

THE SUPPLY SIDE OF OCCUPATIONAL SEX SEGREGATION

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

by

Brennan Allison Schrade

August 2014

© 2014 Brennan Schrade

ABSTRACT

While gender was previously thought to be one of the largest mitigating factors in application decisions among equally qualified graduates, this study found that an even more powerful motivator might be the applicants' parenthood status or the timeline in which they plan to have children. With this factor included, this study found significant differences in the weekly hours and salaries of parents. Another notable finding is that this study demonstrated that women are receiving either equal or higher pay in nearly all of the fields for which information was collected, and the surface level analysis that showed a negative correlation between being a women and salary is actually a factor of more women choosing lower paying fields (like human resources). This study demonstrates that previous research of gendered pay biases and the roots of occupational sex segregation are possibly outdated and incorrect.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Brennan Schrade graduated with her undergraduate degree in Industrial and Labor Relations from Cornell University in the Spring of 2013. She grew attached to and invested in her honors thesis during her senior year, which led to her pursuit of this thesis and the topics it covers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Bill Sonnenstuhl for his continued guidance, patience, and encouragement throughout my time as his advisee. I would also like to thank him for supporting me in pursuing this degree and his uplifting, kind words when I was discouraged. I would also like to thank Sam Bacharach for being the second chair on my committee and for his guidance as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical Sketch.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Gender Segregation in Occupations.....	2
Application Decision Factors and Gender Role Beliefs.....	6
Application Decision Factors.....	7
Preference for Specific Rewards.....	7
Identification with Gendered Careers.....	9
Expectation of Success.....	13
Methods.....	14
Sample.....	14
Instruments.....	15
Measures.....	16
Results.....	20
Alternative Explanations and Limitations.....	33
Conclusion.....	35
Appendix.....	38

LIST OF TABLES

1. Average Salaries within Functions by Gender	27
2. Average Salaries by Gender and Parenthood Status.....	28
3. Parenthood Status, Descriptive Variables, and Work/Life Balance Markers.....	29
4. Work/Life Balance Variables by Parenthood Status within Gender.....	30
5. Job Identification within Programs by Gender.....	31
6. Application Behavior within Programs.....	32

INTRODUCTION

Occupational sex-segregation has been a mainstay in our society for centuries. Yet, even as women begin to enter previously male-dominated industries at a growing rate, segregation remains in levels of achievement between men and women in the workplace. With lower pay for commensurate work and fewer opportunities for advancement, much attention has been drawn to occupational sex-segregation. However, what was long assumed to be demand-side discrimination – with employers making biased hiring/promotion decisions – may actually be partially explained by supply-side decisions. Little attention has been given to the possibility – and likelihood – that even career-focused women want different things in their work roles than their male counterparts.

The interesting aspect of these gendered choices is their (likely) differing influences from external sources, like gender role socialization. Men and women have been raised in a society that holds them to dissimilar standards, preferring women to be submissive and comforting, while men should be decisive leaders (Eagly and Karau 2002). Because of these expectations and others, individuals internalize societal limitations, albeit to different extents. Gender-focused sociologist, Shelley Correll (2001), noted that, “what is needed is an approach that recognizes that what may appear to be choices based on preferences or tastes are, in fact, choices that are constrained or limited by the culture in which individuals are embedded.” From this, research has shown that stereotypes and assumptions about different groups often lead individuals to under or over evaluate their own abilities (Steele 1997, Correll 2004). These self-evaluations then lead individuals to anticipate more or less success with certain endeavors (like a math class or a “masculine” career path), which influences individuals to pursue (or not) various career paths associated with the characteristics they identify with. With that need in mind, this study will look at male and female professional degree students working towards their MBA and

their MILR (master's in industrial and labor relations). In this population, it is likely that the women in the group internalized social gender role expectations and status beliefs to a lesser extent than their less occupational achievement-driven counterparts, as they have pursued higher education at an elite university. This distinction, however, makes it a very interesting sample to look at, especially to understand the pervasiveness of gendered application decisions differences.

GENDER SEGREGATION IN OCCUPATIONS

While this study focuses on supply-side gender segregation in occupations, it is important to know that demand-side segregation (i.e., segregating acts on the side of the employer) is not obsolete. These actions are useful for analyzing because individuals may assume that they will be subject to a biased judgment in certain ways and change their application plans to compensate for such a judgment. Some of the more prevalent gendered biases include judgments on parenthood which tend to disadvantage mothers but aid fathers, by way of pay and perceived competence (Correll et al 2007). For example, while women are judged less well than men on a variety of characteristics, when the factor of parenthood is introduced, evaluators rated fathers the highest (suggested a salary of \$152,000), followed by childless women (\$151,000), then childless men (\$148,000), and finally mothers (\$139,000) with all other factors held equal (Correll et al 2007). In the same study, scales for competence and perceived commitment to work followed a similar pattern.

Research has shown that de-segregation of workplaces happens most often through the hiring stage rather than through promotion (Baron et al 1991), but progress towards greater integration is slow going when the supply networks are very much segregated by gender, as they have been shown to regularly be (Grannovetter and Tilly 1988). This area of segregation is called the supply-side, as it is actions from potential applicants that lead to the gender split –

when men and women decide whether or not to enter themselves into occupational supply networks (through submitting applications for open positions). The two main theories used to explain supply-side gender segregation decisions are human capital theory and gender role socialization, but they each have separate shortcomings. This study takes aspects of both theories, combined with evidence and claims of other academics, to test new hypotheses on supply-side occupational sex segregation.

Human capital theory explains occupational sex-segregation with the idea that women choose female-dominated jobs because they believe they will maximize their lifetime earnings in an occupational path that allows for career interruptions and will maximize their ability to fulfill both family and work responsibilities (Glass 1990). These “feminine” jobs have smaller penalties for extended periods of time out of the labor force (e.g., maternity leave) and higher starting salaries. Contrary to popular belief, however, Glass (1990) also showed that male-dominated occupations had more autonomy – and therefore flexibility – than did female-dominated jobs. This flexibility and autonomy can translate into a greater ability to attend to sick children or make other similar personal decisions during traditional work time. Further, England (1982) proved that women in male dominated occupations actually had higher lifetime earnings than their counterparts in female-dominated jobs, thus disproving the beliefs the form the basis of human capital theory. Since we have now established that earnings and flexibility are both not maximized in female-dominated jobs, the findings beg the question of why women are still choosing those “feminine” career paths (Correll 2001 dis).

Apart from the human capital theory, there is the theory that women self-select out of male-dominated careers because they do not believe they possess the abilities necessary to succeed. Steele (2010) found throughout his research on stereotype threats that perceptions of

one's own ability are affected by socialization. People assess their own ability based on what they have been led to believe is true about the groups they belong to. In the case of gendered ability differentiation, Correll (2001) found that equally qualified (controlling for grades and test scores in mathematics) high school students rated their own ability in math differently, with males assessing themselves significantly above females, which follows the prevalent stereotype that men are better than women at math and physical sciences. Further, she found that the higher a student rated their ability in one area, the more likely they were to pursue a similar subject in college, which led to a higher percentage of male students in math/science disciplines in college. Notably, though, when Correll (2001) controlled for students' self-assessment score, the college math enrollment gap disappeared and the differentiated major choice was reduced. These findings can lead to the notion that some women may not apply to masculine jobs because they believe themselves less capable than their male peers, as a result of internalizing stereotypes. While this theory certainly has merit, it is unlikely that it explains all of the differences in gendered application decisions.

Understanding the drivers behind application segregation is important because they provide insight into the causes of workplace segregation, especially in upper-level management positions in which women are historically underrepresented. Research on gendered application segregation involves combining theories on gender gaps in career outcomes, tokenism, the gendered nature of certain work tasks, social role theory/role congruity theory, and gendered approaches to competition to gain a more holistic understanding of why equally qualified men and women choose to pursue different career paths.

The article, "Do Women Choose Different Jobs from Men? Mechanisms of Application Segregation in the Market for Managerial Workers" by Roxana Barbulescu and Matthew Bidwell

(2013) established some of the first direct evidence of supply-side gender segregation in application decisions, as well as demonstrated gendered identification with certain career paths. Notably, it recognized that equally qualified men and women do not necessarily want the same things in their careers.

