

Gendering Gender: Introducing Gender Image as a Way to Assess Variation in Gender Expression in Survey Research

Claudia Geist

Kari J. Dockendorff

University of Utah

DRAFT PAPER PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION

We seek to bridge the research between "traditional" gender inequality scholars and those who focus on the disadvantages experienced by trans* and gender non-conforming individuals. We build on the pioneering research that has changed the way we think about how to measure gender in survey research. We argue that assessing how individuals see themselves and how they think others see them with respect to femininity, masculinity, and androgyny can give us an additional way to examine how gender structures opportunities and disadvantages in contemporary societies beyond gender identity and sexuality categories. The present paper focuses on introducing the concept and demonstrates overlap and disparities between the way individuals see themselves and believe others see them.

Scholarship on gender is varied, rich, and often controversial. Some research focuses on the ways gender is socially constructed and reproduced (Herek 1986, Lorber and Farrell 1991, Lorber 2004, Ridgeway 1991, Risman 2004). Others explore how gendered takes on different meanings across groups both within and across cultures (i.e. (Collins 1998, Connell 2012, Messner 2000, Oudshoorn, Saetnan and Lie 2002). Our

research more specifically seeks to speak to scholars who examine gender inequality, including economic and health disparities. We seek to demonstrate a way to approximate a measure of gender expression in survey research, which can provide an additional axis to understand ways in which gender structures opportunities and disadvantages in contemporary societies beyond gender identity and sexuality categories.

Background

"Gender Inequality" Research

Traditionally, those who study "gender inequality" explore differences in outcomes such as earnings, occupational choices, major selection, wealth, and a myriad of socio-economic indicators, between "Men" and "Women" (Baxter and Kane 1995, Blau and Kahn 1997, Cole and Geist 2018, Dollar and Gatti 1999, Fuwa 2004, Hundley 2000, Korpi 2000, Morris and Western 1999, Robeyns 2003, Seguino 2000). The research that examines differences between cisgender men and women who are presumed to be heterosexual, relies on fairly monolithic assumptions about gender. Emphasis on gendered responsibilities suggests that life course transitions affect the degree to which individuals conform to or are held to gendered behavior expectations is the only variation of gender. Examples include the gendered implications of parenthood, and domestic division of labor patterns that largely are studied for cisgender (see Aultman 2014 for a discussion of this concept) heterosexual families, etc. These life events, such

as parenthood and familial responsibilities, are presumed to exist within a heterosexual framework, if only because including non-cisgender and non-heterosexual participants creates difficulties for “representative” sample-based studies. This makes the largely qualitative work that specifically examines the lives and experiences of non-heterosexual and non-cisgender individuals and families all the more important, but we mostly discuss the assumptions and challenges of the quantitative work.

Sexual Identity Discrimination

One extension of this overall body of work on gender inequality builds on research on the marginalization of those who are marginalized due to sexuality in a world where heterosexuality is not only assumed but often enforced (Bailey, Wallace and Wright 2013, Clements-Nolle, Marx and Katz 2006, Huebner, Rebchook and Kegeles 2004, Mays and Cochran 2001, Ragins and Cornwell 2001, Tilcsik 2011, Waite and Denier 2015). Specifically, there is a growing body of literature that identifies how labor market experiences are structured by sexuality, and have demonstrated discrimination at the point of hiring, with some complex differences in the experiences of gay men and lesbian women (Antecol, Jong and Steinberger 2008, Bailey, Wallace and Wright 2013, Chrobot-Mason, Button and DiClementi 2001, Ragins and Cornwell 2001, Waite and Denier 2015). Qualitative research on the experience of sexual minority individuals is often rich in describing the subtleties of gender expressions and the careful constructions of identities and the resulting lived experiences (see, for example, Schilt

2006). However, in the largely quantitative research specifically on workplace inequality and wage gaps this often falls by the wayside. There are some notable exceptions such as studies that varied the degree of violation of gender roles (through headshots that were part of the application materials) by lesbian applicants in an audit study (Weichselbaumer 2003).

