Issues in Political Economy, Vol 24, 2015, 7-27

Understanding Wage Determination for Behaviorally Gay and Lesbian People: The Effect of Masculinity Traits

Emily Ellis, American University '15

Workplace discrimination is one of the most prevalent issues that the LGB (lesbian, gay, bisexual) community faces. Twenty-seven percent of the LGB population reports having experienced discrimination at work, with an even higher rate of discrimination against those who are out at work (38 percent)(Sears and Mallory 2011). Discrimination can exist in various forms of hiring, abuse, harassment, and loss of wage (Badgett 1995). Lower wages translate into higher rates of poverty for the LGB community than the heterosexual population (Badgett, Durso, and Schneebaum 2013).[1] In response to the impact of this discrimination on members of the LGB community, mechanisms for understanding wage differentials for LGB people emerged in the 1990s. Around this same time, in 1994, the federal Employment Non-discrimination Act (ENDA) was first introduced in Congress. A version has been introduced every year since 1996, with the exception of 2005-2006, and is yet to be passed to date (HRC 2014b). As such, there exist no federal anti-discrimination protections in the workplace on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. In 29 states, people can be legally fired for their sexual orientation(HRC 2014a).

Two decades of research on LGB wages have largely found that, when controlling for demographic and human capital variables, gay men earn less than straight men, while curiously, lesbians actually earn more than straight women. It remains unclear why gay and lesbian populations experience these different effects. This paper seeks to answer that question through exploration of the effect of masculinity traits on the wages of behaviorally gay and lesbian people. The cause of these differentials must be understood in order to develop policy solutions that provide all people with equal workforce opportunities.

I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Wages of Gays and Lesbians

In 1995, for the first time ever, wage differentials for gay and lesbian people were studied by applying the same techniques used to examine gender and racial discrimination in Badgett's seminal work "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." Badgett pooled 1989 to 1991 data from the General Social Survey (GSS), identifying behaviorally gay respondents through four survey questions: "Having had one or more same-sex sexual partners," "Having had more than one same sex sexual partner," "Having had at least as many same sex sexual partners as opposite sex sexual partners," and "Having had either more than one same sex sexual partner or at least as many same sex sexual partners as opposite sex sexual partners." Badgett used Becker's model of economic discrimination, which states that employers have a "taste for discrimination," or prejudice against associating with a particular group. Becker's model calls for controlling for exogenous productivity characteristics as well as a variable indicating membership in a minority group. Assuming the vector of exogenous characteristics captures productivity, the effect of the minority trait captures discrimination (Becker, 1971). Badgett thus

I would like to thank Professors Mary Hansen, Michael Martell and Evan Kraft for their guidance and support in this research, from question formation, to variable selection, to model development. Their support has been integral to the completion of this work.

utilized a basic Ordinary Least Squares model of wage determination, with separate equations for men and women. She found that behaviorally lesbian/bisexual women earn 12 percent -30 percent less than heterosexual women, though not statistically significant, and that gay/bisexual men earn 18 percent -27 percent less than heterosexual men. Since Badgett's initial work, a body of literature has emerged around this topic. This body of literature continues to utilize Becker's "Taste for Discrimination" theory.

Using various surveys, namely the General Social Survey, the Census, and the American Community Survey, research has found that gay men experience a wage discount, while lesbians experience a wage premium, though the premium for lesbians is only statistically significant some of the time (Gates 2009, Klawitter and Flatt 1998, Antecol, Jong, and Steinberge 2007, Berg and Lien 2002, Black et al. 2003) Elmslie & Tabaldi (2007) Carpenter (2007), Antecol et al (2007). Studies that use the General Social Survey rely on sexual behavior, following Badgett, and studies that use the Census or the American Community Survey use the gender of cohabiting partners to determine if a household is gay or lesbian.

Researchers have suggested different theories to explain why these differentials occur. For the case of women, Badgett proposes that differences between straight women and lesbians' labor force experience and workforce attachment may be a driving force behind lesbians' higher wages. Because lesbians have stronger labor force attachment, they become more highly specialized and gain higher levels of human capital, resulting in higher wages (1995). Martell has offered a model in which gay men accept lower wages in exchange for the ability to be out and feel safe in the work place(2013). This model addresses the fact that Becker's taste for discrimination theory assumes that the minority trait of those experiencing discrimination is visible; in the case gays and lesbians, often they make the decision to "pass" as straight, or to disclose their sexual identity. Still, several authors offer discrimination as the major cause for these wage differentials, but this theory does not explain why lesbians earn more while gay men earn less.

B. Personality Effects on Wages

Another body of literature examines the effect of personality on wages. This body of work improves the assumption in labor economics that economic rewards must reflect skills. Bowles et al (2001) propose a behavioral approach to wage determination that incorporate personality traits that may be rewarded or punished in the labor market independently of traditional human capital variables. These traits (degree of future orientation, personal efficacy, and difference between a worker's marginal utility derived from work and marginal disutility of effort) may respond to incentives, and the employer will reward these traits through the incentive of wage setting. Since, researchers have used this theoretical approach to estimate returns to personality largely utilizing the Big Five personality traits, which are *extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and autonomy.* Various approaches exist within this line of work, some of which lend themselves to comparison across different populations, namely gender.

Nyhus & Pons (2005) and Mueller & Plug (2006) both use the Big Five personality dimensions to analyze the relationship between personality and earnings, and estimate different equations for men and women. Nyhus & Pons use 1996 Dutch data from the DNB Household Survey, which contains both economic and personality variables, and estimate traditional Mincerian wage

equations based on a human capital model, incorporating the five personality traits. They estimate separate equations for women and men. When including the human capital variables, gendered differences are no longer present. They find that conscientiousness and autonomy are not significant in any of the models. Including interactions with tenure and education, they find that for men, conscientiousness is less rewarded with increased tenure, and autonomy is rewarded as tenure increases as well. They further find that agreeableness is positive when interacted with tenure for both men and women. As such, Nyhus & Pons find that personality traits do effect earnings, and also that these effects vary across gender. The DNB Household Data does not allow for examination of differences across occupation and position, but they predict that rewards to personality also vary across occupation. Mueller & Plug (2006) extend this work by decomposing the gender gap into two components, one that can be attributed to differences in observable personality traits, and a second that can be attributed to trait rewards and discounts between men and women. The authors use the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study, excluding workers who were self-employed, worked less than 20 hours, or earned less than $1 per hour. They find that antagonistic, emotionally stable and open men experienced earnings advantages, while extroversion and conscientiousness generated no returns. Women receive rewards for the same traits that men do, but are penalized for being extroverted, and also receive a premium for being conscientious.