This study replicates Barbulescu and Bidwell's 2013 study with a more diverse sample that includes a greater proportion of women and an additional professional degree program, as compared to their sampled (an accelerated, outside of the US) MBA program made up by 23% females. Additionally, this study slightly tweaks the instruments used by Barbulescu and Bidwell in an effort to determine if their findings are generalizable to other managerial/professional labor markets, as well as refines their constructs of work/life balance and parenthood. Additionally, instead of collecting data in three stages as they did, this research collected much of the same information from one survey. Through these changes, this study tests some of Barbulescu and Bidwell's hypotheses, as well as introduces a few new hypotheses. The sample in this study includes professional graduate students at Cornell University in the business school and School of Industrial and Labor Relations. The students in these populations are clearly career and success-driven, evidenced by their pursuit of a professional degree at an elite institution. The two groups range from predominantly male in the business school (30% female) to more gender equal in the ILR school (56% female). Further, the careers that typically follow graduation from the two programs vary a bit based on types of work done, though many aspects of the most prevalent positions (levels of stress, autonomy, etc) are comparable. With the larger variation in peer gender-makeup and future careers, this study was able to gather more evidence about tokenism as well as expectations of success as a result of gender role socialization. Further, if strong connections are seen in this research between gender and application decisions

especially in career-driven women who may be more open to androgynous familial roles, then that would indicate that the effects of gender-socialization and norms would likely be even stronger on the application decisions of women that hold more traditional gender roles.

APPLICATION DECISION FACTORS AND GENDER ROLE BELIEFS

The phase of applying to jobs is an interesting place to look to better understand causes of segregation. Previously, much research has been done to understand the employer side of handling applications and hiring decisions (Heilman 1980), but only recently has research begun on the applicant side of the hiring decisions. Interestingly, employer actions may not even be the primary cause of the persistence of sex-segregation as, “considerable sex segregation appears in the career trajectories of men and women prior to the point of hire and, consequently, prior to working in organizations” (Correll 2001). The application phase is important because gender desegregation in male-dominated workplaces cannot happen if women are not applying to the open positions in them, especially considering that gender desegregation more often happens at the hiring stage rather than through promotion or other internal mobility (Baron et al 1991). An underlying issue in the quest for occupational desegregation, as mentioned previously, is that research has shown that the supply networks from which employers recruit are already very much segregated by gender (Grannovetter and Tilly 1988). Because it has been established that women are, in fact, not applying to these male-dominated positions, the next area of research is to find reasons why not. Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) looked at a variety of factors (preferences for specific rewards, gendered job identification, and expectations of success) and their connections with application segregation to find answers on what is involved in differing job application decisions among equally qualified men and women. This study does the same,

while also introducing more context around gender role socialization and how it affects the three main decision factors.

Application Decision Factors

Potential workers decide which jobs to apply to based on the kinds of jobs they want.

While this general idea may seem self-evident, Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) summarized the factors that affect those decisions into three concepts. First, workers factor in their preferences for specific rewards from their jobs. These could be monetary, intellectual, or social types of rewards. Second, workers consider how they identify with certain jobs. Consistency theory lends the idea here that workers identify more strongly with jobs that are aligned with other identities they hold – whether those be as a mother, Christian, extrovert, etc. Lastly, workers evaluate their perceived chance of application success as well as any penalties for failure when deciding where to (or where not to) apply. Expectancy theory argues that individuals will be less likely to pursue opportunities in which they do not anticipate success, for fear of not only wasted time/effort, but also psychological costs of failure. A combination of these three factors was shown to drive the gender-differentiated decisions of students in their study (Barbulescu and Bidwell 2013).

Preference for Specific Rewards

Men and women have been shown to prefer different forms of rewards more than others from their jobs. Eagly (1987) identified masculine and feminine stereotyped reward structures; whereby, men seek extrinsic rewards and women gravitate towards altruistic and intrinsic rewards. Consistent with those stereotypes, Konrad et al (2000) found that in terms of job attributes, men showed an increased preference for monetary earnings over women. Flexible

work schedules are one of the specific rewards that an individual considers when submitting job applications. Typically, women are the dominant group preferring flexible work schedules, as traditional gender roles allocate many of the housekeeping and familial responsibilities to women. Whether or not female applicants already have families and these responsibilities, they may plan ahead for what they believe will be their situation in the future or may have an intrinsic preference for certain working conditions, unknowingly, because of how they have been socialized.

From a past-facing perspective, Bertrand, Goldin, and Katz (2009) attributed the gender gap in career outcomes of MBA students (as previously mentioned) to differences in training prior to MBA graduation, differences in career interruptions, and differences in weekly hours worked. Women are shown to have less prior training, more career interruptions (often for childbirth/familial responsibilities), and less weekly hours (again, for child-care/home-responsibilities). Their ideas of training prior to MBA graduation are relatable to the questions that Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) asked about previous industry experience. Interestingly, they noted that 13% of the women in their sample were not working 9 years after graduation, as compared to only 1% of the men. Additionally, Bertrand et al (2009) found that women who had children worked 24% fewer hours per week than the average man, while childless women only worked 3.3% fewer hours. Typically, job characteristics are negotiated in conjunction with each other. So, if an offer allows a worker to have fewer weekly hours, it would also likely provide a lower base pay. Similarly if a worker had a flexible work schedule or the opportunity for virtual work, these conveniences might translate to tradeoffs somewhere else, like in monetary compensation. The issue for women here was poignantly phrased by Bertrand et al (2009),

“deviations from the male norm of high hours and continuous labor market attachment are greatly penalized in the corporate and financial sectors.”

Furthermore, Correll, Benard, and Paik (2007) found that women are penalized in hiring decisions as a result of parenthood status. In their study, men’s status as a parent had either no effect or a slightly positive effect on their job outcomes, whereas women’s status as a mother had a negative effect on application outcomes. Specifically, the study found that mothers were seen as less competent and less committed than men with and without children, and mothers were penalized in pay accordingly.

Hypothesis 1: Women are less likely than men to identify with jobs with higher compensation.

Hypothesis 2: Women are more likely to seek jobs with better work/life balance (as seen in fewer hours, fewer travel days, the ability of flexible work schedules, and the option to work from home) than men.

Hypothesis 3: The effect seen in Hypotheses 1 and 2 will be greater in women with children or who expect to have children soon.

Identification with Gendered Careers

Consistency theory argues that a person will try to align the various identities in their life as much as possible. And when two identities do not align, the individual may make changes to reconcile the dissonance or find other ways to cope. Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) emphasize

that even when a job offers rewards in line with an individual's preferences, if it conflicts with an important part of the individual's identity he/she may decide not to pursue that opportunity. For example, issues sometimes arise when the gendered labeling of an individual's job does not match his/her gender identity and social roles.

Gender role socialization theories suggest that expectations of behavioral differences between men and women stem from cultural beliefs about innate abilities and appropriate social role interactions of each gender – this socialization affects the identity a person develops for his/herself as a man or woman. As established in previous research by Cejka and Eagly (1999), some tasks are assumed to be more masculine or feminine and careers that involve such gendered tasks are labeled accordingly. Further, Eagly and Karau (2002) detailed the trait categories of agentic and communal, considered to be masculine and feminine, respectively. Traits such as assertive, controlling, dominant, independent, self-sufficient, and confident are within the “agentic” collection of traits that are “ascribed more strongly to men” (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Alternatively, women are more often associated with “communal traits” that “describe primarily a concern with the welfare of other people – for example, affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturant, and gentle” (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Proving an agentic trend identified by Eagly and Karau (2002), Niederle and Vesterland (2007) isolated men's preference for competition over equally qualified women in a laboratory experiment. These trait categories translate into “masculine” and “feminine” jobs, as typified by Barbulescu and Bidwell's (2013) aggregated job types. For the sake of this research, as an example, human resources positions are considered more feminine, while jobs in finance are more masculine. Consulting and general management occupy a space in between the gendered extremes in the professional realm.

