

---

# GENDER TYPICALITY OF BEHAVIOR PREDICTS SUCCESS ON CREATIVE PLATFORMS

---

**Orsolya Vasarhelyi**  
Centre for Interdisciplinary Methodologies  
University of Warwick  
orsolya.vasarhelyi@gmail.com

**Balazs Vedres**  
Oxford Internet Institute  
University of Oxford

March 3, 2021

## ABSTRACT

Collaboration platforms on the Internet have become crucial tools for independent creative workers, facilitating connections with collaborators, users, and buyers. Such platforms carried the promise of better opportunities for women and other under-represented groups to access markets and collaborators, but evidence is mounting for that they rather perpetuate existing biases and inequalities. In previous work, we had found that the majority of women’s disadvantage in success and survival on GitHub stems from what they do – the gender typicality of their behavior in open source programming – rather than from a categorical discrimination of their gender. In this article we replicate our findings on another platform with a markedly different focus: Behance, a community for for graphic artists. We also study attention as a new outcome on both platforms. We found that female typicality of behaviour is a significant negative predictor of attention, success, and survival on creative platforms, while the impact of categorical gender varies by outcome and field. We found support for the visibility paradox of women in technical fields: while female typicality of behaviors is negatively related to attention, being female predicts a higher level of attention. We quantified the indirect impact of gender homophily on success via gendered behaviour that accounts for 37% of the disadvantage of women in success. Our findings suggest that the negative impact of the gender typicality of behaviour is a more general phenomena than our first study indicated, underlining the scope of the challenge of countering unconscious gender bias in the platform economy.

## Introduction

Collaboration platforms on the Internet have become crucial tools for independent creative workers, providing opportunities to develop skills, to get connected with like-minded others and potential collaborators, and to help capture the attention of potential users and buyers [1, 2]. GitHub, for example, is a platform where programmers can find collaborators, start projects, and get noticed by potential team members and employers, and thus succeed [3, 4, 5]. Other platforms, such as Behance, play a similar role for graphic artists, enabling them to build portfolios of their visual work, find peers and collaborators, and ultimately catch the attention of buyers and clients. The emergence of such platforms carried the promise of extending opportunities to previously disadvantaged groups [6, 7], among them, women [8, 9]. Beyond new opportunities, there is also a risk that the platform economy will perpetuate already existing gender bias [10, 11, 12, 13]. Platforms often lack affordances that would take gender inequalities into account, and furthermore, the deepest aspects of their culture, technology and design might perpetuate gender discrimination [14]. Rather than mitigating gender inequalities, it is likely that the platform economy will magnify disadvantage to women [15, 16].

We argue that gender inequalities that women face on platforms depend on the gender typicality of their behavior more, than on categorical discrimination against them. While gender discrimination is partly targeted at the gender category of a person [17, 18, 19], a significant portion of gendered disadvantage might stem from prejudice against forms of behavior that is typical for a particular gender [20, 21]. In a previous related work, we had mapped how women and men succeed on GitHub [22], as a function of the gender typicality of their behavior. We had found that an overwhelming

majority (about 85%) of women’s disadvantage stems from what they do – the gender typicality of their behavior – rather than from a categorical discrimination of their gender.

In this article we develop our argument further in several major ways. We first replicate our analysis on a platform that is highly orthogonal in terms of content to open source programming: Behance.com, a platform for visual arts and graphic design which emphasizes visual creativity. We were able to replicate all aspects of our analysis of GitHub (where software programmers collaborate by sharing computer code) on Behance, where photographers, designers, and applied graphic artists collaborate. As a platform Behance caters mostly to individual creatives who display portfolios of their photographs, logos, applied visual work. Despite significant differences in the context – due to isomorphism in platform design – all key aspects of our data collection on how programmers experience the GitHub platform could be transferred to the context of graphic artists on Behance. This enables us to make more general statements about gender inequality on platforms than the analysis of a single platform could warrant.

Second, we also extended the depth of our analysis by extending the outcomes we considered as dependent variables in our models. In our study of GitHub, we had predicted success as the number of project bookmarks (stars), and as survival over one year after our data collection ended. We replicate these two measures on the Behance platform as well, and added a third measure of success, attention (as the number of followers) in the analysis of both platforms. Attention precedes bookmarking and survival as an initial form of success, in the sense that platform users need to be noticed before they can succeed along other dimensions. Studies of gender inequalities point to inequalities in being noticed in the workplace as a key dimension of women’s disadvantage: Women in highly masculine professions are facing a paradoxical visibility problem: they are exceptionally visible as women, but are often not regarded as experts [23, 24]. If gender typicality of behavior is a valid measure of gendered disadvantage, we expect attention to be less impacted by it.