Cobb-Clark and Tan (2010) use a two stage model that controls for occupational sorting. The first stage estimates the effect of personality on occupational choice, and these estimates are used to determine whether personality contributes to wage differentials between men and women. They use the Household, Income and Labor Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey, which contains data about personality traits and labor market outcomes. They pool six waves of HLDA, over years 2001 to 2006, restricting to respondents between 25-65 years old. They find that noncognitive skills have substantial effect on probability of employment in many occupations in ways that differ by gender. They find that the gender gap is reduced by more than one half when the endogeneity of occupational choice is included. John and Thomsen (2013) restrict their sample to 30-55 year old men working full time, and also control for occupational endogeneity using a multinomial logit model where they use personality profiles to understand occupational sorting. To do this, they run separate equations for each occupation. They find that agreeableness and locus of control are the most important personality traits with respect to wages, while conscientiousness and openness are less important. This study, however, lacks a gendered analysis due to the exclusion of women.

I will combine these fields in order to understand the effect of masculinity on wages of gays and lesbians. That is, I test the hypothesis that possessing masculinity traits results in higher wages for behaviorally gay and lesbian people. I estimate separate regressions for males and females, and will further estimate differences based on sexual behavior. Rather than broadly examine personality traits as these authors have done, I will strictly examine masculinity variables found within the General Social Survey. Similar to Nyhus & Pons I am unable to control for occupation or occupational sorting as the GSS occupational data is not strong enough to support this type of control.

II. DATA AND VARIABLES

This paper uses data from the General Social Survey (GSS), for the years 1992-2012. The GSS covers a broad range of demographic characteristics and sociological attitudes. Summary statistics for females are displayed in Table 1 and summary statistics for males are displayed in Table 2.

Table 1: Summary Statistics, Females

	Lesbian			**Straight Females**		
	Mean	*St. Dev*	*N*	*Mean*	*St. Dev*	*N*
Log(Hourly Wages)	2.616	0.985	200	2.645	0.824	3897
Does Equal or Most Cooking	0.600	0.516	10	.857	0.351	238
Hours of Household Work	8.615	8.451	13	9.106	8.067	284
Has Attended Dance in Past Year	0.375	0.492	32	0.313	0.464	632
Has Performed in Past Year	0.156	0.369	32	0.106	0.308	632
Has Attended Theater in Past Year	0.353	0.485	34	0.313	0.464	566
Take Care of Self First, then Others	0.545	0.510	22	0.621	0.486	504
Number of Sexual Partners in Past Year	1.894	0.851	198	1.461	0.681	3893
Extramarital Sex (1)	0.126	0.333	119	.064	0.245	2283
Extramarital Sex (2)	0.259	0.447	27	.067	0.250	598
Premarital Sex (1)	0.842	0.366	114	.724	0.447	2287
Premarital Sex (2)	0.840	0.374	25	.726	0.446	584
Age	37.285	10.15	200	39.355	10.92	3891
Years of Educ.	14.265	2.621	200	14.112	2.602	3893
Large Central City	16.00 %		32	15.42 %		601
Black	10.00 %		20	16.19 %		631
Other(Race)	6.50 %		13	6.88 %		268
White	83.50 %		167	76.93 %		2998

The GSS is the only nationally representative survey that contains information on both sexual orientation, wage data *and* sociological attitudes. In the field of wage analysis for gay and lesbian people, analyses have relied largely on two data sources, the Census (and annual American Community Survey (ACS)) and the GSS. The Census and ACS allow for identification of gay and lesbian individuals through the gender household relationships. Using these data sets, an individual is identified as gay/lesbian based on the gender of the household head and gender of spouse/unrelated partner. That is, if a male householder's spouse or unmarried partner is a male, they are identified as gay, and if a female householder's spouse or unmarried partner is a female, they are identified as lesbian. Census/ACS data, however, is unable to capture non-cohabiting gay and lesbian individuals.

Table 2: Summary Statistics, Males

	Gay Males			Straight Males		
	Mean	*St. Dev*	*N*	*Mean*	*St. Dev*	*N*
Log(Hourly Wages)	2.852	0.852	210	2.955	0.834	4896
Does Equal or Most Cooking	0.667	0.516	6	0.512	0.501	299
Hours of Household Work	7.750	4.245	12	7.697	8.185	363
Has Attended Dance in Past Year	0.438	0.504	32	0.164	0.371	852
Has Performed in Past Year	0.250	0.440	32	0.110	0.313	852
Has Attended Theater in Past Year	0.438	0.504	756	0.262	0.44	756
Take Care of Self First, then Others	0.556	0.506	27	0.631	0.483	626
Number of Sexual Partners in Past Year	2.582	1.408	208	1.677	0.976	4890
Extramarital Sex (1)	0.205	0.406	117	0.084	0.278	3001
Extramarital Sex (2)	0.241	0.435	29	0.076	0.266	798
Premarital Sex (1)	0.867	0.341	128	0.760	0.427	2905
Premarital Sex (2)	0.862	0.351	29	0.699	0.459	771
Age	39.848	10.783	210	40.555	11.385	4893
Years of Educ.	14.505	2.729	210	14.018	2.762	4891
Large Central City	30.4 %		64	14.56 %		713
Black	11.43 %		24	10.38 %		508
Other(Race)	10.48 %		22	7.13 %		349
White	78.10 %		164	82.50 %		4039