These gendered traits do not just moderate the choices that men and women make in applying to jobs, but also the normative expectations associated with them “appear to have great influence on women’s advancement in male-dominated professions” (Nelson and Quick 1985). Additionally, Eagly and Karau (2002) looked at men and women’s identification with certain jobs and how those identities meshed (or did not) with their roles in the home. They use social role theory to show how men and women are assessed differently on their performance in the workplace because of external assumptions that others may have about their internal dispositions as a result of their gender. Sex stereotyped reputations are especially salient in workplaces that have lower proportions of women, as female employees lack accessible points of comparison upon which to model their behavior; “Women may thus behave gender stereotypically because of having internalized aspects of gender roles, especially if situational cues make these aspects particularly accessible” (Eagly & Karau, 2002). When the actions of a woman’s gender role are more easily accessed than those of her career role, she may continue to embody its traditional traits and develop a gendered reputation without realizing she is doing so.

Alternatively, when women are able to demonstrate the masculine characteristics preferred in their work, they may be judged negatively for the exact same actions because these actions are not in-line with their gendered reputation. For example, Heilman et al (1989) found that “characteristics that distinguished women from men and successful leaders were negative in connotation, such as bitter, selfish, quarrelsome, and power-hungry.” The actions that created these “negative connotations” may have been described as resilient, proactive, decisive, and leader-like in men, yet they were in contrast with the expectations of the women and therefore received poorly. Eagly & Karau (2002) described the skills and qualities that were preferred at various levels of personnel management,

At the lower level, managers favored abilities involved in direct supervision such as leading, monitoring potential problems, and managing conflict. At the middle level, managers reported that their jobs demanded greater human relations skills that involve fostering cooperative effort and motivating and developing subordinates. At the executive level, managers believed that their jobs required a greater range of skills and activities, including monitoring information, serving as a liaison, manifesting entrepreneurial ability, and engaging in long range planning. Also, a study of male managers' perceptions of the characteristics of successful executives yielded a set of highly agentic qualities – specifically the ability to act as a change agent (e.g. inspirational, decisive), managerial courage (e.g. courageous, resilient), results orientation (e.g. action oriented, proactive) and leadership (e.g. leader, strategic thinker; Martell et al, 1998) (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

The characteristics of managing become increasingly agentic as one moves up the hierarchy of leadership. This can explain the “glass ceiling” that some women may encounter as their abilities combined with their assumed communal traits qualify them for the lower to mid-level managing positions but their stereotyped feminine qualities may make them seem less capable of performing higher level roles. Additionally, as women age, their perceived priorities change too, as it is assumed that women of a certain age will transition some of their work responsibilities in favor of raising a family. The lack of congruency in roles can cause internal stress because the role-holder must juggle multiple identities, as well as external judgment for lack of conformity to gender norms. Correll (2007) also suggests that “cultural beliefs about the tension between motherhood and the ‘ideal worker’ roles may play a part in reproducing this pattern of inequality.” Men and women may proactively manage these conflicting identities by self-selecting into different career paths from the outset of their professional job search. Further, Heilman (1980) demonstrated that when women applied for managerial positions they “faired less well as the proportion of women in the applicant pool decreased,” because when women became “tokens” their femininity was more apparent and gender biases were more prevalent. Because this research collected data for two different programs with varied gender-makeups, it provides a good sample on which to test Heilman’s (1980) claim.

Hypothesis 4: Women are less likely than men to identify with jobs that are stereotypically masculine.

Hypothesis 5: Gendered differences in identification with various kinds of jobs mediate differences in job acceptances by men and women.

Hypothesis 6: Programs with a more equal gender makeup will have smaller differences in career identification between men and women.

Expectation of Success

After an individual feels that they have found an opportunity which provides sufficient rewards in line with his/her preferences and aligned with their other life-roles, they will then assess whether they believe that their application to the opportunity will be successful. Steele's 1997 study begins with an assumption that, "for such an identification to form... one must perceive good prospects in the domain, that is, that one has the interests, skills, resources, and opportunities to prosper there, as well as that one belongs there, in the sense of being accepted and valued in the domain." While there are many factors by which to judge a career path by, to commit to a certain path, "at a minimum one must feel competent at the skills or tasks necessary for a given career" (Correll 2001). Following from this, for career paths that an individual does not perceive himself/herself to be appropriately prepared for, he/she will likely not apply to jobs in that realm as it would likely be a waste of time. Expectancy theory as applied to application decisions suggests that when an individual does not feel confident that an application will be

successful he/she will be less likely to pursue that role – as a way to protect himself/herself from wasting time and the psychological costs of failure.

Furthermore, if an individual believes that they will be judged negatively in the pursuit of a certain job because of a personal trait, like gender, they may choose not to apply to such a job. This circumstance is interesting because even if an individual does not endorse the stereotype they believe others attribute to them, they may still assume that others will treat them accordingly anyways and therefore the individual make decisions to avoid such a judgment. As a result of this dynamic, Correll (2001) demonstrated that the perceived expectations of others sometimes operate in a self-fulfilling manner, by which individuals in “status advantaged categories,” like men, “end up in more powerful and influential roles.” For the sake of application decisions, even if a woman believes that she is competent enough to successfully complete the tasks necessary in a role in finance but thinks that others in her work environment may assume she does not possess the necessary competence, then she may anticipate a future failure and proactively choose not to pursue that role. Moreover, even if a woman believes she could successfully enter a given career path but is unlikely to have long-term success in such a role, she may decide to pursue another path that has an opportunity for both levels of success. In this area, this study includes a question of expected long-term success (based on a suggestion from Roxana Barbulescu). The findings of this question as a factor of application decisions are discussed in the results section.

METHODS

Sample

The sample population includes professional students at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, as an expansion on the 2013 research on MBA students by Barbulescu and Bidwell; this sample

includes both MBA students and professional master's students in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. These students represent a varied range of post-graduate professional interests and have different percentages of women in the programs. The total population of these groups is approximately 450 and the response rate for the survey was approximately 20%.

Additionally, these two programs have greater percentages of female students than the MBA program sampled in the previous research, which allowed for a greater percentage of data points for analysis of female perspectives and had a greater potential of showing nuances of varied gender norms/work orientations based on the gender-makeup of the population a student is a part of (Hypothesis 6). Further, MILR students are predominately driven to careers in human resource management, which is in the corporate sphere (like many job-prospects of MBA students), but carries a much stronger feminine connotation. More feminine fields are an interesting population to look for evidence of gendered application decisions in, as the students in the programs are similarly driven and achievement-oriented, like the MBA students, as they are all in professional degree programs at an elite university, yet may have different social pressures or cues that affect their decision behaviors.

Lastly, a notable difference between Barbulescu and Bidwell's (2013) study and this one is that their sample was made up of students in a one-year MBA program (as many international MBAs are) and the students in this study are members of two-year programs. This is an important distinction because half of the students in this study report information on internships rather than jobs – indicating that they will be returning to school in the fall.

Instruments:

The instruments used in this study were distributed to participants in the form of an online survey. The students in both of the programs were emailed a plea for participation and

chose whether or not to follow the embedded link to the survey. Once in the survey, participants were allowed not to answer any question they do not wish to. The survey started with basic information about the respondent, including gender and standardized test scores. Then it proceeded into personal life status questions on marital status and parenthood and asked respondents to share information about their previous work experience prior to their current job search. Next, respondents were asked to share their desires and dreams regarding certain industries, their expectations for success if they hypothetically applied to the same industries and, finally, details on their current job search (or accepted job/internship, if applicable).

All of the data was collected through one survey over a 28 day period and, unlike Barbulescu and Bidwell's research, there will not be any follow up survey and no demographic information was obtained from the administrative departments of the programs. For this reason, this survey asked for certain demographic data that Barbulescu and Bidwell's student surveys did not. The survey also asked more detailed information about a respondent's parenthood status, as well as specifics about their work/life balance situation, so as to create better measures for comparison. The hope was that with only one survey there would be more usable information and efforts of students to assist in the research once would not be lost (as they would have been if they had only answered one of the parts in the previous study).