By extending our analysis to multiple and diverse platforms, and by incorporating the dimension of attention, we can address longstanding debates about gendered disadvantage. We found that female typicality of behaviour disadvantages men and women on both platforms, indicating that unconscious gender bias might be a general phenomena within the platform economy. Although on Behance there are more active female users (28%) than on GitHub (6%), we found higher ratio of disadvantage caused by gendered behaviour across success categories (Attention on Behance 52%, GitHub 42%; Success 45% & 21%, Survival: 12.5% & 1.8%). This finding suggests that higher ratio of women does not diminish the negative impact of gendered behaviour. Our results also supported that women are more visible as being a minority group in both platforms, but this increased attention could only mitigate on Behance the disadvantage caused by gender typicality of behavior.

Recent findings suggest that strong homophily has a negative network effect on minorities, and reducing their overall success and visibility [25]. However, homophily may benefit minorities with in-group support and preserve social identity [26]. A recently retracted work shows how mixed the impact of gender homophily in empirical work is, causing controversy by claiming that women benefit more from opposite-gender mentorship and suggesting to incorporate this in policies targeting women’s career advancement [27]. The problem with this view that it overlooks the possibility that this is not a decision under the control of women: They might collaborate less with men, because men simply do not find them "worthy" to work with [28]. In our previous work, while operationalizing gendered behaviour we included variables capturing gender homophily. In this study we removed the effect of gender homophily from gendered behaviour to make sure we compose our metric out of variables that are fully under the control of the user. This new methodology allowed us to quantify the impact of gender homophily in relation with gender typicality of behaviour, resulting in a 37% of negative impact on success.

Our article proceeds via the following steps. First, we introduce the empirical basis of our work, and compare the resulting two datasets from GitHub and Behance. After evaluating various gender inferring methods, we operationalize our key measure: gender typicality of behavior - *femaleness*. To compose our femaleness variable, we start from recognizing specializations via factor analysis, and then proceed by using a Random Forest classifier. Our modeling section focuses on reproducing our findings, and compare the relationship of gendered behaviour with the three outcomes: attention, success and survival. Finally, we summarize our findings and conclude potential policy implications of our cross-platform study.

## Empirical Setting and Data

### GitHub

GitHub (www.github.com) is the most popular online hosting and version control service which allows developers to collaborate on software projects all around the world. According to Octoverse, the annual statistical report of GitHub, the platform had more than 56 million user accounts on January, 2021, regardless of their activity status [29]. Since

GitHub provides features beyond recording contributions, and source code management such as traditional social media functionalities (e.g., following), it became a bases of several studies to understand online collaborative activity [30, 31], team success, diversity [32, 33] and the manifestation of gender inequality in technology [34].

In this paper we use a dataset obtained from githubarchive.org, containing individual careers between 2009-02-19 and 2016-10-21. This dataset contains for each individual the following information: creation of a repository, push to a repository, opening, closing and merging a pull request, accompanied by users' information using the GitHub API. (users' names, e-mail addresses, number of followers, number of public repositories and the date they joined GitHub) (See Table 1). Names and e-mail addresses were used to infer users' gender.

## Behance

Behance (www.behance.net) is an online community and hosting site for creative professionals. Similarly to GitHub, Behance allows users to create relationships via social network features (following, commenting, appreciating) and share their works in a wide variety of domains such as photography, graphic design and UX. Recent works have analyzed gender differences in success on Dribbble [8], and the underlying effects on attention on Behance [35].

The original data source of our study is a randomised sample of the Behance database obtained by Kim, 2017 [35] accompanied with additional data points using the official API provided by Behance (<https://www.behance.net/dev>). The original data contained information of 37,777 users' gender, specialized topics, number of followers, number of users followed, number of appreciations (likes), number of comments, views and the number of projects, and stylistic information of projects. We used the official Behance API, to collect more detailed user information about date of registration, activity status, and users' names. This allowed us to evaluate the results of the presented gender inferring method (See Section Evaluating Gender Inferring methods).

	GitHub	Behance
Attention	# of followers	# of followers
Success	# of stars on own repositories	# of appreciations on own designs
Survival	Activity one year after data collection	Activity one year after data collection
Tenure	Years since registration	Years since registration
Gender	Inferred from nickname, e-mail or full name	Inferred from a user's name
Activity	# of pushes, # of own repos, # of repos, where active, # of opened pull requests	# of projects, # of comments, total activity (views, appreciations)
Networking	# of collaborators, # of of users followed	# of of users followed
Fields	Programming languages used in projects	Creative fields designs labelled

Table 1: A list of variables inferred for users from Behance and GitHub.