The GSS, used in this analysis, is able to identify *behaviorally* gay and lesbian individuals based on the gender of past sexual partners. This data is therefore unable to capture individuals who identify as gay or lesbian but have not had sex with those of the same sex. Further, it may misattribute the label of gay or lesbian to a person who identifies differently. [2] The GSS asks four questions concerning sexual history, one based on the past 12 months, one based on the past 5 years, and two based on sex since the age of 18. For the past 12 months and past 5 years, the question asks if the respondent has had sex with exclusively male partners, exclusively female partners, both male and female partners, as well as options for "don't know," "not applicable, " and "did not answer." Concerning sex since 18, one question asks the number of sex partners of each sex since 18, and the second question, asked only in 2008 and 2012, asks if sex partners have been only men, only women, some women by mostly men, some men but mostly women and equally men and women. The first question concerning sex since 18 was asked in all years since 1988, as were the questions concerning sex in the past 12 months and 5 years. Sex in the past 5 years will be the variable used to explain sexual orientation in this analysis. This variable contains more gay and lesbian observations than in the past 12 months, but does not rely on sex since 18. Understanding that sexual preference is fluid, a person's sexual behavior has potential to change considerably since age 18. When referring to behaviorally gay and lesbian people in this analysis, the terms "behaviorally gay and lesbian", and "gay" and "lesbian," will be used interchangeably.

A. Dependent Variable

The natural log of hourly wage is used to measure income, and is the dependent variable in this model. The wage data in the GSS survey is given in ranges for yearly earnings, and therefore is difficult to use in estimation. Following the literature, wage data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) is imputed. For each range given in the GSS data, the median wage for each range was calculated from the CPS.[3] CPS data have been adjusted for inflation and are in 2012 real terms. Hourly wages were then calculated by dividing yearly wage, by the number of hours worked last week, multiplied by 50. Number of hours worked in the previous week is given in the GSS. This analysis is restricted to full-time workers.

B. Independent Variables

Using the variable capturing sexual behavior in the past 5 years, individuals are assumed behaviorally lesbian if they have identified as female and have had sex with exclusively females, or females and males. Individuals are assumed gay if they are identified as males and have had sex with exclusively males, or males and females.[4] Lesbian and gay are coded as binary variables. In the female sample, there are 200 behaviorally lesbian observations and 3,897 behaviorally straight observations. In the male sample, there are 210 gay observations, and 4,896 behaviorally straight observations. Summary statistics are found in Table 1 and Table 2.

The General Social Survey contains variables that reflect masculinity, as defined by the Male Role Norm Inventory (Levant et al. 1992). The Male Role Norm Inventory uses seven characteristics to explain masculinity, including: *Avoidance of Femininity, Non-Relational Attitudes toward Sex, Self-Reliance, Aggression, Restrictive Emotionally, Emphasis on Achievement/Status,* and *Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals*. This analysis intentionally does not include variables to proxy for *Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals*, as it is not reasonable for gays and lesbians to fear and hate homosexuals. There exist good proxies in the GSS, with corresponding wage data, for three of the characteristics: Avoidance of Femininity, Non-Relational Attitudes toward Sex, and Self-Reliance.

Avoidance of Femininity is captured by variables that reflect roles typically performed by women. One question that reflects the avoidance of femininity is the amount of cooking done by the individual, with responses on a four point scale. This variable has been recoded into a binary variable that reflects if the individual does equal or most of the cooking versus less than half of the cooking. For females, there are 10 lesbian observations and 238 straight observations, and for males there are 6 gay observations and 299 straight observations. Another question that captures avoidance of femininity is the number of hours of household work that is performed per week. For females, there are 13 lesbian observations and 284 straight observations, and for males there are 12 gay observations and 363 straight observations. Both of these questions were asked in years 2002 and 2012, but there is only corresponding wage data available for 2002. Three additional variables are used to capture avoidance of femininity, which are: attending a dance performance in the past year, attending a non-musical drama in the past year, and performing in a theater or dance production in the past year. The questions about attending a dance or performing in a production were asked in 1993, 1998 and 2002, and having attended a non-musical drama was asked in 1998 and 2002. All three variables are binary. There 32 lesbian observations for both dance and having performed, and 34 lesbian observations for having

attended a non-musical drama, with 632 and 566 straight observations respectively, and 32 gay observations for all three variables. There are 852 straight male observations for attending a dance or performing in the past year, 756 straight male observations for attending a non-musical drama in the past year.

Self-Reliance is captured by the extent to which the individual agrees with the statement "You have to take care of yourself first, and if you have any energy left over, then help other people." This has been recoded into a binary variable capturing general agreement or general disagreement with this statement. For males, there are 27 gay observations and 626 straight observations. For females, there are 22 lesbian observations and 504 straight observations. This question was asked in 1993 and 1996.

Five variables are used to capture non-relational attitudes toward sex, including the number of sex partners in the past year, as well as two questions concerning premarital sex, and two questions concerning extramarital sex. The number of sex partners in the past year has been restricted to respondents who have been sexually active in the past year. Number of sexual partners is given in ranges of 1, 2-4, 5-10, 11-20, 21-100 and more than 100. The first premarital sex question has been asked in all years of the survey, and has been framed as such, *"There's been a lot of discussion about the way morals and attitudes about sex are changing in this country. If a man and woman have sex relations before marriage, do you think it is…"* and responses have been recoded into a binary variable indicating that it is generally wrong or generally not wrong. There are 114 lesbian observations, 2287 straight female observations, 128 gay observations, and 2905 straight male observations. The second premarital sex question was asked as part of the international ISSP Religion module asked in 1991, 1994, 1998 and 2008 and asks *"Do you think it is wrong or not wrong if a man and a woman have sexual relations before marriage,"* and has again been coded into responses indicating that it is generally wrong or generally not wrong. For this variable, there are 25 lesbian observations, 584 straight female observations, 29 gay observations, and 771 straight male observations. The questions concerning extramarital sex follow a similar pattern. The first extramarital sex question, asked in all years, asks, *"What is your opinion about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than the marriage partner?"* and has been recoded into a binary variable indicating that it is generally wrong, or generally not wrong. For this variable, there are 119 lesbian observations, 2283 straight female observations, 117 gay observations, and 3001 straight male observations. The second extramarital sex question was also asked as part of the ISSP Religion module in the same years as the second premarital sex question, and asks "*What about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than his or her husband or wife, is it…"* and answers have again be recoded into a binary variable indicating that it is generally wrong, or generally not wrong. There are 27 lesbian observations, 598 straight female observations, 29 gay observations, and 798 straight male observations.

