E. and Bono, J.E. (2006), "Men, women, and managers: are stereotypes finally changing?", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 59 No. 4, pp. 815-46.
- Eagly, A.H. and Carley, L.L. (2007), *Through The Labyrinth: The Truth about How Women Become Leaders*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Eagly, A.H., Makhijani, G. and Klonsky, B.G. (1992), "Gender and the emergence of leaders: a meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 117 No. 1, pp. 125-45.
- Eckes, T. (2004), "Geschlechterstereotype: von Rollen, Identitäten und Vorurteilen", in Becker, R. and Kortendiek, B. (Eds), *Handbuch Frauen und Geschlechterforschung. Theorie, Methoden, Empirie*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden, pp. 165-77.
- Emirbayer, M. (1997), "Manifesto for a relational sociology", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 103 No. 2, pp. 281-317.
- Emirbayer, M. and Johnson, V. (2008), "Bourdieu and organizational analysis", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 1-44.
- Engler, S. (2004), "Habitus und sozialer Raum: zur Nutzung der Konzepte Pierre Bourdieus in der Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung", in Becker, R. and Kortendiek, B. (Eds), *Handbuch der Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung. Theorie, Methoden, Empirie*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden, pp. 222-33.
- Eurostat (2010), *Einkommensschere Frauen-Männer in der EU. Differenz der Gehälter zwischen Frauen und Männern 2007 in % in Betrieben mit mindestens zehn Beschäftigten*, Eurostat, Luxembourg.
- Fateri, N. and Kleiner, B.H. (1992), "The status and sex-role orientation of female managers in corporate America", *Equal Opportunities International*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 14-18.
- Fuimano, J. (2004), "Add coaching to your leadership repertoire", *Nursing Management*, Vol. 35 No. 1, p. 16.
- Gould, S.B. and Hawkins, B.L. (1978), "Organizational career stage as a moderator of the satisfaction-performance relationship", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 434-540.
- Helmreich, R.L., Spence, J.T. and Wilhelm, J.A. (1981), "A psychometric analysis of the personal attributes questionnaire", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 7 No. 11, pp. 1097-108.
- Heslin, P.A. (2005), "Conceptualizing and evaluating career success", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 113-36.
- Hoffmann, R.M. (2001), "The measurement of masculinity and femininity: historical perspective and implications for counseling", *Journal of Counseling & Development*, Vol. 79 No. 4, pp. 472-85.
- Hofstede, G. (2010), "Geert Hofstede cultural dimensions", available at: www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_austria.shtml (accessed April 2, 2010).
- Hossiep, R. and Paschen, M. (1998), *Das Bochumer Inventar zur berufsbezogenen Persönlichkeitsbeschreibung (BIP)*, Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie, Göttingen.