Measures

Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) made assumptions about the interaction of parenthood in application decisions but did not have true data on whether or not the men and women in the sample had children. Instead, the authors substituted age and marital status to infer whether or not a student likely had children or would in the near future, thereby creating "parenthood" as a construct instead of as a variable itself. This construct is founded on the assumptions that

married people are parents and that 30-40 is the “prime child bearing age” (p. 740), both of which are unreliable predictors. For the construct of parenthood, the instruments of this study explicitly asked, “Q: Do you have children?” with the answer options of, “Yes, No – but I plan to in the next 0-5 years, No – but I plan to in the next 5-10 years, No – but I plan to have children in 10+ years, and No – I do not anticipate having children”. Turning this construct into a direct measure allowed for more internal validity in the findings. This measure was used in the testing of Hypothesis 3, to analyze whether women with children or women who expect to have children soon would be less likely than their male counterparts to identify with jobs with higher compensation and more likely to seek jobs with better work/life balance. With the information from this question, this study also drew on some of the research questions used in Bertrand, Goldin, and Katz’ (2009) article on the gender gap in career outcomes of MBA students from the University of Chicago. The questions they used are tweaked for this study’s purposes, as their study was asked years into alumni’s careers rather than prior to the start of their careers. Their research found that men experienced greater career advancement because of more prior-to-MBA training, longer work hours, and fewer career interruptions. The presence of children was the primary indicator of career interruptions for women. Because of this, women were less likely to reach as high of leadership roles as their male counterparts. Following these notions, the idea arises that a student may not pursue an opportunity that they believe will not engender long-term success. With that in mind and to understand the role of long-term goals play in application decisions, the instruments of this study asked students how likely they think they are to “make it to the top” in their accepted role. The introduction of this question was also prompted by advice shared by Roxana Barbulescu (one of the authors of the study this research is based on); this study added the measure of anticipated career progression in accepted jobs/internships, which

allows for the introduction of expectancy theory again to compare a student's expectation of application success with their expectations of actual career success. On this topic, there may be gendered differences in what constitutes "making it to the top", but that is outside of the scope of this research.

As described before, Bertrand et al (2009) found that the gender gap in career outcomes could be attributed to three differences between the men and women in their study: training prior to MBA graduation, career interruptions, and variations in weekly hours. Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) asked questions pertaining to prior experience in certain industries and related the answers to future application decisions in said fields, which produced similar findings to those of Bertrand, Goldin & Katz (2009). This study combines sentiments of both studies by looking at prior experience, parenthood, work hours/flexible work, and future application decisions (by way of identification and expectation of success).

Finally, in the area of work/life balance, there is certainly value in the question that Barbulescu and Bidwell asked of "How happy are you with the work/life balance in the job you accepted?", but this study goes a step further to compare relative levels of happiness between men and women with objectively similar work/life balances. To gain the information to do this, this study asked three more questions that covered how many hours the student expects to work per week (in the short and long-term), how many days per month they anticipate they will travel, and their opportunities of flexible work scheduling/virtual work. By asking more specific questions about the realities of their anticipated work/life balance, this study challenges previous findings by Nelson and Quick (1985) and Hoschild (1989) that argued that men were more successful in masculine careers because of sex-typed roles in family life that prevented women from being equally committed to their careers. Presumably, when there are more options for

flexible work schedules and virtual work, women will expect to have a better chance of balancing familial responsibilities and succeeding in their career, while making fewer concessions in either realm. The variables for work/life balance are used in the testing of Hypotheses 2 and 3, which predicted that women would be more likely to seek more work/life balance from their jobs, and that this effect would be larger in women who have children or plan to soon.

In the data collected by Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013), the researchers codified all of the information they received on applications into 19 job types (in conjunction with career path information from other top business schools). They then grouped the 19 job types into broader categories of finance, consulting, and general management. Next, the researchers used attributes established by Cejka and Eagly (1999) to conceptualize the masculinity of each of the three job types. Specifically, the eight traits considered to be “stereotypically masculine” through survey data collected by Cejka and Eagly (1999) are: competitive, daring, unexcitable, dominant, adventurous, stands-up under pressure, aggressive, and courageous. For their three main categories of finance, consulting, and general management, they established that finance was the most “masculine” of the three and the other two were comparably equal to each other. The new career path added by the MILR program is primarily human resources – demonstrated by the fact that 25 of the 27 MILR students who gave information on their accepted jobs/internships listed human resources as their function. As previously mentioned in the identification with jobs section, human resources is widely considered to be more feminine than the other three functional categories. This research also allowed for other job types and functions but received responses consistent with those of Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013). The only other additional “function” this research reports on is rotational programs because the information on that subject

produced interesting findings. The job functions determined herein were used in the analysis of Hypotheses 4 and 5, which suggested that women would be less likely than men to identify with jobs that are stereotypically masculine and that these differences in identification would mediate job acceptances, respectively.

RESULTS

103 individuals responded to the emailed plea for survey participation. From those, eight were students in the law school – a group included in the emails blasts – and were later removed from the data, because of the dismal response rate from the law school student population. Next, twelve individuals who accepted the first question to begin the survey did not provide any further responses. Those twelve entries were also removed. From the 83 remaining, 47 were MILR students and 29 were MBAs – additionally, 11 respondents selected “other” for their program. For these “Other” students, I am inclined to believe that they are PhD students (rationale to follow in the job search status section), but there was no text entry box on the survey for them to clarify their program. Lastly, eleven students did not submit any information past Q13, which began the questions on expectations of success, and therefore reduced the amount of data analyzed for the remaining portion. I think that perhaps why students got to that question and then stopped is possibly because they saw a page full of ranking questions after just finishing two other pages full of similar questions and at that point decided the survey was no longer worth their time. This was an unfortunate design flaw on my part – not realizing how monotonous and time consuming the survey appeared to the students, whether or not it actually was.

The students that responded to this survey seemed to be fairly representative of their respective overall populations in age and experience, with substantially more women responding

than men as compared to the gender makeup of the populations. For the MBA students, the school reports that their two-year MBA program has 30% women and students have an average of five years of experience prior to enrollment; the statistic for average age of MBA student was not reported, but inferring from the statistics about work experience and normal graduation age from an undergraduate program, it is likely that the average age of MBA students in the overall population is approximately 27/28. The MBA students that responded to this survey were 38% women and 28 years old with 4.7 years of average work experience. The MILR program reports an enrollment that is comprised of 56% women, the average age is 27 and students have an average experience of 4.1 years prior to enrollment. The MILR respondents to this survey were an average of 27.3 years old with 4.01 years of experience but were 74% women. While there are proportionally more women that responded to this survey than there are in the programs, I believe that this is a positive difference, as it allows for more female data points, something that Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) lacked in their population of 23% women. Additionally, three of the students were joint MBA/MILR students. Their information is reported in the statistics of both programs, except where denoted.

By way of standardized test scores, the survey participants are again generally representative of the general population. The median GMAT score reported for MBA students by Cornell University is 700, which is in the 89th percentile. The average score of these participants was 698, which is in the 88th percentile. Similarly, Cornell reported the average GMAT scores of the MILR program to be 660 (converted from separate portion scores reported) which is in the 80th percentile, whereas the survey respondents here had an average GMAT score of 664 in the 82nd percentile. For the students who reported GRE scores – which was especially popular among the MILR students – I used a conversion table provided by ets.org (the official

testing organization for a wide range of standardized tests, including the GRE and SAT) to convert those scores into projected GMAT scores for a more equal comparison. These scores, coupled with the other demographic statistics that generally matched those reported of the entire programs, demonstrate that findings based on this group are likely also representative of the other students as well.

In the area that asked for previous experience, students were able to divide their experience prior to enrollment into the standard categories as well as an “other” column. In conjunction with the “other” column where they could enter the number of years of experience, there was also a text box for a short description of what field the experience was in. The answers that appeared more than once in that column included variations of politics, non-profit work, healthcare, and research. None of the manually-entered fields appeared frequently enough to create a trend or prompt further research.

Students were asked to share their current job search stages. Eighteen students reported that they have accepted jobs and thirty students responded that they had accepted internships. Only one respondent will be starting his/her own company and no respondents reported that they would be becoming an independent consultant or joining their family’s business. Additionally, eight students reported that they did not yet have offers – in the text entry for this section, many of these eight indicated that they were still in the interview process with prospective companies. Lastly, eight students responded that they had no job search to share information on. Of these eight, six of them were also students that selected “other” in the program question, indicating that they were neither MBA students nor MILR students. Because of this conjunction, I am inclined to believe that these are students part of the way through a PhD program, whereby they would have been on the listservs in the business school and ILR School that received the plea for

participation. I made the decision to leave the data from these students in the analysis because they shared many of the same identification and expectation characteristics of the students in the other two programs.