Caution must be used when interpreting the coefficients on questions relating to premarital and extramarital sex. The questions concerning premarital sex explicitly refer to a man and woman having sex, and both questions relate to marriage, an institution from which gays and lesbians have been excluded at the time of most of these surveys. Therefore, these questions may be interpreted in multiple ways by gay and lesbian people. For instance, it is possible that some of the individuals have been able to marry, and substitute their own gender partnerships where

"man and woman" is indicated. Others, unable to marry, may view the reference to marriage as any long-term committed relationship. Others, still, may view the question strictly as asking about marriage between a man and a woman, and their answer may reflect an "outsider" opinion. This is not to say these questions cannot be used, but they must be interpreted carefully.

Number of years of education is given as a continuous variable, as is age. Both are asked in all years of the survey. Following Badgett, potential experience is used to capture experience, and is calculated by *Years of Education-Age-5.* Race was also asked in all years of the survey, and is given as White, Black or Other. This race variable has been transformed into three binary variables. Region is provided in all years of the survey as well, and region fixed effects are included in the analysis, as well as year-fixed effects where appropriate. Additionally, a binary variable capturing if an individual lives in a large central city, with a population of 250,000 or greater is also included.

III. METHODS

In order to estimate the relationship between wage differentials for gay and lesbian people controlling for masculinity traits, a simple step-wise Ordinary Least Squares regression is used. Using OLS continues the literature's use of Becker's "taste for discrimination" theory, and allows for comparison with previous results. Following the literature, separate regressions are run for females and males due to differences in labor market behavior by gender. Data restrictions require separate estimations of the log of hourly wages for each masculinity variable. Additionally, an interaction variable of sexual preference and masculinity variables is included in each estimation in order understand the combined effect of these characteristics. For the female equations, an interaction term of *lesbian*potential experience* is also included.[5] Formally, the estimator for hourly wage is as follows, with robust standard errors. It is necessary to include robust standard errors in this estimation due to heteroskedasticity arising from differences in variances in independent variables between the gay/lesbian population and the straight population, as well the data being collected in different years.

FEMALES*:*

(1) $$Y_I = \beta_0 + \beta_1(LESBIAN)_i + \beta_2(LESBIAN*MASCULINITYTRAIT)_i + \beta_3(EDUCATION)_i + \beta_4(POTENTIAL\ EXPERIENCE)_i + \beta_5(POTENTIAL\ EXPERIENCE)^2_i + \beta_6(POTENTIAL\ EXPERIENCE*LESBIAN)_i + \beta_7(BLACK)_i + \beta_8(OTHER[RACE])_i + \beta_9(MARRIED)_i + \beta_{10}(LARGE\ URBAN\ AREA)_i + \beta_{11}(REGION)_{ij} + \beta_{12}(YEAR)_{ij} + \varepsilon_I$$

MALES*:*

(2) $$Y_I = \beta_0 + \beta_1(GAY)_i + \beta_2(GAY*MASCULINITYTRAIT)_i + \beta_3(EDUCATION)_i + \beta_4(POTENTIAL\ EXPERIENCE)_i + \beta_5(POTENTIAL\ EXPERIENCE)^2_i + \beta_6(BLACK)_i + \beta_7(OTHER[RACE])_i + \beta_8(MARRIED)_i + \beta_9(LARGE\ URBAN\ AREA)_i + \beta_{10}(REGION)_{ij} + \beta_{11}(YEAR)_{ij} + \varepsilon_I$$

IV. RESULTS

This analysis reveals that the effect of masculinity traits on wages of gay and lesbian people results in higher wages for gay males, and lower wages for lesbians. The effect of each variable is discussed below, by trait.

A. Basic Wage Controls (Table 3 and Table 4)

Table 3: Demographic and Human Capital Controls, Females

	(1) Log(Hourly Wage)	(2) Log(Hourly Wage)	(3) Log(Hourly Wage)	(4) Log(Hourly Wage)	(5) Log(Hourly Wage)
Lesbian				-0.015	-0.203
				(0.061)	(0.129)
Years of Education	0.128***	0.123***	0.124***	0.124***	0.124***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Potential Experience	0.054***	0.054***	0.054***	0.054***	0.054***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
(P. Experience)^2	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Other (Race)	0.041	-0.007	-0.006	-0.007	-0.007
	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.050)
Black	-0.0921***	-0.106***	-0.107***	-0.108***	-0.109***
	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Married	0.020	0.035	0.034	0.033	0.033
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Large Central City		0.120***	0.119***	0.119***	0.118***
		(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Experience*Lesbian					0.0104*
					(0.006)
Constant	0.174*	0.335***	0.385***	0.386***	0.401***
	(0.091)	(0.106)	(0.111)	(0.111)	(0.111)
Region Fixed Effects	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	4,087	4,087	4,087	4,087	4,087
R-squared	0.213	0.227	0.230	0.230	0.231

*Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

Table 4: Demographic and Human Capital Controls, Males

	(1) Log(Hourly Wage)	(3) Log(Hourly Wage)	(4) Log(Hourly Wage)	(5) Log(Hourly Wage)
Gay				-0.104*
				(0.0547)
Years of Education	0.108***	0.107***	0.107***	0.107***
	(0.00393)	(0.00393)	(0.00395)	(0.00394)
Potential Experience	0.0559***	0.0546***	0.0546***	0.0549***
	(0.00367)	(0.00365)	(0.00363)	(0.00363)
(P. Experience)^2	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***
	(7.44e-05)	(7.40e-05)	(7.35e-05)	(7.34e-05)
Other (Race)	-0.0856*	-0.111**	-0.107**	-0.105**
	(0.0453)	(0.0464)	(0.0469)	(0.0471)
Black	-0.155***	-0.164***	-0.166***	-0.167***
	(0.0343)	(0.0347)	(0.0348)	(0.0348)
Married	0.148***	0.156***	0.156***	0.149***
	(0.0221)	(0.0221)	(0.0222)	(0.0224)
Large Central City		0.0380	0.0412	0.0451
		(0.0316)	(0.0318)	(0.0319)
Constant	0.631***	0.720***	0.721***	0.721***
	(0.0712)	(0.0880)	(0.0925)	(0.0925)
Region Fixed Effects	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	5,097	5,097	5,097	5,097
R-squared	0.228	0.240	0.241	0.242

*Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

For females, in the first model, controlling for demographic characteristics including education, potential experience, race, marital status, region, and living in a large central city, being lesbian has a negative effect on wages, significant at the 10 percent level. In this same model for males, being behaviorally gay has a negative, effect on wages significant at the 10 percent level. In both the male and female models, using a step-wise approach, the effect of each of these controls is not affected by additional variables, including controlling for sexual preference. All of the controls are significant at the one percent level, except for race; *other* is significant at the 5 percent level for men, and not significant for women. Unless otherwise noted, all of the variables discussed capturing masculinity traits, and interactions between masculinity traits and gay or lesbian, are statistically insignificant.

B. Masculinity Trait: Avoidance of Femininity (Table 5 and Table 6)

1. Variable: Does Equal or Most of Cooking

For both males and females, performing equal or more of the cooking results in a wage premium. Lesbians who perform equal or more of the cooking experience additional wage benefits, while gay males who perform equal or more of the cooking experience a wage discount. As such, lesbians who "avoid femininity," by not cooking experience a wage discount, gay males experience a wage premium for this same behavior. Therefore, this masculinity characteristic supports the notion that more masculine gay males earn more than less masculine males, but this does not hold true for lesbians.

Table 5: Avoidance of Femininity, Females

	(1) Log(Hourly Wage)	(2) Log(Hourly Wage)	(3) Log(Hourly Wage)	(4) Log(Hourly Wage)	(5) Log(Hourly Wage)
Lesbian	-0.270	-0.377	-0.350	-0.246	-0.278
	(0.446)	(0.809)	(0.325)	(0.266)	(0.396)
Does Equal or Most of Cooking	0.0477				
	(0.0340)				
Cooking*Lesbian	0.228				
	(0.187)				
Hours of Household Work		0.000660			
		(0.00419)			
Household Work*Lesbian		0.0168			
		(0.0320)			
Has Attended Dance in Past Year			0.165***		
			(0.0578)		
Dance*Lesbian			0.223		
			(0.274)		
Has Performed in Past Year				-0.0509	
				(0.0789)	
Perform*Lesbian				0.0841	
				(0.236)	
Has Attended Play in Past Year					0.141**
					(0.0704)
Play*Lesbian					-0.293
					(0.241)
Constant	0.717*	0.682**	0.839***	0.769***	0.803***
	(0.367)	(0.319)	(0.246)	(0.243)	(0.280)
Region Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	248	297	663	663	598
R-squared	0.277	0.254	0.274	0.265	0.245

*Estimates include controls in Table 3 (not shown), Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

2. Variable: Hours of Household Work

Males and females experience asymmetrical earnings effects when controlling for hours of household work. In this model, being lesbian carries a negative coefficient, and gay carries a positive coefficient. For females, household work carries a positive coefficient, as does the interaction term; for male, both of these variables carry negative coefficients. The interaction term for men is significant at the 5 percent level, suggesting that gay men experience 7.4 percent lower earnings for each additional hour of work per week. As in the of the cooking variable, lesbians who "avoid femininity," by performing fewer hours of household work experience a wage discount, while gay males experience a wage premium for this same behavior.

Table 6: Avoidance of Femininity, Males

	(1) Log(Hourly Wage)	(2) Log(Hourly Wage)	(3) Log(Hourly Wage)	(4) Log(Hourly Wage)	(5) Log(Hourly Wage)
Gay	0.258	0.608*	-0.0854	-0.173	-0.134
	(0.436)	(0.349)	(0.229)	(0.174)	(0.195)
Does Equal or Most of Cooking	0.0565				
	(0.0516)				
Cooking*Gay	-0.106				
	(0.0908)				
Hours of Household Work		-0.00938			
		(0.00643)			
Household Work*Gay		-0.0744**			
		(0.0358)			
Has Attended Dance in Past Year			-0.0754		
			(0.0863)		
Dance*Gay			-0.0687		
			(0.279)		
Has Performed in Past Year				-0.202**	
				(0.0937)	
Perform*Gay				0.241	
				(0.316)	
Has Attended Play in Past Year					0.00537
					(0.0686)
Play*Gay					-0.0875
					(0.301)
Constant	-0.353	-0.0923	1.345***	1.356***	1.166***
	(0.577)	(0.459)	(0.215)	(0.210)	(0.235)
Region Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	305	375	883	883	786
R-squared	0.328	0.356	0.205	0.210	0.219

Note: Estimates include controls in Table 4 (not shown)
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Both the cooking and household work variables reflect the private sphere and the results are in line with expectations of sex roles for each sex. Lesbians are rewarded for performing domestic functions, and gay men are rewarded for avoiding those domestic functions.

3. Variable: Has Attended Ballet or Other Dance Performance in Past Year

When controlling for having attended a dance performance in the past year, both gay and lesbian carry negative coefficients. However, returns to attending a dance performance differ for the general male and female populations; females experience positive returns, while males experience negative returns. Similarly, returns to attending a dance performance are different for gays and lesbians; lesbians experience a wage premium, while gay males experience a wage discount. Therefore, lesbians who avoid this feminine behavior earn lower than those who do not, and gay males who avoid this behavior earn higher wages than those who do not. The effect of attending a dance performance differs by sex, but within each sex, the effect of being gay or lesbian moves in the same direction of the effect of sex. Lesbians are rewarded for attending a performance that is associated with something women are expected to enjoy, and gay men are rewarded for not attending these performances. This act occurs in the public sphere, but the results are the same as in the case of cooking and household work, which occur in the private sphere.