## Data Cleaning

In online collaborative platforms it is common that users create accounts without maintaining their activity. Therefore, in both databases we filtered our users by the level of activity, keeping only users with at least 10 traces of activity within their careers. Furthermore we removed users with names containing substrings that classified them as potential artificial agents (e.g.: "bot", "test", "daemon", "svn2github", "gitter-badger"). In the case of Behance we moved all users whose account we could not connect with the API anymore, and did not have a display name, which is an indication of being a company. The resulting database contains 1,634,373 GitHub users, and 30,186 Behance users. Table 2 shows the resulting database by data source and gender. Gender recognition on GitHub yield 11.87% females and 88.13% males out of all users with names, while on Behance the resulting database contained 29.45% females and 70.55% males. After filtering for users with at least 10 activity points on both platforms, in GitHub the ratio of female users decreases to 5.49%, while on Behance the ratio of active female users decreases only by 1.06 percentage point to 28.39%.

To avoid unbalanced data of users in regards of gender, we took a biased sample with 10,000 users from the GitHub users, and 6,000 of Behance of each gender (male, female).

## Evaluating Gender Inferring Methods

Since none of the data sources lists users' gender, we infer gender from the first names listed by users. In the case of GitHub, we apply the same method explained in Vedres and Vasarhelyi: we infer first names from display names, usernames and e-mail addresses. Behance data was published with inferred gender using a commercial service called

	GitHub	Behance
N in population	7,798,509	37,777
Female	194,000	11,124
Male	1,441,130	26,653
Unknown	6,163,379	-
N After Filtering	1,634,373	30,186
Female	56,731	8,569
Male	977,389	21,617
Unknown	600,253	-
Sample size (by gender)	10,000	6,000

Table 2: Data cleaning and gender inferring results. After filtering for users with at least 10 activity points, in GitHub the ratio of female users is 5.49%, and on Behance the ratio of active female users is 28.39% out of those users whose gender could be inferred.

Gender API (<https://gender-api.com/>). In order to assess the accuracy of these two methods we took a sample of 200 users for each gender (female, male, unknown) in both datasets and inferred their gender manually. We compared this baseline classification with the presented gender inferring methods, and a third commonly used gender inferring methods available as ready-to-use python package (Gender Guesser, <https://pypi.org/project/gender-guesser/>). Figure 1 shows the the precision, recall and F-score of each algorithm by gender.




Figure 1: **Gender Inferring Accuracy** Precision, Recall, and F-score of the GitHub (Vedres-Vasarhelyi, 2019) and Behance (Gender API) gender inferring methods against the manually inferred baseline method and a commonly used alternative method (Gender Guesser Python Package).

Among GitHub users our method and the default python package yielded very similar results, optimized for high male-precision, which is a similar finding to our previous comparison where we compared this method with two other popular gender inferring methods (Gender Computer by Vasilescu [32] and Simple Gender by Ford [36]). Our method’s relative strength is female-recall, and it’s weakness is unknown-recall. The commercial Gender API used to infer the gender of Behance users resulted in higher overall precision, recall and f-score compared to the default python package. It is important to note that this dataset officially did not include unknown-gendered users, although we found 45 (11%) accounts which belong to companies, therefore their gender could not be inferred.

## Measures

### Identifying specializations

We applied principal component analysis to capture specialization activity. In both datasets we created field-specific count variables that measure how many times a user used the given programming language on GitHub (e.g.: C, Java,

Python), and how many projects of a user was labelled by a given creative field (e.g.: photography, copy-writing). On both fields we used the 20 most popular programming languages or design fields, which appeared at least in 1000 projects. Figure 2 shows the resulting specializations.



Figure 2: **Specializations on GitHub and Behance** We used Scipy’s PCA.decomposition package with Varimax Rotation to identify independent factors [37]. Bar charts show the explained variance of each factor. The correlation matrices show the “importance” and the sign of the relationship of the language/design field in the component. On GitHub we identified 6 main specializations; 1) Frontend development, 2) Developers using Ruby for backend development, 3) Backend Development with high activity in Java, 4) Data Science, 5) iOS development, and 6) PHP enthusiastic with Frontend focus. On Behance our principal component analysis yield 8 main factors: 1) Photography, 2) Graphic Design, 3) Branding, 4) Art Direction, 5) Digital Art, 6) Fashion Photography 7) Fine Arts, and 8) Web design- UX.

### Femaleness

The key interest of this work is to operationalize gendered behaviour in two collaborative online platforms. In our previous work, we captured the gendered typicality of behavior as the probability of being female given behaviour. Specifically, we used a Random Forest model to predict whether a user’s inferred gender is female. Our model took into account variables covering behavioral choices in the level of activity, specialization in programming languages, and the gender choice of collaborators. An important methodological consideration was that variables that capture one’s behaviour are theoretically under the control of the individual. We called the resulting prediction score *femaleness*, which quantifies on a scale between 0 to 1 how female-like one’s behaviour is.

Here, we replicate this methodology with one important difference. In our previous Femaleness model variables capturing female homophily (No. of female collaborators, No. of females followed) were the most important predictors of being female. It can indicate that women work with women, because men do not want to collaborate with them. If that is the case, then our original methodological consideration using variables that the individual can control is not fulfilled. Female homophily is just the manifestation of the underlying mechanisms that produce discrimination. Therefore in this replication we remove variables capturing gendered collaboration patterns (No. of female collaborators,

No. of male collaborators, No. of unknowns collaborators, No. of females followed, No. of males followed, No. of unknowns followed) and use in our modelling only the number of followed users and the number of collaborators to capture network effect. On Behance, there is barely any collaboration on design projects, in that case we keep only the number of followed users.