Transgender Identity Discrimination

Research on the extreme marginalization, exclusion, and violence experienced by transgender individuals and others who do not identify within the gender binary (i.e. gender non-conforming, gender queer, non-binary, or agender individuals) has highlighted the much higher mortality and morbidity rates among transgender people, especially transwomen of color who face multiple types of oppression (Bradford et al. 2013, Gosset et al. 2017, Grant et al. 2011, Singh 2013, Spade 2015, see also Westbrook and Schilt 2014). Although much of the research on trans* experiences and the challenging negotiations of gender expression in the public sphere, the research that seeks to quantify the disadvantages, victimization, and economic marginalization experiences is usually based on limited identity markers, that minimizes variation within this social category.

Assumptions of Homogeneity

Much of the ongoing research efforts seek to ensure that the erasure of those who do not identify as cisgender or heterosexual, through more detailed measures of sex and gender identity, persists by asking questions about sexual behavior as well as identity. There are many promising efforts to improve the measurement of gender diversity in survey research (Magliozzi, Saperstein and Westbrook 2016).

We seek to explore an alternative approach. Even more fine-grained measures of gender identity do not address the issue of social exclusion that is often based on acts by others, and discrimination is often committed by those who base their actions on assumptions about individuals – that is how individuals are “read” by others rather than how they identify is underexplored.

Audit studies usually include markers of sexuality. Workplace ethnographies have identified how coming out may be associated with changes in how people are treated, but many questions remain.

Gender Expression vs. Identity

Typically, survey research relies on participants self-classification for sociodemographic categorizations. However, limited categorical measures of identities that are unstable and fluid, such as gender (Butler 2004), have the effect of preventing the existence of certain identities. Social identities are meaningful, and research has shown that offering a wide variety of categories, for example allowing multiple racial

categories, or providing more than two possible gender identities are good research practices that can make participations feel less excluded even if they are socially marginalized (Butler 2004, Magliozzi, Saperstein and Westbrook 2016, Mayo 2017) Mayo, 2017). Identities are central to how people interact with one another, and much research has been done about disclosure of sexual and gender minority identities (Spade 2007, Spade 2015).

However, many interactions lack the kind of information that provide contextual information – passers-by will not know your names, your pronouns, or sexual identity. Ridgeway (2011) argues that even in casual interactions, individuals seek to gender others fall back on established ways to communicate and to make gendered assumptions about one another. Ridgeway's work outlines how gender stereotypes are persistent even as views about gender have been changing. Her work, however, does not address the variation across individuals in the extent to which they conform or deviate to normative gender expression.

Our research is motivated by the idea that identities are often invisible, and that interactions, especially with those who do not know us, are shaped by gender expression rather than identity.

The present study: Gender Image as additional dimension of study

Our research seeks to add a different dimension to the study of gender inequality – rather than focus on the axes of cis-gender vs not cis-gender, and heterosexual vs not heterosexual, we want to lay the foundation for research that distinguishes individuals not necessarily on their chosen gender category but differentiates in their adherence to notions of femininity, masculinity, and androgyny.

Previous research has been relatively silent on variation in gender display or expression in cisgender individuals. A small number of studies in the hiring discrimination field has explored whether perceived femininity mattered in how lesbian applicants are evaluated (Weichselbaumer 2003), and other research has explored the role of “passing”, perceived adherence to cis-gender presentations in the experience of oppression in transgender individuals (Miller and Grollman 2015), but less has been done on misattribution of sexuality outside of the body of literature that examines the spouse of trans* and gender nonconforming people (i.e., Pfeffer 2010).

How much does adherence to traditional femininity help or hurt cisgender, heterosexual women? Does conformity to traditional masculinity ideals in their gender expression and demeanor limit discrimination experienced by gay men? If individuals appear as traditionally feminine or masculine cisgender identities even if that is not in line with, say, queer, genderfluid identities, which matter more?

In this paper, we do not attempt to answer these questions but we seek to provide the groundwork for exploring ways to measure gender expression and, what we

coin gender image. Specifically, we explore whether there is meaningful variation in femininity, masculinity, and androgyny in two medium size samples. Our goal is not to demonstrate specific inequalities along the lines of adherence of conventional masculinities and femininities, but rather to identify whether individuals cluster in gender presentation groupings that then can be used for additional scholarly research on gender inequalities. Others have attempted to create measures of gender expression, specifically for gender minority women (Lehavot, King and Simoni 2011), but those were framed on very specific aspects of hairstyle, carrying a purse, etc. which we consider to be less robust over time, across classes, as well as across racial and ethnic groups. Instead, we explore the degree to which people see themselves, and believe others see them as masculine, feminine, and androgynous.