Of the respondents, eight had children (one joint MBA/MILR student and seven MILRs) and twenty-nine anticipate having children in the next zero to five years. For these students, it is likely that they will base certain job search decisions on this anticipation. Additionally, respondents' parenthood status also likely affects the way that they view certain characteristics of their accepted job, like work/life balance aspects. This factor will be analyzed further later in the paper. For the students planning to have children in more than five years, their application decisions are likely affected increasingly less by their family plans as time to parenthood increases. Only six students reported that they do not intend to have children at all. Moreover, the survey asked for relationship status; 38 respondents were single, 25 were in a relationship, and 20 were married. The three answers were coded as 1, 2, and 3 – indicating increasing levels of commitment from single, to in a relationship, and married, respectively. This information is shown in the correlation tables, as compared with other statistics.

After their various descriptive personal statistics, students were asked to rate how much they identify with a range of job types that fit into the categories of consulting, finance, general management, and human resources. These job types, in finance for example, included advisory (e.g., investment banking), sales and trading, buy-side, and investment management (e.g., hedge funds). A couple of the other categories types were similarly divided and can be seen in full in the appendix. Additionally, the questions on identity also included questions about rotational programs. The findings about rotational program identity (Q: "I often think about working in a rotation program.") showed a very strong negative correlation (p-value less than .00) between a

respondent's age (as well as years of experience) and their identification with rotational programs. This might indicate that the older students (who had significantly more work experience, p-value of less than .00) do not feel the need to gain more exposure and business acumen through a rotational program in the same way that younger respondents do. Additionally, MILR students were significantly more likely to identify with rotational programs than were their MBA counterparts. Again, this might reflect the way that employers hire out of these programs and the prevalence of rotational programs in human resources, the most popular career path for MILR students.

In their jobs, MILR students expect to work on average 53 hours per week, while MBA students expect to work significantly (p-value: <.01) more hours per week (on average 68.7). Weekly hours were also very highly correlated with strong identification with roles in finance – both identification averages were significant at the .01 p-value level. This is not surprising, as the reputation of the financial industry is to have extremely long hours, especially in the lower levels of hierarchy.

Many of the career-identification statistics are highly correlated with each other, which indicates that students considered a wide range of employment options when deciding where to apply. Also, the different identification statistics are correlated with expectation of success in the corresponding areas. This is not surprising, as it likely indicates that the students have prepared themselves well for their ideal career, therefore leading them to believe they are qualified for the jobs they would like to have. The shaded areas on Table 1 show the identity questions correlation with each other, as well as the expectations of success for the same functions. Lastly, the identification statistics were not significantly correlated with previous experience in the same

function. Initially, this was surprising, but it may indicate that the experience students had pushed them to pursue more education so that they would be able to successfully switch fields.

Students were also asked if their accepted job was specific to their degree (i.e. MBA-track, or master's-track roles, as many employers hire this way). Of the eighteen students who have accepted a job, seventeen of them are joining track-programs specific to their degree. Twenty of the thirty accepted internships were also reported as track-programs.

Students were then asked to rate their satisfaction with various areas of their accepted job – one being very displeased, five being very pleased. Not surprisingly, no student responded that they were “very displeased” with any aspect of their accepted job. Likely, if a student was very displeased with an aspect of an offer, they would either not accept the offer or find a different way to rationalize the aspect to themselves and would be unlikely to report such dissatisfaction. Because of the lack of information for the “very dissatisfied” answer, that column has been removed from the tables included in this paper. Students were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their accepted job and then also individually rate their satisfaction with the pay/benefits, industry, function, location, level of responsibility, and work/life balance. Interestingly, on average, students rated their overall satisfaction with their accepted job as 4.67 – which indicates they are between pleased and very pleased. When the other six satisfaction averages were also averaged, the result was 4.5 – which falls in the same area of pleased and very pleased, but marginally less than the overall satisfaction reported. This finding prompts me to question if there are other large factors students are considering their satisfaction with, or if they are weighting some areas more than others to develop their “overall satisfaction” rating. Another interesting finding was that MBA students were significantly more likely to be pleased with their level of responsibility than MILR students were.

Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) based much of their research on codified information drawn from details on students' job acceptances and specific applications. Their survey asked question on the top three types of jobs that students applied for, as well as how successful each of those applications were. This survey attempted to do the same. Regrettably, although this survey asked questions about the types of applications that students submitted, because of the variety in level of detail as well as (lack of) descriptiveness of the answers received, a fruitful comparison was not possible. Many students were not forthcoming with this information and I did not have the appropriate resources to follow up with the student by phone, as Barbulescu and Bidwell reported that their contacts in the career services department did. This data is saved, however, for later research, should more data points be collected for analysis. A preliminary analysis of the information collected from these questions can be found in the discussion of Hypothesis 5, which predicted that gender differences in identification with various kinds of jobs mediate differences in job applications by men and women.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that women are less likely than men do identify with jobs with higher compensation. In marginal preliminary support of Hypothesis 1, women were found to have a (non-significantly) lower salary than their male counterparts. This could be a factor of more women in the MILR program, which has a significantly (at the .05 p-level) lower average salary than the MBA program. What is interesting, however, is that upon further analysis of the data collected, Hypothesis 1 is very much not supported. The data indicates that women are actually receiving higher pay in the majority of the functions included in this research. The distribution of women towards the lower paying fields, like human resources specifically that reports compensation information for 15 women, affects the overall average pay statistic of women (\$110,609 with data from 21 women). Men, on the other hand, are more evenly

distributed between the functions and have a higher percentage of respondents in typically high paying functions like finance and consulting. Importantly, though, even in human resources, women are still receiving higher pay than their male counterparts in the same field. The only function in which men received greater compensation than women in this study was consulting. All of the distributions can be seen in Table 1 below. While these findings don't disprove Hypothesis 1, because women are still entering the lower paying functions at higher rates and receiving an overall lower average salary, it does demonstrate that previous research of gendered pay biases are possibly outdated and incorrect.

Table 1

Average Salaries (with pay construct, in \$)		
Function	Women	Men
Finance	200,000 (2)	120,540 (5)
Consulting	125,000 (2)	136,500 (4)
Gen Mgmt	115,700 (2)	86,541 (3)
HR	96,092 (15)	82,253 (6)
Average	110,609 (21)	119,472 (20)

Hypothesis 2, which suggested that women are more likely to seek jobs with better work/life balance (as seen in fewer hours, fewer travel days, the ability to have flexible work schedules, and the option to work from home) than are men, did not receive statistically significant support from the data. Women did report marginally lower weekly hours and monthly travel days, but not significantly less than their male counterparts. One interesting finding, in light of this, is that women reported lower levels (to a .05 p-level) of satisfaction with their anticipated work/life balance. This finding partially supports Hypothesis 2 in that it indicates women expected more from their work/life balance than did men. Not surprisingly, identifying with finance was strongly correlated with an increased number of weekly hours – this fits with the common understanding that finance is a very demanding function, expecting high

hours and minimal flexibility. Identifications with general management and human resources were negatively correlated with weekly hours (significant to a .01 p-level), which demonstrate the difference between those two functions and finance. Consulting was in the middle, with no significantly positive or negative correlation to weekly hours.

Hypothesis 3 – which suggested that mothers and women who expect children soon (within the next 5 years) would be less likely to seek jobs with higher compensation and more likely to apply to jobs with better work/life balance – was supported for all parents, not just mothers. This is shown clearly in Table 2 as the base salary for parents was an average of \$87,500 whereas for non-parents planning on children in the next 1-5 years, their average salary jumped to \$102,600 and continued to increase as the years until parenthood grew.

Table 2

	Average Salary (w/ weeklyhours*hourly)					P-Value
	Overall (N=?)	Parents (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 1-5 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 5-10 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 10+ years or never (N=?)	
Males	119,472 (20)	94,920 (2)	126,583 (6)	95,938 (8)	168,150 (4)	0.001
Females	110,609 (21)	85,000 (1)	100,893 (8)	123,237 (9)	107,166 (3)	0.418

One concession that needs to be acknowledged, however, is with regards to the salary construct created to compare accepted internships with full-time jobs. For students who accepted internships, they reported their hourly pay instead of an annualized salary. The same students also reported their anticipated weekly hours. To find a fair comparison value, I produced 3 “constructs” for salary comparison. First, I combined annualized salary with a measure that multiplied hourly wages by 40 hours per week. This construct is useful if the students aren’t being paid overtime during the duration of their internships. Next, I combined annualized salary with a measure that multiplied hourly wages by the anticipated number of weekly hours that each

student reported. This construct produced a much higher salary value for almost every student, as few were working 40 hours or less. Then, for comparison, I compiled a table that just showed reported annualized salaries, which allowed me to choose the combined construct that was the most accurate. These tables can be seen in Appendix 2. For the sake of this research, I chose the construct that multiplied hourly pay by weekly hours, as I felt it was closest to reality and accounted for both students who were only being paid until they reached 40 hours, as well as students that were paid time and a half past 40 hours.