Figure 3: **Femaleness Prediction Variable importance of gendered behavior prediction by the Random Forest Prediction in GitHub and Behance.** A) Variable importance is calculated by the drop-feature importance method that re-runs the prediction without the "dropped" variable. Then, the importance of the variable is the difference between the overall accuracy of the model and the accuracy of the model built after dropping the variable. B) Univariate Odds Ratios predicting  $gender = female$  with Logistic Regression Models.

The GitHub Random Forest classification was moderately accurate  $AUC = 0.64$ , which is lower than the the baseline model that contained gendered variables ( $AUC = 0.71$ ). The strength of Random Forest model is that can capture non-linear relationships between variables and enable intuitive ways to quantify variable importance [38, 39, 40]. In particular, we adopted a drop-feature importance method that re-runs the prediction without the "dropped" variable. Then, the importance of the variable is the difference between the overall accuracy of the model and the accuracy of the model built after dropping the variable.

Figure 3 shows the behavioural aspects of femaleness on GitHub and Behance by A) variable importance from random forest models, and B) univariate odds ratios predicting  $gender = female$  with a logistic regression models. The most important predictor on GitHub was specializing in iOS development, which was the third most important predictor in our original model. The second important predictor of Femaleness is Backend development, which is significantly more associated with men than women. The third most important aspect is the number of collaborators (users who contributed to the same repository with the focal user), which is the gender-neutral version of the baselines models' most important predictor "No. of female collaborators". Variable importances indicate that specializations in different programming fields are still important predictors, and odds ratios suggest similar gender behaviour patterns as before: Specifically, Frontend development and Backend developers using Ruby are significantly more likely to be females,

while pure Backend and PHP-focused Frontend developers are less likely. Odds ratios of Data Science and iOS were not significant.

The accuracy of the femaleness prediction on Behance was a bit higher ( $AUC = 0.69$ ) than on GitHub. Interestingly the most important behavioural aspect of femaleness was the number of followed users, which was the least important in the case of GitHub. On Behance, out of twelve predictors only two were significantly predicting higher probability for designers to be female: Fine Arts and the number of projects. Except total activity which is gender-neutral, non-significant predictor in the logit model, all other specializations and activity were significantly more associated with men. The probability density of Femaleness is shown on Figure 4.




Figure 4: **The probability density of Femaleness** The probability density of femaleness for males, females on GitHub and Behance. The median femaleness of our baselines model was 0.42 for males and 0.55 for females. The new femaleness on GitHub is more distinct by gender, the median femaleness for females is 0.2, and for men 0.8. On Behance the median predictions are closer to each other 0.37, and 0.63.

## Models

Our dependent variables are *attention*, *success* and *survival*. Attention is an important asset of success in online collaborative platforms: On GitHub successful developers have more followers [41, 42] and increased attention was shown to bring more success (appreciation) on Behance too [35]. Gender inequality was also shown on several social media platforms: in portfolio sites, such as GitHub, Behance or Dribbble (similar design community) - men tend to have higher number of followers. Success is measured on GitHub as the number of times other users have starred a repository of a given user, at the time of data collection. On Behance success is operationalized as the number of "appreciations" (likes) given to designs created by the focal user. Survival measured the same way on both platforms: we revisited both sites one year after data collections and checked whether the user had any new activity. If the user did not make any contribution on the site within the one year time window we marked the user as dropped-out, otherwise as a survivor.

Mann-Whitney U-tests (MW) also revealed that men have significantly higher number of followers (GitHub:  $IQR_{male} = [1, 12]$ ,  $IQR_{female} = [0, 10]$ ,  $MW_p = 0.000$ , Behance:  $IQR_{male} = [41; 927]$ ,  $IQR_{female} = [25, 401]$ ,  $MW_p = 0.000$ ), and are more successful (Number of stars on GitHub  $IQR_{male} = [0, 1]$ ,  $IQR_{female} = [0, 0]$ ,  $MW_p = 0.000$ , Number of project appreciations on Behance  $IQR_{male} = [0, 2264]$ ,  $IQR_{female} = [0, 980]$ ,  $MW_p = 0.000$ ) on both platforms. Men have a lower average drop-out rate on GitHub (Average drop-out  $Avg_{male} = 0.93$ ,  $Avg_{female} = 0.88$ ,  $MW_p = 0.000$ ) but a higher one on Behance ( $Avg_{male} = 0.45$ ,  $Avg_{female} = 0.417$ ,  $MW_p = 0.000$ ).