Data and Methods

Data

For the purposes of this project, we use data from two different studies: one set of data is from a national study, and the second set of data comes from a smaller study at the University of Utah. The sample for the national study (study 1) is made up of student affairs staff at public, four-year institutions across the United States. Academic advisors, admissions counselors, housing staff, registrar's staff, financial aid counselors, and career advisors were surveyed as part of a larger study measuring trans* inclusivity

of staff within postsecondary education. Participants were contacted directly via email or through key contacts within an organization who agreed to share survey information with co-workers; 552 individuals completed the survey. See Table 1 for participant characteristics).

The sample for the student study (study 2) includes undergraduate students enrolled in Spring, Summer, and Fall 2017 semesters at the University of Utah. The university is a large, research institution serving approximately 33,000 students, located in Salt Lake City, Utah's state capital. The University of Utah is a Predominantly White Institution (PWI), with about 68% of enrolled students identifying as white (University of Utah, 2017). Convenience sampling was used to select large sociology and gender studies courses that had professors willing to send our survey out and student who might be motivated to participated in the study (Creswell and Creswell 2017). Students received a link to a Qualtrics survey sent out by their instructor through their student portal platform. Students were under no obligation to complete the survey and could enter a raffle to win a gift certificate upon completion of the survey. As we could not verify instructors' follow-through with sending out survey links, we cannot calculate a response rate. A total of 338 students completed the survey (See Table 1 for participant characteristics).

Measures

Sex and Gender. We include a measure of sex assigned at birth, with the options of male, female, and intersex, which was followed up with a question about participants' current gender. Participants could select multiple options (Woman, Man, Transgender, Gender queer, Gender non-conforming, a gender not listed here (please specify). This two-question approach is in line with current best practices for survey research (Tate, Ledbetter and Youssef 2013).

Sexual Identity. Participants could select one or more sexual identity categories. Options were Heterosexual/straight, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Queer, Other (please specify).

Gender Image. Building on previous research from Magliozzi et al. (2016), we asked participants to reflect on how they see themselves ("In general, how do you see yourself") and how others see them ("In general, how do most people see you?") with scales for "feminine", "masculine", and "androgynous" ranging from "not at all" (0) to "very" (6). Some cisgender women only filled out the femininity score and did not fill out how they or others saw them with respect to masculinity and androgyny, and similarly a number of cisgender men did not provide information about their self-assessed femininity and androgyny. We imputed the missing values as "not at all," as participants seemingly did not see these dimensions of gender as applicable to them. We also collected information about age and race/ethnicity.

Table 1: Overview of Two Samples

	Sample 1 (National Sample)			Sample 2 (Student Sample)			Range (both samples combined)	
<i>Gender Identity</i>	531							
Man		0.71		235	0.70	0.46	0	1
Woman		0.24		235	0.23	0.42	0	1
Trans/GnC/Nonbinary		0.05		235	0.07	0.25	0	1
<i>Sex at Birth</i>	531							
assigned female		0.74		235	0.74		0	1
assigned male		0.25			0.26		0	1
assigned intersex ¹		0.004 (n=2)			0		0	1
Exclusively Heterosexual (1=yes 0=no)	531	0.72	0.45	235	0.67	0.47	0	1
White (1=yes 0=no)	531	0.79	0.41	235	0.71	0.45	0	1
Age (in years)	525	34.24	10.21	224	22.88	5.74	17	67
<i>Gender Image (self)</i>								
Femininity	530	3.90	1.75	235	3.73	1.83	0	6
Masculinity	529	2.05	1.80	235	2.12	1.89	0	6
Androgyny	531	0.95	1.44	235	1.23	1.74	0	6
<i>Gender Image (others)</i>								
Femininity	529	4.01	1.95	234	3.81	1.99	0	6
Masculinity	528	1.83	2.01	235	1.86	2.04	0	6
Androgyny	531	0.61	1.13	235	0.86	1.44	0	6

Notes: 1 because of the extremely small group size ($n=2$) of people who report intersex assignment at birth and the difficulty of cis vs. transgender categories these 2 cases are excluded from most analyses that included gender categories. They are included in the latent class analyses of gender Image.