-
- Huppertz, K. (2009), "Reworking Bourdieu's 'capital': feminine and female capitals in the field of paid caring work", *Sociology*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 45-66.
- Iellatchitch, A., Mayrhofer, W. and Meyer, M. (2003), "Career fields: a small step towards a grand career theory?", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 728-50.
- Jennrich, R.I. and Schluchter, M.D. (1986), "Unbalanced repeated-measures models with structured covariance matrices", *Biometrics*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 805-20.
- Józwiak, J. and Kotowska, I. (2008), "Decreasing birth rates in Europe: reasons and remedies", *European View*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 225-36.
- Judge, T.A. and Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D. (2007), "Personality and career success", in Gunz, H. and Peiperl, M. (Eds), *Handbook of Career Studies*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 59-78.
- Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Bourdeau, J.W. and Bretz, R.D. (1995), "An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 485-519.
- Katz, R. (1980), "Time and work: toward an integrative perspective", in Staw, B.M. and Cummings, L.L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 81-127.
- Kyriakidou, O. and Özbilgin, M.F. (Eds) (2006), *Relational Perspectives in Organizational Studies: A Research Companion*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Lahire, B. (2003), "From the habitus to an individual heritage of dispositions. Towards a sociology at the level of the individual", *Poetics*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 329-55.
- Leasure, J.W. (1962), "Changing birth and reproduction rates, 1950-1960", *Population Index*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 13-18.
- Liu, H., Zheng, Y. and Shen, L. (2008), "Goodness-of-fit measures of R^2 for repeated measures mixed effect models", *Journal of Applied Statistics*, Vol. 35 No. 10, pp. 1081-92.
- Lyness, K.S. and Thompson, D.E. (1997), "Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 3, pp. 359-75.
- Lyness, K.S. and Thompson, D.E. (2000), "Climbing the corporate ladder: do female and male executives follow the same route?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 1, pp. 86-101.
- McCulloch, C.E. and Searle, S.R. (2001), *Generalized Linear and Mixed Models*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Martin, J.L. (2003), "What is field theory?", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 109 No. 1, pp. 1-49.
- Mayrhofer, W. and Schneiderhofer, T.M. (2009), "The lay of the land. European career research and its future", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 4, pp. 721-37.
- Mayrhofer, W., Iellatchitch, A. and Meyer, M. (2005), "Career habitus revisited. Complicated and incomprehensible answers to questions nobody asked?", paper presented at the 21st Colloquium of the European Group of Organizational Studies (EGOS), Berlin, 30 June-2 July.
- Mayrhofer, W., Meyer, M. and Steyrer, J. (2007), "Contextual issues in the study of careers", in Gunz, H. and Peiperl, M. (Eds), *Handbook of Career Studies*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 215-40.
- Melamed, T. (1995), "Career success: the moderating effect of gender", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 35-60.

- Meyer, M. and Iellatchitch, A. (2005), "Über den Stallgeruch: soziale Herkunft, Lebensstil und Karriererfolg", in Mayrhofer, W., Meyer, M. and Steyrer, J. (Eds), *Macht? Erfolg? Reich? Glücklich? Einflussfaktoren auf Karrieren*, Linde international, Wien, pp. 100-31.
- Ng, T.W.H., Eby, L.T., Sorensen, K.L. and Feldman, D.C. (2005), "Predictors of objective and subjective career success: a meta-analysis", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 58 No. 2, pp. 367-408.
- Özbilgin, M. and Tatli, A. (2005), "Understanding Bourdieu's contribution to organization and management studies", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 855-69.
- Özbilgin, M.F. and Woodward, D. (2004), "'Belonging' and 'otherness': sex equality in banking in Turkey and Britain", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 11 No. 6, pp. 668-88.
- Peiperl, M. and Gunz, H. (2007), "Taxonomy of career studies", in Gunz, H. and Peiperl, M. (Eds), *Handbook of Career Studies*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 39-54.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and Organ, D.W. (1986), "Self-reports in organizational research: problems and prospects", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 531-44.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I. and Broverman, D.M. (1968), "Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students", *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 287-95.
- Roth, J.A. (1968), "The study of the career timetables", in Glaser, B. (Ed.), *Organizational Careers – A Sourcebook for Theory*, Aldine, Chicago, IL, pp. S35-S49.
- Runge, T.E., Frey, D., Gollwitzer, P.M., Helmreich, R.L. and Spence, J.T. (1981), "Masculine (instrumental) and feminine (expressive) traits. A comparison between students in the United States and West Germany", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 142-62.
- Schiefle, U. (1990), *Einstellung, Selbstkonsistenz und Verhalten*, Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie, Göttingen.
- Schiffinger, M. and Strunk, G. (2003), "Zur Messung von Karrieretaktiken und ihrer Zusammenhänge mit Karriereerfolg und Karriereaspirationen", in Hitzler, R. and Pfadenhauer, M. (Eds), *Karrieropolitik. Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion erfolgsorientierten Handelns*, Leske & Budrich, Opladen, pp. 295-313.
- Schneidhofer, T.M., Schiffinger, M. and Mayrhofer, W. (2009), "Men and women – what else? Gender role types and their effects on objective career success over time", paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL, 7-11 August.
- Schneidhofer, T.M., Schiffinger, M. and Mayrhofer, W. (2010), "Mind the (gender) gap. Gender, gender role types, and their effects on objective career success over time", *Management Revue*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 437-57.
- Seibert, S.E. and Kraimer, M.L. (2001), "The five-factor model of personality and career success", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58 No. 1, pp. 1-21.
- Snyder, M. (1974), "Self-monitoring of expressive behavior", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 526-37.
- Spence, J.T. (1991), "Do the BSRI and PAQ measure the same or different concepts?", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 141-65.
- Spence, J.T. and Buckner, C.E. (2000), "Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes: what do they signify?", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 44-62.
- Spence, J.T. and Helmreich, R.L. (1978), *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, & Antecedents*, University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.

- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L. and Holahan, C.K. (1979), "Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting-out behaviors", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 37 No. 10, pp. 1673-82.
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L. and Stapp, J. (1974), "The personal attributes questionnaire: a measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity", *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, Vol. 4 No. 43, p. 617.
- Strunk, G. and Hermann, A. (2009), "Berufliche Chancengleichheit von Frauen und Männern", *Eine empirische Untersuchung zum Gender Pay Gap*, *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 237-57.
- Swartz, D. (2008), "Bringing Bourdieu's master concepts into organizational analysis", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 45-52.
- Twenge, J.M. (1997), "Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: a meta-analysis", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 36 Nos 5/6, pp. 305-25.
- Vinnicombe, S. and Singh, V. (2002), "Sex role stereotyping and requisites of successful top managers", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 17 Nos 3/4, pp. 120-31.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1987), "Doing gender", *Gender & Society*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 125-51.
- Williams, C. (1992), "The glass escalator: hidden advantages for men in the 'female' professions", *Social Problems*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 253-67.
- Williams, J.E. and Bennett, S.M. (1975), "The definition of sex stereotypes via the adjective check list", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 327-37.
- Wood, G. (2008), "Gender stereotypical attitudes. Past, present and future influences on women's career advancement", *Equal Opportunities International*, Vol. 27 No. 7, pp. 613-28.
- Wood, W. and Eagly, A.H. (2002), "A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: implications for the origins of sex differences", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 128 No. 5, pp. 699-727.
- Zahidi, S. and Ibarra, H. (2010), *The Corporate Gender Gap Report 2010*, World Economic Forum, Geneva.

Appendix. Descriptive statistics on gender, GRT, and income

	Mean income (SD) career years 1-10 (in €)			Mean income (SD) career years 1-10 (in €)	
<i>1990 cohort</i>					
Women (<i>n</i> = 62)	31,633	(9,747)	Undifferentiated (<i>n</i> = 15)	28,866	(8,746)
			Feminine (<i>n</i> = 21)	28,464	(5,949)
			Masculine (<i>n</i> = 11)	33,298	(12,316)
			Androgynous (<i>n</i> = 15)	37,615	(10,715)
Men (<i>n</i> = 113)	39,339	(11,932)	Undifferentiated (<i>n</i> = 34)	39,083	(10,736)
			Feminine (<i>n</i> = 19)	35,969	(13,549)
			Masculine (<i>n</i> = 29)	42,853	(11,128)
			Androgynous (<i>n</i> = 31)	38,398	(12,604)
<i>2000 cohort</i>					
Women (<i>n</i> = 70)	39,297	(13,758)	Undifferentiated (<i>n</i> = 24)	33,957	(12,860)
			Feminine (<i>n</i> = 17)	40,037	(15,190)
			Masculine (<i>n</i> = 13)	41,767	(10,398)
			Androgynous (<i>n</i> = 16)	44,512	(14,280)
Men (<i>n</i> = 89)	52,675	(19,520)	Undifferentiated (<i>n</i> = 25)	47,809	(19,331)
			Feminine (<i>n</i> = 10)	37,215	(11,446)
			Masculine (<i>n</i> = 23)	50,405	(15,888)
			Androgynous (<i>n</i> = 31)	63,721	(19,367)

Table AI.

Corresponding author

Thomas M. Schneidhofer can be contacted at: thomas.schneidhofer@wu.ac.at