Because attention and success are right-skewed continuous variables, we apply logarithmic transformation on the number of followers, number of stars and project appreciations. We estimate  $\log(\text{attention})$  and  $\log(\text{success})$  with Linear Models. *Survival* is a binary variable, so we estimate it with a logistic regression model, where users who had activity are flagged with 1, while dropped-out ones as 0. Each model has the same control variables, which can provide alternative explanations between gender, femaleness and outcomes. Due to work-family conflict women have usually less time to maintain their professional presence, therefore the level of activity might benefit men more than women [43]. Men are more likely to join online portfolio sites earlier [44], and users with longer tenure are more likely to build

larger audiences and accumulate more success [41, 42]. Thus we control for *tenure* (number of years since registration) and *total activity* (No. of repositories/projects, and total activity on sites).

## Results

### Femaleness and outcomes

Figure 5 shows the key variables' point estimates and 99 percentile confidence interval for 3-3 regression models on GitHub and Behance (See full model table in SI Table 1.). Compared to our previous study, where women had a statistically significant negative relationship with survival, in our new models this disadvantage disappear ( $t_g = -0.15170$  ( $p = 0.386$ ),  $t_b = -0.19169$ , ( $p = 0.195$ )). Gender as an indicator of categorical gender discrimination is not significant in any of the models, regardless of platform or outcome. In the case of attention the relationship between being female and the number of followers is positive, but not significant on none of the platforms ( $t_g = 1.539$  ( $p = 0.124$ )),  $t_b = 0.030$  ( $p = 0.976$ )).




Figure 5: Point estimates, with 99 percent CIs, for variables related to gender. *Attention* and *Success* shows coefficients from Linear Models predicting success (the log. number of stars received, log. number of project appreciations), while *Survival* shows odds ratios from logit models predicting survival over a one year period following our data collection.

The *Femaleness* of behaviour is a strong negative predictor of *Attention* ( $t_g = -5.341$ ,  $t_b = -18.977$ ) and *Success* ( $t_g = -6.597$ ,  $t_b = -14.116$ ) on both platforms, but only significantly negative predictor of *Survival* in the case of Behance ( $t_g = -1.816$ , ( $p = 0.069$ ),  $t_b = -4.235$ ).

To test whether categorical gender discrimination and the negative impact of gendered-behavior can impact women differently than men, we tested for the *interaction of gender and femaleness*. In the case of GitHub, the interactions of categorical gender and female-like behavioural traits were not significant in any of the outcomes. However, on Behance the interaction of categorical gender and femaleness is a significant predictor of attention ( $t = 2.12$ ) and success ( $t = 3.23$ ). Figure 6 shows predicted values of attention (1st column), success (2nd column) and survival (3rd column) along the range of femaleness by gender categories on GitHub (1st row) and Behance (2nd row). Although the negative impact of femaleness put both men and women in disadvantage in all models (negative slope), in some cases categorical gender impacts outcome differently. In the case of attention, the difference between females (orange) and males (green) increases along the range of femaleness, predicting higher level of attention for female users with highly female-like behavior than men. This trend holds for predicting the number of project appreciations on Behance, while the difference between female and male GitHub users' success by femaleness is insignificant. Categorical gender has no impact on the survival of Behance users, while female GitHub users are clearly in disadvantage compared to men.

To quantify the impact of femaleness on outcomes, we take the median of femaleness by gender. The predicted attention on GitHub based on men' median is 39 followers for men, for women the prediction at their median femaleness is 38 followers. Taking men's attention as a 100%, the expected number of followers is 96% of that for women, meaning that the disadvantage that femaleness causes in attention for women is 4% point. The reason behind this small disadvantage is due to the positive impact of being female. To calculate the impact of categorical gender (being female) we calculate






Figure 6: Marginal predictions of attention, success and survival by *femaleness* and *gender* category from models illustrated on Figure 5, with fixing all other variables at their means. Prediction is only shown for the observed range of femaleness. Vertical dashed lines indicate medians of femaleness, and shaded vertical bars show the interquartile range (IQR).

the predicted attention for males at females' femaleness median (22.7) and divide it by males predicted number of followers based on their femaleness. This result in 58% point. The impact of categorical gender is simply the difference of the relative ratio of males' and females predicted success at females' median femaleness compared to men's predicted attention based on their own median femaleness. (Table SI.2. shows the exact numbers for each prediction). Thus, on GitHub categorical gender mitigates the disadvantage caused by femaleness with 38% point. Following the same formula on Behance we found that for men the prediction based on their median femaleness is 180 followers, for women 113 resulting in a 52% point of disadvantage, which was mitigated by categorical gender with 15% point. The positive impact of categorical gender (being female) indicate that women - regardless of their behaviour - are more visible than men on both platforms.