Analytic Strategy

In a first step, we describe sex, gender, sexuality, including the intersection of sex assigned at birth, current gender, and sexual identity in both samples. In a second step, we describe Gender Image, the self-reported level of femininity, masculinity, and androgyny across established gender categories. In the third step, we use latent class analysis (LCA) to identify Gender Image latent classes. To understand the extent to which these latent classes overlap or differ from established gender categories we describe, in a final step, the latent classes of Gender Image relative to reported gender identities and sexuality.

Although for much of our analyses we simplify gender identity into three broad categories of Woman, Man, and all other identities combined, Table 2 shows the actual distributions of gender identities in our two samples.

Table 2: Gender Identities: Reported Combinations

National Sample (Sample 1)	N	
Woman	378	71.19
Man	129	24.29
Gender queer	5	0.94
Gender non-conforming	3	0.56
Man,Gender non-conforming	2	0.38
Transgender,Gender queer,Gender non-conforming	2	0.38
Gender non-conforming, non-binary	1	0.19
Man,Gender queer	1	0.19
Man,Transgender	1	0.19
Transgender	1	0.19
Transgender, non-binary	1	0.19
Transgender,Gender queer, agender	1	0.19
Woman, cisgender	1	0.19
Woman,Gender non-conforming	1	0.19

A gender not listed here (please specify). You tell me, I don't know; Fluid; Nonbinary; ze, zir	4	0.75
Total	531	100

Table 2 continued.

Student Sample		
Woman	165	70.21
Man	54	22.98
Genderqueer	5	2.13
Gender Non-conforming, agender	1	0.43
Man, gender questioning	1	0.43
Man,Genderqueer, "Identify with male body. Identify more with society's view of women"	1	0.43
Man,Woman,Genderqueer, Gender Fluid	1	0.43
Transgender	1	0.43
Transgender,Gender Non-conforming, "nonbinary"	1	0.43
Transgender, Genderqueer, "Agender/non-binary"	1	0.43
Transgender, Genderqueer, Gender Non-conforming, nonbinary, agender	1	0.43
A Gender Not Listed Here (Please Specify. apache helicopter; trashcan dumpster agender	3	1.28
Total	235	100

Table 2 alone illustrates that when given the choice, people will choose identities other than man or woman, and illustrates the diversity of gender identities. Table 3 further illustrates in a different way how limiting assumptions of cisgender heterosexual samples really are. Only the combinations in the greyed-out boxes conform to these assumptions. But many more combinations exist. However, Table 2 also finds that heterosexual and cisgender identities go hand-in-hand. And yet, when we look at those

who do not identify as heterosexual, identities outside of the binary are not uncommon. Those who identify as gender nonconforming or participants who are transgender might not feel that they can identify as heterosexual, and vice versa, those who identify as non-heterosexual are more open to identify outside of the binary.

Table 3: Gender Identities by Sexuality and Sex Assigned at Birth

Sexuality	Heterosexual		Not Heterosexual	
	Assigned MALE at birth	Assigned FEMALE at birth	Assigned MALE at birth	Assigned FEMALE at birth
National Sample				
Man	100% (77)	0	90% (52)	0
Woman	0	99% (299)	0	85% (78)
Transgender/GnC/Nonbinary	0	1% (3)	10% (6)	15% (14)
Student Sample				
Man	0	100% (117)	74% (14)	0
Woman	98% (40)	0	0	83% (48)
Transgender/GnC/Nonbinary	2% (1)	0	26% (5)	17% (10)

Note: In the national sample 2 individuals were assigned intersex at birth. One person identifies as woman and not heterosexual, one person identifies as “a gender not listed here” (detailed description not filled in) and heterosexual.

In the national sample, among those who identify as not heterosexual, between 10 and 15 individuals identify outside the binary, but there are also 3 individuals who identify as heterosexual who identify as neither man or woman.

In the sample of students, we see higher rates of nonbinary and trans identities, which could be expected given the focus of the data collection. Among those who do

not identify as heterosexual, 17% of those who were assigned female at birth and 26% of those who were assigned male at birth identify outside of the gender binary.