4. Variable: Has Attended Non-Musical Theater in Past Year

Having attended a non-musical theater production in the past year results in negative returns for both the male and female population, and being gay or lesbian carries a negative coefficient, as well. However, both lesbians and gay males who have attended these performances in the past year experience higher wages. Therefore, gay males and lesbians who avoid femininity through lack of attendance experience lower wages than those who do not. It is unclear why this occurs.

5. Variable: Has Performed in Dance or Theater Performance in Past Year

The effect of having performed in the past year is the same across sex and sexual preference. For both males and females, performing in a production in the past year results in lower wages, but for gay and lesbian people, there is a wage premium for having performed in the last year. Perhaps performing in dance or theater affords individuals a sense of confidence that allows them to better negotiate wages. The fact that the general male and female populations experience a wage discount for performing suggests otherwise, though. Alternatively, it is possible that performing allows gay and lesbian people the skills to better mask their sexual identities, and they are therefore able to avoid workplace discrimination.

C. Masculinity Trait: Self-Reliance (Table 7)

1. Variable: Takes Care of Self First, then others if there is Time

The returns to taking care of oneself first is uniform across sex and sexual orientation. For males and females, this variable carries a negative coefficient, and when controlling for this variable, both gay and lesbian carry positive coefficients. The interaction terms between this variable and being behaviorally gay or lesbian both are negative. This suggests that for the entire population, being self-reliant has negative wage consequences. It is possible, however, that this variable has multiple interpretations. Perhaps, this variable has been interpreted by respondents as selfish, or

as unable to work as part of a team. These are generally unfavorable characteristics in the eyes of employers.

Table 7: Self Reliance

	Females Log(Hourly Wage)	*Males* Log(Hourly Wage)
Lesbian/Gay	0.394	0.0454
	(0.354)	(0.175)
Takes Care of Self First	-0.0101	-0.0252
	(0.0605)	(0.0561)
Self First*L/G	-0.472	-0.0760
	(0.401)	(0.271)
Constant	0.577*	1.012***
	(0.310)	(0.224)
Region Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Observations	525	653
R-squared	0.237	0.296

Note: Estimates include a controls in Tables 3 and 4 (not shown)
Robust standard errors in parentheses
**** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

D. Masculinity Trait: Non-Relational Attitudes Toward Sex (Table 8 and Table 9)

1. Variable: Number of Sexual Partners in Past Year

When controlling for number of sexual partners in the past 12 months, the results are asymmetrical for gays and lesbians and females and males. In the female model, number of sexual partners, and lesbian, carry positive coefficients, while in the male model, these two variables carry negative coefficients. In the female model, the interaction term between number of sexual partners and sexual preference is negative and significant at the 10 percent level, while the interaction term in the male model is positive. This, thus, suggests that lesbians who have non-relational attitudes toward sex are punished, while gay males who have non-relational attitudes toward sex are rewarded. As with the cooking, household work, and dance variables, the number of sex partners in the past years appears to reward gays and lesbians for following the prescribed social "rules" of their sex.

2. Variables: Extramarital Sex (Two Questions)

The first question concerning views toward extramarital sex, which is asked in all years, carries a negative coefficient for the general female population, and a positive coefficient for the general male population, but gay males and lesbians both experience positive returns for believing extramarital sex is not wrong. The second question, which spans only four years, carries a negative coefficient for the general male and female populations, though gay males now experience an additional discount, while lesbians continue to experience positive returns.

Table 8: Non-Relational Attitudes Toward Sex, Females

	(1) Log(Hourly Wage)	(2) Log(Hourly Wage)	(3) Log(Hourly Wage)	(4) Log(Hourly Wage)	(5) Log(Hourly Wage)
Lesbian	0.252	-0.0649	-0.815**	-0.155	-0.348*
	(0.174)	(0.107)	(0.319)	(0.286)	(0.190)
Number of Sexual Partners	0.00615				
	(0.0219)				
Partners*Lesbian	-0.188**				
	(0.0780)				
Extramarital Sex Not Wrong (1)		-0.0608			
		(0.0619)			
Extramarital Sex(1)*Lesbian		0.137			
		(0.232)			
Extramarital Sex Not Wrong (2)			-0.0285		
			(0.116)		
Extramarital Sex (2)*Lesbian			0.552		
			(0.417)		
Premarital Sex Not Wrong (1)				0.0255	
				(0.0353)	
Premarital Sex (1)*Lesbian				-0.120	
				(0.255)	
Premarital Sex Not Wrong (2)					0.187**
					(0.0810)
Premarital Sex (2)*Lesbian					-0.218
					(0.193)
Constant	0.361***	0.145	0.459*	0.385***	0.228
	(0.122)	(0.140)	(0.268)	(0.140)	(0.280)
Region Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	4,081	4,081	2,397	623	2,395
R-squared	0.227	0.228	0.239	0.233	0.239

*Note: Estimates include controls in Table 3 (not shown), Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

Table 9: Non-Relational Attitudes Towards Sex, Males

	(1) Log(Hourly Wage)	(2) Log(Hourly Wage)	(3) Log(Hourly Wage)	(4) Log(Hourly Wage)	(5) Log(Hourly Wage)
Gay	-0.249**	-0.123	-0.161	-0.181	-0.585**
	(0.111)	(0.0840)	(0.143)	(0.179)	(0.262)
Number of Sexual Partners	-0.0175				
	(0.0144)				
Partners*Gay	0.0569				
	(0.0427)				
Extramarital Sex Not Wrong (1)		0.0224			
		(0.0548)			
Extramarital Sex(1)*Gay		0.261			
		(0.184)			
Extramarital Sex Not Wrong (2)			-0.0393		
			(0.116)		
Extramarital Sex (2)*Gay			-0.191		
			(0.294)		
Premarital Sex Not Wrong (1)				0.00794	
				(0.0328)	
Premarital Sex (1)*Gay				0.0380	
				(0.196)	
Premarital Sex Not Wrong (2)					0.0308
					(0.0578)
Premarital Sex (2)*Gay					0.351
					(0.302)
Constant	0.777***	0.744***	0.769***	0.655***	0.701***
	(0.0952)	(0.105)	(0.232)	(0.124)	(0.239)
Region Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5,089	3,111	826	3,027	799
R-squared	0.240	0.258	0.219	0.236	0.217