In the case of success on GitHub we found that women suffer a 21% disadvantage due to femaleness, which is much lower than in our baseline work where women had a disadvantage of 58%. This finding, and the key methodological difference in composing femaleness, specifically not taking homophily into account, suggest that gender homophily penalizes women more in settings where they are the minority. On Behance we found that women have a 45.5% of disadvantage in success due to femaleness, but it is eased by being female by 16% point. Similarly to attention, on Behance men are penalized more than women for having highly female-like behavior. In the case of survival women are in a disadvantage on both sides: on GitHub it is 1.8% point due to femaleness and 4.1% points due to being female, while on Behance the disadvantage is 12.5% points due femaleness and categorical gender has a 1.4% point positive impact.

## Discussion

We found that female typicality of behaviour is a significant negative predictor of attention, success and survival in creative platforms. Our models have negative coefficients for femaleness on both platforms, while categorical gender's impact varies by outcome and field. Femaleness impacts both gender negatively, but on the more gender-balanced design community men are penalized more for highly-female-like behaviour than women. We found supporting evidence for the famous visibility paradox of women in technical fields: while female typicality of behaviors is negatively related to attention, being female predicts higher level of attention. By not adding gender homophily to our new femaleness measure, we managed to quantify the indirect impact of gender homophily via gendered behaviour. We found a 37% point disadvantage difference between our previous results and our new ones, indicating that gender homophily is negatively impacting success by manifesting into gendered behaviour in open source software development. This is in agreement with seminal empirical studies on gender homophily and success [45, 46].

Our findings suggest that the impact of the gender typicality of behaviour might be a more general phenomena than our first study indicated. Although design careers are often considered more feminine than software development, and has a higher ratio of female professionals (28%), masculine career choices have been related to more success [8]. This is alarming since empirical studies suggests that women's shorter tenure and lower participation is the main factor behind lower wages and success [13]. The case of Behance proves the opposite: higher female participation does not automatically diminish unconscious gender discrimination. Furthermore, the increased visibility that women receives in such online collaborative platform is a double-edged sword: On the one hand, female professionals could use this increased attention to build a wider audience and promote their work, which eventually can help them, and the larger community to succeed with more visible role models [47, 48]. On the other hand, in online settings women are more likely to be harassed, and increased visibility might generate a backlash [49, 50, 51], making women less likely to participate in platforms, where they are exceptionally visible [52].

As technology, and especially AI systems advances, the gender data gap [53], and stereotypes rooted in behavior have long-lasting consequences, ranging from labelling images in a sexist manner [54, 55] to assigning women lower credit lines [56]. Research suggest that diversity enforces objectivity and mitigate creating products that discriminate [57, 58, 59, 60, 61]. Therefore the gatekeeper role of platforms, where (especially early-stage) professionals can gain feedback or showcase their work increases. Behance and GitHub serve as a portfolio sites for professionals, therefore keeping women active in these platforms could have long-term positive impacts.

This work is not without limitations. This study relies on large-scale open datasets where individuals do not self-report their gender. Gender is inferred based on individuals' names, which can be culturally biased towards Western names [62], therefore our findings cannot be generalized to every culture. An other limitation of our study is the way we quantified survival which is measured as having activity a year after data collection on the given platform. We are aware that users' without activity are not necessary quit their profession or the platform, it is a possible scenario that "dropped-out" users got a new job, which required a new account or forced them move to a competing platform. Finally, we attempted to measure femaleness by variables that can be controlled by the focal user, but due to the gendered nature of online platforms [16, 10] one cannot assume that stereotypes and the subordinate role of women in the society does not impact women's career decisions.

## References

- [1] Gernot Grabher and Jonas König. Disruption, embedded. a polanyian framing of the platform economy. *Sociologica*, 14(1):95–118, 2020.
- [2] Brendan Churchill and Lyn Craig. Gender in the gig economy: Men and women using digital platforms to secure work in australia. *Journal of Sociology*, 55(4):741–761, 2019.
- [3] Andrea Bonaccorsi and Cristina Rossi. Why Open Source software can succeed. *Research Policy*, 32:1243–1258, 2003.
- [4] Laura Dabbish, Colleen Stuart, Jason Tsay, and Jim Herbsleb. Social Coding in GitHub: Transparency and Collaboration in an Open Software Repository. In *Proceedings of the ACM 2012 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, pages 1277–1286, New York, New York, USA, 2012. ACM Press.
- [5] Hudson Borges and Marco Tulio Valente. What's in a github star? understanding repository starring practices in a social coding platform. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 146:112–129, 2018.
- [6] Annelieke C van den Berg, Sarah N Giest, Sandra M Groeneveld, and Wessel Kraaij. Inclusivity in online platforms: Recruitment strategies for improving participation of diverse sociodemographic groups. *Public Administration Review*, 2020.