Table 4: Gender Image (by Self and Others) by Gender Identity Categories (Mean Scores)

	National Sample			Student Sample		
	Men	Women	Trans*/ GnC/ Nonbinary	Men	Women	Trans*/ GnC/ Nonbinary
<i>Femininity</i>						
By self	1.75	4.70	2.91	1.37	4.63	2.25
By others	1.42	4.90	3.43	1.11	4.79	2.88
<i>Masculinity</i>						
By self	4.39	1.42	2.65	4.74	1.18	3.06
By others	4.64	1.00	2.48	4.80	0.77	2.94
<i>Androgyny</i>						
By self	0.59	1.09	3.91	1.06	1.02	4.13
By others	0.45	0.71	2.30	0.78	0.70	2.81
N	106	303	23	164	54	16

Note: Numbers in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals based on 1000 replications (bootstrap procedure), scales range from 0 to 6.

Table 4 describes responses to the gender image questions. As expected, men report seeing themselves and being seen by others as very masculine (with a mean of over 4 on a scale of 0 to 6), those who identify as women have similarly high scores on femininity. Participants who identify outside the binary have means that suggest, on average, they see themselves and are perceived as somewhat feminine, somewhat masculine, and also somewhat androgynous. This holds for both the Utah based student sample as well as the national sample. Table 4 also illustrate that gender image scores

on masculinity, femininity and androgyny are somewhat less gender stereotypical than the gender image that others perceive – self-reported femininity is slightly lower than that perceived by others for women, and vice versa for masculinity perceived by men. Androgyny as perceived by others is lower for those who identify as men, women, and those who identify with a gender descriptor outside the binary.

Table 5: Gender Image by Gender Identity and Sexuality
National Sample

	Heterosexual		Trans*/ GnC/ Non- binary	Not Heterosexual		Trans*/ GnC/ Non- binary
	Cisgender			Cisgender		
	Women	Men	Women	Men		
	235	62	3	67	44	20
Femininity						
By self	4.91	1.53	3.33	3.97	2.05	2.85
By others	5.11	1.16	4.67	4.18	1.77	3.30

Masculinity						
By self	1.21	4.74	2.67	2.15	3.89	2.60
By others	0.79	4.92	1.67	1.76	4.25	2.50
Androgyny						
By self	0.83	0.50	3.33	1.99	0.73	4.10
By others	0.51	0.47	2.00	1.39	0.43	2.30

Student Sample

	Heterosexual		Trans*/ GnC/ Non- binary	Not Heterosexual		Trans*/ GnC/ Non- binary
	Cisgender			Cisgender		
	Women	Men		Women	Men	
	116	40		48	14	
Femininity			1			15
By self	4.78	1.10	0.00	4.29	2.14	2.40
By others	4.86	0.78	0.00	4.60	2.07	3.07
Masculinity						
By self	0.94	5.00	6.00	1.75	4.00	2.87
By others	0.66	5.03	6.00	1.04	4.14	2.73
Androgyny						
By self	0.73	0.95	0.00	1.71	1.36	4.40
By others	0.59	0.80	0.00	0.94	0.71	3.00

Table 5 further breaks down the gender image scores by sexuality in addition to the typical gender categories. We find that the patterns described in Table 3 also apply to sexual minority participants, where gender image described by others is slightly more stereotypical than the self-described means. We find greater reports of androgyny in those who identify as not heterosexual for both men and women, and men who are not heterosexual report lower levels of self-perceived masculinity and higher levels of

femininity whereas women who do not identify as heterosexual report great higher levels of masculinity.

In latent class analysis we explored whether individuals' "self" gender image or their gender image through the lens of others better categorized participants into distinct groups. We found that other's attributions resulted in a better model fit (see Table 6). We also compared the model fit of a 3 class and a 4-class solution, and found that 4 classes provide a better model fit across each of the two samples.

Table 6: Fit Statistics for Latent Class Models

	National Sample		Utah Student Sample	
	3 classes	4 classes	3 classes	4 classes
Self Gender Image	4769.417 / 4829.263	4602.306 / 4679.252	2411.645/2460.080	2336.660/2398.933
"Other" Gender Image	4432.358 / 4492.178	4312.667 / 4389.579	2285.278/2333.712	2227.850/ 2290.123

Note: AIC/BIC, we also explored solutions based on both self and other gender image but the fit was inferior.