*Note: Estimates include controls in Table 4 (not shown), Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

3. Variables: Premarital Sex (Two Questions)

For both questions concerning premarital sex, the coefficients carry the same signs on the variables of interest. When controlling for these variables, gay and lesbian both carry negative coefficients, while for the general population, believing premarital sex is not wrong generates positive returns. However, lesbians who believe premarital sex is not wrong experience lower wages, while gay males experience higher wages. Thus, more "masculine" gay males earn higher wages, while more "masculine" lesbians earn lower wages for believing premarital sex is not wrong. It is possible that being a lesbian who believes premarital sex is not wrong reflects deviance from expectations and rules of women and sex, as is the case with many of the other variables.

V. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Limitations Related to Data

The General Social Survey provides a wealth of variables, but unfortunately, lacks a wealth of gay and lesbian observations for whom there is wage data available as well as masculinity traits. The interpretations of the results would be stronger if there were a greater number of gay and lesbian observations. Similarly, the masculinity index used, the Male Role Norm Inventory, is not the strongest measures of masculinity available. Other masculinity measures are based on a composite index of behaviors and traits in which respondents will reply if the statement applies to them. Unfortunately, a survey of this breadth does not exist at a nationally representative level, with indicators or income and sexual preference.

An additional limitation related to data is that not all questions asked in the General Social Survey appear in all years. It is this data limitation that has allowed for only three of the masculinity traits from the Male Role Norm Inventory to be explored in this analysis; relevant survey questions exist for all traits, however, for the three traits not explored, those who answered these questions did not also answer questions concerning income. Additionally, if variables of interest appeared in all years, a single regression analysis could be run, controlling for all masculinity traits at the same time. Further, weakness of the occupational data has led to this important control to be omitted. Moreover, is possible that occupation is endogenous, in that gays and lesbians sort into occupations based on personality traits. A two-stage analysis, such a Cobb-Clark and Tan (2010), which first controls for occupational sorting, may be more revealing. Separate regression for each proxy, and exclusion of occupational data, likely results in omitted variable bias. That is, the variables that are included in the regression may capturing the effect of these variables that are included. Therefore, the effect of the other variables may be over-or underestimated.

Using variables as proxies for traits poses potential problems, as well. Several of the variables used in this analysis may be interpreted in multiple ways, by the respondents and by the researcher. A researcher must use caution when interpreting the results of these variables. For this analysis, this includes the variables concerning pre-martial and extramarital sex, as they explicitly relate to marriage, which is an institution from which the gay and lesbian community has been excluded for most of the years of this survey. Further, the variable “Takes care of self first, then takes care of others if there is time,” is used as a proxy for self-reliance, however, it is possible that a respondent would interpret this as being selfish, not self-reliant.

Overall, this analysis could be hugely improved if there existed more reliable data on the LGB community. No major, nationally representative survey consistently allows for the LGB community to self-identify their sexual orientation, or allow for alternative gender identities. While researcher-identified approaches, like those used based on sexual behavior in the GSS and based on relationship to the Household Head in the Census/ACS, allow for estimation, the number of observations and reliability of the data is expected to be stronger if self-identification is possible. Specifically for the purposes of this analysis, a survey that contains questions concerning masculinity traits, income, and sexual preference, with sufficient observations of all sexual identities would allow for a more comprehensive analysis.

B. Limitations Related to Gender Analysis of Data

While the General Social Survey contains a great number of valuable questions, many of these questions can be interpreted in many different ways. This is inclusive of demographic variables.

Sociological and Feminist literature distinguishes between sex and gender. Sex is the biological, physiological distinction between male and female. Gender is the socially constructed the socially constructed roles and behaviors that society assigns to men and women (See Rubin, 1975). As gender is socially constructed, it is more fluid than sex, and further, it is argued, there exist more than two binary, opposed genders.[6] With that, it is possible that a person may have body parts associated with the male sex, yet identify as a woman, genderqueer, or other gender. There has been a debate in Sociological and Feminist fields concerning inclusion of more gender options on surveys and interviews.[7] The General Social Survey, as of yet, has not opened to a more gender inclusive approach, and restricts responses to male and female.

Further, the General Social Survey conflates the concepts of sex and gender. It is generally accepted that male and female are words that refer to sex, while words like woman and man correspond to gender. The question concerning the respondent's sex asks for sex and codes for male or female. However, questions concerning relationship to the household head ask for gender, yet continue to use male and female terminology. The fact that the GSS uses sex and gender interchangeably makes interpretation difficult for both respondents and researchers, should a person's gender not match their sex. Further, the terms masculine and feminine are associated with gender, and a person's relative masculinity may guide their gender identity. As this paper tests masculinity with different equations for males and females, it is essential that this distinction is clear. Further, at least one additional gender option of "other" should be included, and if sex is ever asked, additional options should also be available.[8] This should also be an option for the gender of sexual partners. As this survey reflects sociological attitudes, gender should be used throughout the survey instead of sex.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This analysis has returned mixed results for the effect of masculinity traits on the wages of behaviorally gay and lesbian people. While the results do often vary by trait, proxy, and sex, there is a pattern that appears to follow societal sex roles. Seven of the 11 variables indicating masculinity result in wage discounts for lesbians. These are: avoidance of cooking, avoidance of household work, avoidance of dance, avoidance of performing in a production, taking care of oneself first, having more sexual partners, and both premarital sex variables. On the other hand only 3 of the 11 result in wage discounts for gay males. These variables are: avoidance of performing in a production, taking care of oneself first, and the second extramarital sex variable. The two overlapping variables between gay males and lesbians that result in wage discounts quite possibly suffer from multiple interpretations.