Furthermore, the second half of Hypothesis 3, which suggested that mothers or soon-to-be mothers would seek jobs with greater work/life balance, was also supported for males in similar parenthood circumstances. So, as salary increased with increased years to procreation, the opposite happened with work/life balance factors and parents reported much lower weekly hours (48/week) than the average (60) and a marginally higher satisfaction with work/life balance (4.0) than the average (3.8). Soon-to-be parents also reported lower weekly hours and higher satisfaction with their work/life balance, than did those respondents who did not plan to have children for a longer period of time. More details on these variations can be seen in Tables 3 and 4 below.

Table 3

Variables	Overall (N=?)	Parents (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 1-5 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 5-10 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 10+ years or never (N=?)	P-Value
% Women	54% (48)	50% (8)	59% (17)	59% (16)	57% (8)	0.735
Average Age	28.3 (81)	30.8 (8)	28.3 (29)	26.9 (27)	28.8 (14)	0.019
Program	31 MBA, 44 MILR, 3 MBA/MILR (81)	1MBA/MILR, 7 MILR, Other (8)	14 MBA, 11 MILR, 4 Other (29)	6 MBA, 19 MILR, 2 MBA/MILR (27)	5 MBA, 5 MILR, 4 Other (14)	0.043
Expected Weekly Hours	60.5 (50)	48.3 (4)	58.5 (20)	61.5 (18)	69.3 (8)	0.205
Satisfaction with Work/Life Balance	3.81/5 (48)	4.00/5 (4)	4.06/5 (18)	3.56/5 (18)	3.75/5 (8)	0.632

Table 4

	Women				Men			
	Parents (4)	0-5 years (17)	5-10 years (16)	10+/never (8)	Parents (4)	0-5 years (12)	5-10 years (11)	10+/never (6)
Weekly Hours	40 (1)	52.5 (10)	62.5 (9)	68.8 (4)	51.5 (2)	64.5 (10)	60.5 (9)	70 (4)
Chance that hours will decrease over time? (% yes)	0 (1)	27% (11)	22% (9)	25% (4)	33% (3)	60% (10)	22% (9)	0 (4)
Travel Days (per month)	2 (1)	3 (10)	4.5 (8)	3.5 (4)	0 (2)	1.8 (9)	6.7 (9)	5 (4)
Possibility of Virtual Work (% yes)	100% (1)	38% yes, 38% maybe (13)	25% yes, 62% maybe (8)	50% maybe (4)	66% maybe (3)	60% yes, 20% maybe (10)	20% yes, 50% maybe (10)	25% yes, 50% maybe (4)
Flexible Work Schedule (% yes)	0 (1)	33% (12)	0 (8)	0 (4)	66% (3)	40% (10)	10% (10)	0 (4)

Next, Hypothesis 4, which suggested that women are less likely than men to identify with jobs that are typically masculine, is strongly supported by the correlation evidence. There were no significant correlations between gender and identification with consulting, rotational programs, or general management. However, there was a significant negative correlation (at the .05 p-level) between the identification question which read, “I often think about working in finance” and gender and a positive correlation (at the .01 p-level) for “I often think about working in human resources” and gender. These findings indicate that men (0 in the gender measure) find themselves thinking about working in finance much more often than women do – and that women (coded 1 in the gender measure) think about working in human resources much more often than men do. These findings confirm the findings of Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) about gendered identification towards specific industries in an otherwise homogenous body of students. Because this research collected information on two programs, it was necessary to see if there were identification differences between the two genders within the separate programs, to rule out the possibility that the data was showing false positives due to the higher percentage of women in the MILR program which has a much stronger proclivity towards human resources for all students. The findings are shown in Table 5, which still show that more women (29%) than men (5%) in the less HR-focused MBA program thought about working in HR. Interestingly, however, fairly equal percentages of women and men within the MBA program considered finance as a job prospect – thereby indicating that surface level findings may have been skewed

as a result of gender segregation in the survey respondents' programs. Further research on this topic with more varied programs would certainly be useful.

Table 5

Identification within Programs (% high identifiers*)				
	MILR		MBA	
	Women (35)	Men (11)	Women (8)	Men (21)
Finance	0%	0%	29%	33%
Consulting	41%	60%	57%	24%
General Management	8%	0%	0%	10%
Human Resources	89%	80%	29%	5%

*"high identifiers" refers to the individuals who reported either a 4 or a 5 out of 5 in how much they identified with the industries

Hypothesis 5, which predicted that gender differences in identification with various kinds of jobs would mediate differences in job applications by men and women, could not be proven or disproven to any level of statistical significance because of the incomplete data received for applications submitted. However, some surface level analysis is possible. 30 MILR students and 25 MBA students (with 3 overlapping because of joint enrollment) shared information on at least their application submissions. Some students shared information on the top three sample jobs they were applying for, while others only shared the first type – indicating less variability in the applications they submitted or, perhaps, earlier successful applications that negated the need for applications for less desirable jobs. The table below (Table 6) shows the average number of application submissions, initial interviews, final round interviews, and offers for each of the candidates ranked options separated by program. The counts of the functions reported in each of the options was fairly consistent, with the vast majority of MILR students reporting various positions in HR for their three options (along with a few MILR students that clearly favored

consulting). MBA students who responded to this section applied predominately to consulting and finance jobs for their first two options, but had a distinct switch towards general management for their third option. Other popular responses in MBA options were marketing, and entrepreneurship/working for startups.

Table 6

		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
MILR	Number of Applications submitted	5.8	2.9	2.4
	Initial Interviews	4.2	2.6	1.9
	Final Round Interviews	2.5	1.25	1.7
	Offers	1.5	0.9	0.8
	Average Application Success	26%	31%	33%
MBA	Number of Applications submitted	8.9	4.14	6.7
	Initial Interviews	4.3	2.8	3
	Final Round Interviews	2.1	1.3	1.1
	Offers	1.3	0.8	1
	Average Application Success	15%	19%	15%
(numbers represent group averages)				

Hypothesis 6, which suggested that programs with a more equal gender makeup will have smaller differences in career identification between men and women, is supported by the data. Unfortunately, this finding may be misleading because the MILR program, though it is in fact more gender equal, also has a much smaller range of careers that students enter – human resources being the main function. This hypothesis could have received more support if data

from the law school had been analyzed, but without that, there were only two programs to compare against each other. Therefore, the findings are interesting but not telling of any predictable trends.

Another interesting finding, which was not specifically related to any hypothesis, was that students who believed they would be successful in consulting also had high expectations of success in finance, general management, and rotational programs (significant at the .01 p-level). This may show that consulting expects a broad range of knowledge and capabilities from its employees and, therefore, a student who believes they could successfully perform a role in consulting would also believe they could be successful at jobs that represent components of consulting.

ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

In terms of gendered application decisions, there are many alternative explanations for why men and women may choose to apply to different positions from each other. This research looked at the concepts of value preference, job identification, and expectation of success. Certainly there are more factors that men and women consider when deciding which jobs to apply to and each is weighed holistically while considering the others. For instance, applicants may make decisions based on the relative schedule and value of their spouse's occupation (Stone 2007, Bertrand et al 2009) or they may have other sources of income aside from the current application track. Alternatively, individuals may view feminine jobs as possessing less workplace stress to be carried over into other aspects of their lives – so, while they could be working the same hours with the same amount of flexibility, they are not enduring the

atmosphere that would be commonplace somewhere more “masculine,” like on a trading desk, and may choose such positions accordingly.