Table 7 illustrates mean scores on the gender image (through the lens of others) for the 4 classes we found, followed by a brief descriptor for the class, which is used in the remainder of the paper for clarity. Class 1, which we label "hyper femininity" is characterized by very mean scores on femininity, and low to very low scores on masculinity and androgyny. Class 2, expanded femininity, still has relatively high femininity scores, but higher scores on masculinity as well as androgyny. Class 3 is

different between the national and the Utah student sample. In the national sample it is best described as “multifaceted,” with relatively high levels of masculinity, androgyny as well as, to a somewhat smaller extent, femininity. In the Utah student sample, this grouping is defined by very high levels of androgyny, which is why we coin it expanded androgyny. Class 4 is masculinity with very low levels of androgyny and high levels of masculinity and relatively low levels of femininity. Supplemental analyses that explored whether there were also two subgroups of masculinity in solutions with more than four classes yielded no such findings.

Table 7: Gender Image Means by Latent Class

National Sample				
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Mean				
<i>Femininity</i>	5.22	4.51	2.89	1.20
<i>Masculinity</i>	0.58	1.84	3.62	4.85
<i>Androgyny</i>	0.14	2.37	3.50	0.22
Class descriptor	Hyperfemininity	Expanded Femininity	Multifaceted	Traditional Masculinity
% of sample	55%	15%	7%	22%
Student Sample				
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Mean				
<i>Femininity</i>	5.11	3.28	2.44	1.07
<i>Masculinity</i>	0.46	2.13	3.45	4.96
<i>Androgyny</i>	0.18	2.94	5.49	0.20
Class descriptor	Hyperfemininity	Expanded Femininity	Expanded Androgyny	Traditional Masculinity
% of sample	56%	19%	3%	22%

Next, we calculated the mean probability to be a group member of each of the four classes as described above more commonly used gender categories. We find that the average probably of belonging to the hyperfeminine class among those who identify as women is .75, followed by a probably of .18 to belong to the androgynous femininity group. Among respondents who identify as men, the mean probably of fitting in the traditional masculinity class is .82. Those who identify as transgender, gender non-conforming, or nonbinary are more varied. On average, their probably of fitting in the multifaceted class is .38, closely followed by a probably of .33 of being a member of the androgynous femininity class. Lower probabilities of group membership were found for hyperfemininity (.17) and traditional masculinity (.12).

Table 8: Mean probability of class membership by Stated Gender Identity

National Sample					
	Class descriptor	Women (377)	Men (129)	Trans*/ GnC/ Nonbinary (24)	
Class 1	Hyperfemininity	0.75	0.05	0.17	
Class 2	Androgynous Femininity	0.18	0.04	0.33	
Class 3	Multifaceted	0.05	0.09	0.38	
Class 4	Traditional Masculinity	0.02	0.82	0.12	
Student Sample					
	Class descriptor	Women (165)	Men (54)	Trans*/ GnC/ Nonbinary (16)	

Class 1	Hyperfemininity	0.79	0.02	0.00
Class 2	Expanded Femininity	0.16	0.13	0.68
Class 3	Expanded Androgyny	0.01	0.05	0.13
Class 4	Traditional Masculinity	0.04	0.80	0.19

In a next step we examine whether sexuality, another common marker of gender, broadly defined, neatly explains gender image classes. We find that among respondents who identify as heterosexual, mean probability of membership in the hyper feminine and traditional masculinity groups were higher (.79 for women and .88 for men), but lower among those who do not identify as not heterosexual.

Table 9: Mean probability of class membership by Stated Gender Identity and Sexuality

National Sample				
	Class descriptor	Women	Men	Trans*/ GnC/ Nonbinary
Heterosexual		298	77	4
Class 1	Hyperfemininity	0.80	0.00	0.25
Class 2	Androgynous Femininity	0.16	0.03	0.50
Class 3	Multifaceted	0.03	0.08	0.25
Class 4	Traditional Masculinity	0.01	0.88	0.00
Not Heterosexual		79	52	20
Class 1	Hyperfemininity	0.56	0.11	0.15
Class 2	Androgynous Femininity	0.24	0.06	0.30