- [7] Denae Ford, Justin Smith, Philip J Guo, and Chris Parnin. Paradise unplugged: Identifying barriers for female participation on stack overflow. In *Proceedings of the 2016 24th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 846–857, 2016.
- [8] Johannes Wachs, Anikó Hannák, András Vörös, and Bálint Daróczy. Why do men get more attention? exploring factors behind success in an online design community. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 11, 2017.
- [9] Anna May, Johannes Wachs, and Anikó Hannák. Gender differences in participation and reward on stack overflow. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 24(4):1997–2019, 2019.
- [10] Seppo Poutanen and Anne Kovalainen. New economy, platform economy and gender. In *Gender and Innovation in the New Economy*, pages 47–96. Springer, 2017.
- [11] Francesco Bogliacino, Cristiano Codagnone, Valeria Cirillo, Dario Guarascio, et al. Quantity and quality of work in the platform economy. *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*, 2019.
- [12] Raphael Silberzahn, Eric Luis Uhlmann, and Lei Zhu. Pay as she goes: For stereotypically male jobs, women tend to be hired by the hour. In *Academy of Management Proceedings*, volume 2014, page 16273. Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510, 2014.
- [13] Cody Cook, Rebecca Diamond, Jonathan Hall, John A List, and Paul Oyer. The gender earnings gap in the gig economy: Evidence from over a million rideshare drivers. 2018.
- [14] Kenneth D Mandl, Joshua C Mandel, and Isaac S Kohane. Driving innovation in health systems through an apps-based information economy. *Cell systems*, 1(1):8–13, 2015.
- [15] Maria Lohan and Wendy Faulkner. Masculinities and technologies: Some introductory remarks. *Men and masculinities*, 6(4):319–329, 2004.
- [16] Catherine Truss, Edel Conway, Alessia d’Amato, Grainne Kelly, Kathy Monks, Enda Hannon, and Patrick C Flood. Knowledge work: gender-blind or gender-biased? *Work, employment and society*, 26(5):735–754, 2012.
- [17] H. M. Hacker. Women as a Minority Group. *Social Forces*, 30(1):60–69, oct 1951.
- [18] Ann Oakley. *Sex, gender and society*. Ashgate Publishing, Burlington, 2015.
- [19] Diana Schellenberg and Anelis Kaiser. The sex/gender distinction: Beyond f and m. In Cheryl B. Travis, Jacquelyn W. White, Alexandra Rutherford, Wendi S. Williams, Sarah L. Cook, and Karen Fraser Wyche, editors, *APA handbook of the psychology of women: History, theory, and battlegrounds (Vol. 1)*, pages 165–187. American Psychological Association, Washington, 2018.
- [20] J Richard Udry. The nature of gender. *Demography*, 31(4):561–573, 1994.
- [21] Candace West and Sarah Fenstermaker. Doing difference. *Gender & Society*, 9(1):8–37, feb 1995.
- [22] Balazs Vedres and Orsolya Vasarhelyi. Gendered behavior as a disadvantage in open source software development. *EPJ Data Science*, 8(1):25, 2019.
- [23] Dulini Fernando, Laurie Cohen, and Joanne Duberley. The problem of visibility of women in engineering and how they manage it. *HBR*, 2018.
- [24] Zhendong Wang, Yi Wang, and David Redmiles. Competence-confidence gap: A threat to female developers’ contribution on github. In *2018 IEEE/ACM 40th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Society (ICSE-SEIS)*, pages 81–90. IEEE, 2018.
- [25] Eun Lee, Fariba Karimi, Claudia Wagner, Hang-Hyun Jo, Markus Strohmaier, and Mirta Galesic. Homophily and minority-group size explain perception biases in social networks. *Nature human behaviour*, 3(10):1078–1087, 2019.
- [26] Kelly A Mollica, Barbara Gray, and Linda K Trevino. Racial homophily and its persistence in newcomers’ social networks. *Organization Science*, 14(2):123–136, 2003.
- [27] Bedoor AlShebli, Kinga Makovi, and Talal Rahwan. Retracted article: The association between early career informal mentorship in academic collaborations and junior author performance. *Nature communications*, 11(1):1–8, 2020.
- [28] Elroi J Windsor. *Femininities*. 2015.
- [29] GitHub. Octoverse, official github statistics homepage=<https://octoverse.github.com/#the-world-of-open-source>, note = Accessed: 2020-02-18,.
- [30] Georgios Gousios and Diomidis Spinellis. Mining software engineering data from github. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion (ICSE-C)*, pages 501–502. IEEE, 2017.