Another consideration is that the respondents in this study are not representative of the general public. While it could be argued that the participants in this study are a novel place to see the interaction of gender and application decisions because the candidates are already in similar career-driven programs and have comparable backgrounds, it could also be argued that this level of education and the rationale that goes into applying to jobs is not generalizable to the general public – especially in lower socio-economic groups where there may be more creative strategies for handling familial responsibilities as well as increasing income.

Furthermore, in stark contrast to some of the hypotheses proposed in this study, which suggested that mothers/soon-to-be mothers would apply to more feminine occupations because of a perceived increased ability to be able to better handle familial responsibilities, Okamoto and England (1999) arrived at a contrasting conclusion. They did not find a connection between individuals who anticipated future career interruptions and female-dominated occupations. They suggest that it is gender role attitudes that form in youth through gender role socialization alone that lead women (and mothers) to choose different employment options.

It would be interesting if future research combined the topics studied here with information on respondents’ spouses and their careers. This would provide information about why respondents choose specific rewards over other or why they may have assessed their potential for future success the way they did (i.e. their spouse has a flexible work schedule and therefore the respondent would prefer to take more monetary rewards in place of the luxury to leave work/tend to familial responsibilities as needed; or they plan to leave their work entirely at some point in the future).

Finally, even with all of the information this research collected, the direction of causality between various measures affecting application decisions is difficult to infer. It is impossible to tell if it is human capital theory or gender role socialization that are primarily affecting the decisions of equally qualified men and women to apply to different jobs. Because decisions are a human choice, it would be impossible to establish patterns that hold true to every case of job applications. While the correlations this study found are valid within this sample at this place in time, it is very possible that students elsewhere are developing new preferences or altering their work patterns. Further, as our society and job market develop, there continues to be changes to both societal views of gender roles as well as changing job characteristic norms (especially with technological developments).

While strong correlations were seen in this research between gender and some factors of application decisions, the women in this study continue to be career driven, which may lead them to be more open to non-traditional familial roles. If this is the case, then that would indicate that the effects of gender would likely be even stronger on applications of women that hold more traditional gender roles.

Similarly to Correll (2007) who noted that her experiments only “evaluated the status-based discrimination mechanism for a high-status job that appeared to require high levels of commitment,” like the jobs sought by the professional students in this study, this body of research is limited in the same way. She also notes that, ‘whether mothers would experience the same type and amount of discrimination in lower-status jobs that are more or less gender-typed is an open question.’”

CONCLUSION

The research conducted in this study confirmed and further clarified a previous study conducted by Barbulescu and Bidwell (2013) which established some of the preliminary evidence that a portion of the gendered-segregation in occupations can be explained by the cursory understanding that equally qualified men and women do not actually want the same thing for and from their careers. Additionally, this research bridges the gap between gender, parenthood, and application decisions – a gap that was previously filled with research models based on wide-spanning, debatable assumptions. Complicating many prior findings of Barbulescu and Bidwell’s research, this study found again that women identified with finance significantly less than men did and also found that they identified with human resources much more, but that within the same programs, the gender differences in functional preferences were much smaller than the whole. Consistent with Barbulescu and Bidwell’s findings, again, the hypothesis that women would seek lower paying jobs in favor of better work/life balance could not be confirmed to any statistically significant level. While the average salary of all female respondents was lower than that of the male respondents, within job functions salary between genders was generally comparable. Interestingly, women were shown to report less satisfaction with the work/life balance offered by their accepted job or internship. This could indicate that, while men and women are accepting fairly similar jobs with commensurate benefits, they continue to rate said elements differently. Most importantly and unexpectedly, what this study found is that the same hypothesis about mothers’ preferences held for all parents – that is, that parents and soon-to-be parents (who expect to have children in <5 years) are also choosing jobs with lower pay and better work/life balance. This is an important finding because it held for both mothers and fathers, certainly contrary to the popular belief that mothers are the ones changing their careers for family reasons (Bertrand et al 2009). Finally, while the more gender-equal

MILR program did prove to have a greater degree of gender-equality in applications and identifications among students, more research needs to be done in that arena with a program that has a wider variety of career functions post-graduation.

Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	
1 Gender	1																																								
2 Age	-0.13	1																																							
3 MBA	-0.65**	0.24	1																																						
4 MLR	0.04	-0.20	-0.64	1																																					
5 Marital Status	0.04	0.18	-0.04	0.36	1																																				
6 Childbearing Status	0.15	0.15	-0.82	-0.65	-0.68**	1																																			
7 Years of Experience	-0.02	0.95**	0.18	-0.14	0.13	-0.08	1																																		
8 Consulting	-0.166	0.578	0.166	-0.253	0.364	-0.225	0.825	1																																	
9 Finance	-0.207	0.394	0.443	-0.200	-0.108	-0.404	0.881	0.431	1																																
10 Experience in Human Resources	0.129	0.524	0.189	-0.198	0.324	-0.071	0.630	0.020	-0.076	1																															
11 Consulting	-0.094	0.454	-0.294	0.204	0.183	-0.573	0.535	0.397	0.809**	-0.078	1																														
12 To work in A Rotational Program is an important part of who I want to be.	0.071	0.111	-0.101	0.145	-0.172	0.180	0.078	-0.212	0.125	0.184	-0.213	1																													
13 Finance	-0.254	-0.128	0.375	-0.467	-0.278	0.132	-0.168	-0.184	0.285	-0.411	-0.103	0.038	1																												
14 General Management	-0.031	-0.492	-0.118	0.367	0.103	-0.161	-0.356	-0.282	-0.313	-0.620	0.110	0.053	0.131	0.514**	1																										
15 Human Resources	0.096	-0.304	-0.054	0.219	0.015	-0.024	0.087	-0.383	-0.093	0.348	-0.039	0.189	0.131	0.514**	0.131	0.514**	1																								
16 Consulting	0.423	-0.333	-0.682	0.890	0.124	-0.190	-0.220	-0.289	-0.481	-0.454	0.264	0.105	0.387**	0.470**	0.366**	0.366**	1																								
17 Finance	0.045	-0.030	0.044	0.225	-0.279	0.168	0.013	-0.115	-0.118	0.000	0.001	0.755	0.142	0.110	-0.280	0.212	1																								
18 A Rotational Program	-0.079	0.011	0.309	-0.344	-0.121	0.002	-0.106	-0.213	0.314	-0.329	-0.021	-0.016	0.838	-0.101	-0.110	-0.286	0.153	1																							
19 General Management	0.030	-0.235	0.021	0.186	0.129	-0.121	-0.213	-0.453	-0.413	-0.430	-0.047	0.081	-0.065	0.989	0.419	0.286	0.281*	0.075	1																						
20 Identity 2	0.072	-0.171	0.088	0.081	-0.100	0.035	-0.166	-0.546	-0.041	0.246	-0.127	0.310	0.150	0.354	0.668	0.198	0.547**	0.231	0.640**	1																					
21 Human Resources	0.367	-0.365	-0.521	0.727	0.048	-0.141	-0.353	-0.479	-0.448	-0.710	0.160	0.086	-0.216	0.504	0.346	0.851	0.269*	0.07	0.417**	0.372**	1																				
22 Consulting	0.004	-0.146	0.209	-0.075	-0.093	0.116	0.080	0.461	0.023	-0.157	-0.035	0.402**	0.241	0.049	0.093	-0.129	0.296*	0.116	-0.002	0.04	-0.153	1																			
23 Expectation of A Rotational Program	-0.171	-0.083	0.351	-0.367	-0.228	0.092	0.090	0.046	0.355	-0.287	-0.030	0.62	0.712**	-0.293	-0.178	-0.311	0.080	0.642**	-0.124	-0.038	-0.307	0.343	1																		
24 Application Success in:	-0.041	-0.268	0.174	0.103	0.092	-0.121	0.012	0.335	0.248	-0.388	0.110	0.107	-0.042	0.327**	0.270	0.165	0.058	-0.019	0.152	0.054	0.099	0.486	0.143	1																	
25 Human Resources	-0.120	-0.096	0.352	-0.239	-0.037	-0.021	0.002	0.482	0.336	0.135	0.007	0.033	0.121	-0.082	0.296*	0.178	0.073	0.086	-0.068	0.096	-0.155	0.571	0.297	0.647**	1																
26 Base Salary	0.412	-0.312	-0.628	0.790	-0.081	0.003	-0.190	-0.284	-0.548	-0.208	0.336	0.119	-0.274	0.289	0.247	0.834**	0.154	-0.253	0.168	0.03	0.718**	-0.004	-0.195	0.170	-0.019	1															
27 Hourly Pay	-0.277	0.145	0.505	-0.505	-0.232	0.180	0.188	0.097	0.289	-0.687	-0.144	0.170	0.471	-0.519	-0.473	-0.533	0.228	0.232	-0.401	-0.335	-0.612	0.220	0.476	-0.068	0.056	-0.292	1														
28 Sign-on Bonus	-0.058	-0.054	0.549	-0.481	0.007	0.385	-0.097	0.306	0.023	0.971	0.040	0.051	0.601	-0.229	-0.454	-0.410	-0.044	0.432	-0.133	-0.207	-0.302	0.350	0.523	-0.030	0.115	-0.335	0.115	1													
29 Overall	-0.251	-0.052	0.136	-0.200	0.124	-0.003	0.049	0.114	-0.035	0.152	-0.221	-0.124	0.155	0.063	-0.081	-0.146	-0.191	0.005	0.244	-0.289	-0.101	0.167	-0.078	0.015	0.007	-0.176	0.428	0.228	0.009	1											
30 Pay	-0.077	-0.015	0.077	-0.068	0.058	0.159	0.002	0.086	-0.343	0.206	-0.263	0.048	0.278	-0.128	-0.288	-0.051	0.113	0.199	-0.004	-0.099	-0.087	0.201	0.198	0.081	-0.099	0.050	0.774	0.381	0.264	0.288	1										
31 Satisfaction with In your accepted job or membership	-0.285	-0.089	0.294	-0.482	-0.127	0.288	-0.104	0.058	0.207	-0.234	-0.055	0.386	0.005	-0.008	-0.473	-0.126	0.253	-0.248	-0.102	-0.403	0.174	0.088	0.083	0.105	-0.439	0.238	0.378	0.307	0.456	0.248	1										
32 Location	-0.131	-0.179	0.354	-0.285	-0.015	0.180	-0.169	-0.155	-0.226	-0.164	-0.394	-0.171	0.277	-0.102	-0.046	-0.152	0.030	0.149	-0.031	-0.010	-0.007	0.130	0.085	0.021	0.073	-0.086	0.324	0.298	0.218	0.472	0.364	0.259	1								
33 Responsibility	-0.204	-0.133	0.256	-0.295	-0.068	0.225	-0.195	0.010	-0.230	-0.061	-0.586	0.085	0.228	-0.042	-0.293	-0.236	-0.115	0.143	-0.196	-0.283	-0.189	0.337	0.091	0.047	0.109	-0.126	0.238	0.355	0.238	0.456	0.374	0.552	0.422	1							
34 WorkLife Balance	-0.288	-0.116	0.391	-0.398	-0.137	0.163	-0.083	-0.160	-0.100	0.016	-0.435	-0.108	0.406	-0.289	-0.328	-0.347	-0.059	0.289	-0.088	-0.106	-0.216	0.154	0.152	-0.184	0.030	-0.287	0.296	0.301	0.004	0.451	0.275	0.771	0.698	0.617	1						
35 Expectation of Long-term Success	-0.228	0.148	0.022	-0.174	0.291	-0.152	0.105	0.293	-0.123	0.270	-0.225	-0.108	-0.073	-0.032	-0.246	-0.166	-0.301	-0.006	-0.008	-0.130	-0.157	-0.046	-0.080	-0.112	-0.015	-0.199	-0.236	-0.034	-0.352	0.307	-0.015	0.049	0.000	0.283	0.355	1					
36 Expected Weekly Hours	-0.130	0.067	-0.492	-0.479	-0.172	0.251	0.134	0.075	0.191	0.093	-0.253	0.101	0.511	-0.344	-0.378	-0.480	0.040	0.483	-0.220	-0.084	-0.350	0.243	0.344	-0.019	0.186	-0.313	0.456	0.482	0.310	0.064	0.286	0.300	0.299	0.327	0.389	0.146	0.067	1			
37 Likelihood of Hours Decreasing	0.116	-0.019	-0.152	0.347	-0.368	0.183	-0.082	0.028	-0.151	-0.557	0.149	0.036	-0.177	0.205	0.314	0.385	0.170	-0																							