Class 3	Multifaceted		0.14	0.09	0.40
Class 4	Traditional Masculinity		0.06	0.74	0.15
Student Sample					
	Class descriptor	Women	Men	Trans*/ GnC/ Nonbinary	
Heterosexual		117	40	1	
Class 1	Hyperfemininity		0.82	0.00	0.00
Class 2	Expanded Femininity		0.13	0.11	0.00
Class 3	Expanded Androgyny		0.02	0.07	0.00
Class 4	Traditional Masculinity		0.03	0.82	1.00
Not Heterosexual		48	14	15	
Class 1	Hyperfemininity		0.74	0.08	0.00
Class 2	Expanded Femininity		0.21	0.21	0.73
Class 3	Expanded Androgyny		0.00	0.00	0.13
Class 4	Traditional Masculinity		0.04	0.72	0.13

The results from Table 9 illustrate that we miss variation in gender expression or at the very least gender self-perception by using broad gender identity and sexual identify markers. If we want to understand gender inequalities that may have anything to do with how individuals are perceived/read, more specific markers of adherence to gender normativity will be more helpful.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study documents that in the context of two independent samples of different populations, "Gender Image" emerges as similar construct. Although replications with larger samples are necessary we conclude that gender image, that is the way respondents report how others usually perceive them with respect to masculinity, femininity and androgyny captures variation within the more established gender marker categories. We argue that future research should explore how gender image, in conjunction and beyond markers of categorical gender identity and sexuality structure inequality in a variety of outcomes, such as employment and earnings discrimination, street harassment, health care experiences, etc.

Gender Image might be a valuable dimension to measure stereotype-based discrimination, especially in settings with a lack of information (i.e. when details such as names, pronouns, sexual identity, gender identity are less likely to be known), for examples which resorts in various forms of everyday harassment. Gender image measures will also allow us to better understand the variation of experiences of those in marginalized identities – building on research about being "trans enough" (Catalano 2015).

Our study also implies that respondents take advantage of multiple gender identity markers, which goes beyond the current best practice of asking for sex assigned at birth and current gender. Although not easily analyzed in quantitative ways, we argue

that allowing participants to define their gender in more detailed ways can increase their engagements with the survey and does not seem to alienate respondents who "only" identify as women or men.

References

- Antecol, Heather, Anneke Jong and Michael Steinberger. 2008. "The Sexual Orientation Wage Gap: The Role of Occupational Sorting and Human Capital." *ILR Review* 61(4):518-43.
- Aultman, B. 2014. "Cisgender." *Transgender Studies Quarterly* 1(1-2):61-62.
- Bailey, John, Michael Wallace and Bradley Wright. 2013. "Are Gay Men and Lesbians Discriminated against When Applying for Jobs? A Four-City, Internet-Based Field Experiment." *Journal of homosexuality* 60(6):873-94.
- Baxter, J. and E. W. Kane. 1995. "Dependence and Independence - a Cross-National Analysis of Gender Inequality and Gender Attitudes." *Gender & Society* 9(2):193-215.
- Blau, F. D. and L. M. Kahn. 1997. "Swimming Upstream: Trends in the Gender Wage Differential in the 1980s." *Journal of Labor Economics* 15(1):1-42.
- Bradford, Judith, Sari L Reisner, Julie A Honnold and Jessica Xavier. 2013. "Experiences of Transgender-Related Discrimination and Implications for Health: Results from the Virginia Transgender Health Initiative Study." *American journal of public health* 103(10):1820-29.
- Butler, Judith. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. Psychology Press.
- Catalano, D Chase J. 2015. "'Trans Enough?' the Pressures Trans Men Negotiate in Higher Education." *Transgender Studies Quarterly* 2(3):411-30.
- Chrobot-Mason, Donna, Scott B Button and Jeannie D DiClementi. 2001. "Sexual Identity Management Strategies: An Exploration of Antecedents and Consequences." *Sex Roles* 45(5-6):321-36.
- Clements-Nolle, Kristen, Rani Marx and Mitchell Katz. 2006. "Attempted Suicide among Transgender Persons: The Influence of Gender-Based Discrimination and Victimization." *Journal of homosexuality* 51(3):53-69.
- Cole, Wade M and Claudia Geist. 2018. "Progress without Progressives? The Effects of Development on Women's Educational and Political Equality in Cultural Context, 1980 to 2010." *Sociology of Development* 4(1):1-69.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. "It's All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation." *Hypatia* 13(3):62-82.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2012. "Gender, Health and Theory: Conceptualizing the Issue, in Local and World Perspective." *Social Science & Medicine* 74(11):1675-83.