- [31] Nikolas Zöllner, Jonathan H Morgan, and Tobias Schröder. A topology of groups: What github can tell us about online collaboration. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 161:120291, 2020.
- [32] Bogdan Vasilescu, Daryl Posnett, Baishakhi Ray, Mark GJ van den Brand, Alexander Serebrenik, Premkumar Devanbu, and Vladimir Filkov. Gender and tenure diversity in github teams. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 3789–3798, 2015.
- [33] Marco Ortu, Giuseppe Destefanis, Steve Counsell, Stephen Swift, Roberto Tonelli, and Michele Marchesi. How diverse is your team? investigating gender and nationality diversity in github teams. *Journal of Software Engineering Research and Development*, 5(1):1–18, 2017.
- [34] Nasif Imtiaz, Justin Middleton, Joymallya Chakraborty, Neill Robson, Gina Bai, and Emerson Murphy-Hill. Investigating the effects of gender bias on github. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 700–711. IEEE, 2019.
- [35] Nam Wook Kim. Creative community demystified: a statistical overview of behance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00800*, 2017.
- [36] Denae Ford, Alisse Harkins, and Chris Parnin. Someone like me: How does peer parity influence participation of women on stack overflow? In *2017 IEEE symposium on visual languages and human-centric computing (VL/HCC)*, pages 239–243. IEEE, 2017.
- [37] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- [38] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- [39] Carolin Strobl, Anne-Laure Boulesteix, Thomas Kneib, Thomas Augustin, and Achim Zeileis. Conditional variable importance for random forests. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 9(307), 2008.
- [40] Terence Parr, Kerem Turgutlu, Christopher Csiszar, and Jeremy Howard. Beware default random forest importances. *March*, 26:2018, 2018.
- [41] Ali Sajedi Badashian and Eleni Stroulia. Measuring user influence in github: the million follower fallacy. In *2016 IEEE/ACM 3rd International Workshop on CrowdSourcing in Software Engineering (CSI-SE)*, pages 15–21. IEEE, 2016.
- [42] Jing Jiang, David Lo, Jiahuan He, Xin Xia, Pavneet Singh Kochhar, and Li Zhang. Why and how developers fork what from whom in github. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 22(1):547–578, 2017.
- [43] M K Ahuja. Women in the information technology profession: a literature review, synthesis and research agenda. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 11(1):20–34, mar 2002.
- [44] Johannes Putzke, Kai Fischbach, Detlef Schoder, and Peter A Gloor. Cross-cultural gender differences in the adoption and usage of social media platforms—an exploratory study of last. fm. *Computer Networks*, 75:519–530, 2014.
- [45] Mohsen Jadidi, Fariba Karimi, Haiko Lietz, and Claudia Wagner. Gender disparities in science? dropout, productivity, collaborations and success of male and female computer scientists. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 21(03n04):1750011, 2018.
- [46] Luke Holman, Devi Stuart-Fox, and Cindy E Hauser. The gender gap in science: How long until women are equally represented? *PLoS biology*, 16(4):e2004956, 2018.
- [47] Jacquelynne S Eccles and Ming-Te Wang. What motivates females and males to pursue careers in mathematics and science? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 40(2):100–106, 2016.
- [48] Shulamit Kahn and Donna Ginther. Women and stem. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2017.
- [49] Hannah Yelin and Laura Clancy. Doing impact work while female: Hate tweets, ‘hot potatoes’ and having ‘enough of experts’. *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, page 1350506820910194, 2020.
- [50] Corinne A Moss-Racusin and Laurie A Rudman. Disruptions in women’s self-promotion: The backlash avoidance model. *Psychology of women quarterly*, 34(2):186–202, 2010.
- [51] Stav Atir and Melissa J Ferguson. How gender determines the way we speak about professionals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(28):7278–7283, 2018.
- [52] Katherine Baldiga Coffman. Evidence on self-stereotyping and the contribution of ideas. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(4):1625–1660, 2014.

- [53] Caroline Criado Perez. *Invisible Women: Exposing data bias in a world designed for men*. Random House, UK, 2019.
- [54] Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam T Kalai. Man is to computer programmer as woman is to homemaker? debiasing word embeddings. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 4349–4357, 2016.
- [55] James Zou and Londa Schiebinger. Ai can be sexist and racist—it’s time to make it fair, 2018.
- [56] Neil Vigdor. Apple card investigated after gender discrimination complaints. *The New York Times*, 10, 2019.
- [57] Jennifer Raymond. Most of us are biased. *Nature*, 495(7439):33–34, 2013.
- [58] Sheen S Levine, Evan P Apfelbaum, Mark Bernard, Valerie L Bartelt, Edward J Zajac, and David Stark. Ethnic diversity deflates price bubbles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(52):18524–18529, 2014.
- [59] David Rock and Heidi Grant. Why diverse teams are smarter. *Harvard Business Review*, 4(4):2–5, 2016.
- [60] Julia B Bear and Anita Williams Woolley. The role of gender in team collaboration and performance. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 36(2):146–153, jun 2011.
- [61] Kendall Powell. These labs are remarkably diverse — here’s why they’re winning at science. *Nature*, 558(7708):19–22, jun 2018.
- [62] Fariba Karimi, Claudia Wagner, Florian Lemmerich, Mohsen Jadidi, and Markus Strohmaier. Inferring Gender from Names on the Web: A Comparative Evaluation of Gender Detection Methods. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web - WWW ’16 Companion*, pages 53–54, 2016.