2.

Average Salary (w/ 40 hour*hourly)						
	Overall (N=?)	Parents (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 1-5 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 5-10 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 10+ years or never (N=?)	
Males	97,876 (20)	86,600 (2)	98,200 (6)	82,865 (8)	133,050 (4)	
Females	89,431 (21)	85,000 (1)	86,675 (8)	86,462 (9)	107,166 (3)	
Overall	93,304 (42)	85,350 (4)	91,614 (14)	84,769 (17)	121,957 (7)	
Average Salary (w/ weeklyhours*hourly)						
	Overall (N=?)	Parents (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 1-5 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 5-10 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 10+ years or never (N=?)	P-Value
Males	119,472 (20)	94,920 (2)	126,583 (6)	95,938 (8)	168,150 (4)	0.001
Females	110,609 (21)	85,000 (1)	100,893 (8)	123,237 (9)	107,166 (3)	0.418
Overall	114,672 (42)	94,710 (4)	111,903 (14)	110,390 (17)	142,014 (7)	
*Two-way ANOVA p-value for entire table = .113						
Average Salary (only salary)						
	Overall (N=?)	Parents (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 1-5 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 5-10 years (N=?)	Expect Children in the next 10+ years or never (N=?)	
Males	112,000 (9)	90,000 (1)	116,500 (2)	113,333 (3)	115,000 (3)	
Females	95,650 (10)	85,000 (1)	93,333 (3)	93,333 (3)	107,166 (3)	
Overall	103,921 (19)	87,500 (2)	102,600 (5)	103,333 (6)	111,083 (6)	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barbulescu, R., & Bidwell, M. (2013). Do women choose different jobs from men? Mechanisms of application segregation in the market for managerial workers. *Organization Science*, 24, 3, 737-756.
- Baron JN, Mittman BS, Newman AE (1991). Targets of opportunity: Organizational and environmental determinants of gender integration within the California civil service, 1979-1985. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(6):1362-1401.
- Bertrand M, Golfin C, Katz LF (2009). Dynamics of the gender gap for young professionals in the corporate and financial sectors. NBER Working Paper 14681, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.
- Cejka, M.A. & Eagly, A.H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex-segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulliten*. 25(4):413-423.
- Correll, S.J. (2001). "Gender and the Career Choice Process: The Role of Biased Self-Assessments." *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 1691-730.
- Correll, Shelley J. (2004). "Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status, and Emerging Career Aspirations." *American Sociological Review*. 69.1: 93.
- Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 5, 1297-1339.
- Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social Role Interpretation*. (Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ).
- Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.
- England, P. (1982). "The Failure of Human Capital Theory to Explain Occupational Sex Segregation." *Journal of Human Resources*, 18:358-70.
- Fernandez, R.M., & Sosa, M.L. (2005). Gendering the Job: Networks and Recruitment at a Call Center. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 111, No. 3, 859-904.
- Glass, J. (1990). "The Impact of Occupational Segregation on Working Conditions." *Social Forces*, 68: 779-96.

- Granovetter, M. and Tilly, C. (1988). "Inequality and Labor Processes." Pp. 175-220 in The Handbook of Sociology, edited by Neil J. Smelser. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heilman, M.E. (1980). The impact of situational factors on personnel decisions concerning women: Varying the sex composition of the applicant pool. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26(3):386-395.
- Konrad AM, Ritchie JE Jr, Lieb P, Corrigan E (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: a meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, 126(4):593-641.
- Nelson, D.L. & Quick, J.C. (1985). Professional women: Are distress and disease inevitable? *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 206-218.
- Okamoto, D., & England, P. (December 01, 1999). Is There a Supply Side to Occupational Sex Segregation?. *Sociological Perspectives*, 42, 4, 557-582.
- Roach, S. L. (1990). Men and Women Lawyers in In-House Legal Departments: Recruitment and Career Patterns. *Gender & Society*, 4, 2, 207-219.
- Steele, C. (1997) "A threat is in the air: how stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance." American Psychologist. 52: 613-629.
- Steele, C. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: And other clues to how stereotypes affect us*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.