As such, it appears that being more masculine results in higher wages for gay men, in support of the original hypothesis. Alternatively, more masculine lesbians appear to be punished for deviance for sex roles. Therefore, masculinity traits appear to provide some of the explanation for gay men's lower wages, but it remains unclear why the literature has found a wage premium for lesbians. Further research should explore the earnings effects of human capital for lesbians. It

should be noted that this analysis is only able to capture three of the seven masculinity traits; the ability to test these additional traits may provide further insight.

As most of the results are insignificant, the analysis could be aided by stronger data that allows for self-identification of sexual orientation, more gay and lesbian observations, and existence of masculinity variables in all years.

VII. REFERENCES

Antecol, Heather, Anneke Jong, and Michael Steinberge. 2007. "The sexual orinetation wage gap: The role of occupational sorting, human capital, and discrimination." *Institute for the study of labor (iza)* Discussion Paper no 2945.

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

Badgett, M.V. Lee, Laura E. Durso, and Alyssa Schneebaum. 2013. New Patterns of Poverty in the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Community. The Williams Institute

Becker, Gary S. 1971. *The Economics of Discrimination*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berg, Nathan, and Donald Lien. 2002. "Measuring the effect of sexual orientation on income: Evidence of discrimination? ." *Contemporary economic policy* 4:393-414.

Black, Dan A, Sanders R. Hoda, Seth G. Sanders, and Lowell J. Taylor. 2003. "The earnings effects of sexual orientation." *Industrial and labor relations review* 56 (3):449-469.

Bowles, Samuel, Herbert Gintis, and Melissa Osborne. 2001. "The determinants of earnings: A behavioral approach. ." *Journal of Economic Literature* 39:1137-1176.

Butler, Judith. 1990 “Gender Trouble : Feminism and the Subversion of Identity." New York. Routledge.

Cobb-Clark, Deborah A, and Michelle Tan. 2010. "Noncognitice skills, occupational attainment and relative wages." *Labour Economics, IZA.*

Flaherty, Colleen. 2013. "Defining Gender Categories." Accessed 1/27/2015. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/09/10/sociologists-debate-terminology-members.

Gates, Gary J. 2009. "The impact of sexual orientation anti-discrimination policies on the wages of lesbians and gay men." *California center for population research working paper series*.

HRC. 2014a. "Employment Non-Discrimination Act."

HRC. 2014b. "Employment Non-Discrimination Act: Legislative Timeline." Human Rights Campaign Accessed April 12, 2014. http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/employment-non-discrimination-act-legislative-timeline.

John, Katrin, and Stephan Thomsen. 2013. "Heterogeneous returns to personality: the role of occupational choice." *Empirical Economics*.

King, Miriam, Steven Ruggles, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Ganadek, Matthew B. Schroeder, Brandon Trampe, and Rebecca Vick. 2010. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 3.0 [Machine-readable databse]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Klawitter, Marieka, and Victor Flatt. 1998. "The effects of state and local anti-discrimination policy on earnings for gays and lesbians. ." *Journal of policy analysis and management* 4:658-686.

Levant, R.F, L. Hirsch, E. Celentano, T. Cozza, S. Hill, M. MacEachern, N. Marty, and J. Schnedeker. 1992. "The male role: An investigation of conteporary norms." *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 14:325-337.

Martell, Michael E. 2013. "Differences Do Not Matter: Exploring the Wage Gap for Same-Sex Behaving Men." *Eastern Economic Journal* 39:45-71.

Mueller, Gerrit, and Erik Plug. 2006. "Estimating the Effect of Personality on Male and Female Earnings." *International Labour Review* 60 (1):3-22.

Nyhus, Ellen, and Empar Pons. 2005. "The effects of personality on earnings." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 26 (3):363-384.

Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy". *Toward an Anthropology of Women* Monthly Review Press:157-210.

Sears, Brad, and Christy Mallory. 2011. Documented Evidence of Employment Discrimination & Its Effect on LGBT People. The Williams Institute.

VIII. NOTES

[1] A 2013 analysis by Badgett et al of the Williams Institute finds that 29.4% of bisexual women and 22.7% of lesbians are poor, compared with 21.1% of heterosexual women. 20.5% of gay men and 25.9% of bisexual men fell at or below the federal poverty line than heterosexual men (15.3%).

[2] Following the literature, I use the terms behaviorally gay and lesbian in this paper to refer to all respondents who report having sex with persons of the same sex, or same sex and opposite sex. The terms gay and lesbian may not reflect the individuals' self-identification. While grouping all of these people under the same title has statistical value in increasing number of observations of "gay" and "lesbian" people, this process contributes to the erasure of bisexual, pansexual and other deviant sexual identities.

[3] CPS data was downloaded from the IPUMS, The Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. CPS data have been adjusted for inflation according to the "Note on Adjusting Dollar Amount Variables for Inflation (CPI-U)" accessed from < https://cps.ipums.org/cps/cpi99.shtml>.

[4] There is a distinction between gender and sex that the General Social Survey fails to recognize. This analysis will exclusively use the terms female and male, rather than woman and man. This demographic question in the survey asks for sex, not gender, and provides options for "male" and "female." Although other researchers have used the terms interchangeably, this is an important distinction. See section "Limitations and Further Recommendations" for further explanation.

[5] Badgett (1995) suggests that the potential experience proxy may more closely proxy lesbians' actual experience than straight women's, and should be accounted for by this interaction.

[6] Sex, too, does not exist as two distinct entities. There are additional sexes to male and female, such as intersex. Yet still, some argue that sex is just as socially constructed as gender in that it is a performative act. See Butler, "Gender Trouble."

[7] See Flaherty, "Defining Gender Categories."

[8] See note 6