- Creswell, John W and J David Creswell. 2017. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage publications.
- Dollar, David and Roberta Gatti. 1999. *Gender Inequality, Income, and Growth: Are Good Times Good for Women?*, Vol. 1: Development Research Group, The World Bank Washington, DC.
- Fuwa, M. 2004. "Macro-Level Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in 22 Countries." *American Sociological Review* 69(6):751-67.
- Gossett, R., Stanley, E. A., & Burton, J. (Eds.) (2017). *Trap Door: Trans Cultural Production and the Politics of Visibility*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Grant, Jaime M, Lisa Mottet, Justin Edward Tanis, Jack Harrison, Jody Herman and Mara Keisling. 2011. *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. National Center for Transgender Equality.
- Herek, Gregory M. 1986. "On Heterosexual Masculinity: Some Psychological Consequences of the Social Construction of Gender and Sexuality." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29(5):563-77.
- Huebner, David M, Gregory M Rebchook and Susan M Kegeles. 2004. "Experiences of Harassment, Discrimination, and Physical Violence among Young Gay and Bisexual Men." *American journal of public health* 94(7):1200-03.
- Hundley, Greg. 2000. "Male/Female Earnings Differences in Self-Employment: The Effects of Marriage, Children, and the Household Division of Labor." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54(1):95-114.
- Korpi, W. 2000. "Faces of Inequality: Gender, Class, and Patterns of Inequalities in Different Types of Welfare States." *Social Politics* 7(2):127-91.
- Lehavot, Keren, Kevin M King and Jane M Simoni. 2011. "Development and Validation of a Gender Expression Measure among Sexual Minority Women." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 35(3):381-400.
- Lorber, Judith and Susan A Farrell. 1991. *The Social Construction of Gender*. Sage Newbury Park, CA.
- Lorber, Judith. 2004. "'Night to His Day': The Social Construction of Gender." *Race, class, and gender in the United States*:54-64.
- Magliozzi, Devon, Aliya Saperstein and Laurel Westbrook. 2016. "Scaling Up: Representing Gender Diversity in Survey Research." *Socius* 2:2378023116664352.
- Mayo, Cris. 2017. "Queer and Trans Youth, Relational Subjectivity, and Uncertain Possibilities: Challenging Research in Complicated Contexts." *Educational Researcher* 46(9):530-38.
- Mays, Vickie M and Susan D Cochran. 2001. "Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults in the United States." *American journal of public health* 91(11):1869-76.
- Messner, Michael A. 2000. "Barbie Girls Versus Sea Monsters: Children Constructing Gender." *Gender & Society* 14(6):765-84.

- Miller, Lisa R and Eric Anthony Grollman. 2015. "The Social Costs of Gender Nonconformity for Transgender Adults: Implications for Discrimination and Health." Pp. 809-31 in *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 30: Wiley Online Library.
- Morris, M. and B. Western. 1999. "Inequality in Earnings at the Close of the Twentieth Century." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:623-57.
- Oudshoorn, Nelly, Ann Rudinow Saetnan and Merete Lie. 2002. "On Gender and Things: Reflections on an Exhibition on Gendered Artifacts." Pp. 471-83 in *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 25: Elsevier.
- Pfeffer, Carla A. 2010. "'Women's Work'? Women Partners of Transgender Men Doing Housework and Emotion Work." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(1):165-83.
- Ragins, Belle Rose and John M Cornwell. 2001. "Pink Triangles: Antecedents and Consequences of Perceived Workplace Discrimination against Gay and Lesbian Employees." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(6):1244.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia. 1991. "The Social Construction of Status Value: Gender and Other Nominal Characteristics." *Social Forces* 70(2):367-86.
- Risman, Barbara J. 2004. "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender & Society* 18(4):429-50.
- Robeyns, Ingrid. 2003. "Sen's Capability Approach and Gender Inequality: Selecting Relevant Capabilities." *Feminist Economics* 9(2-3):61-92.
- Schilt, Kristen. 2006. "Just One of the Guys? How Transmen Make Gender Visible at Work." *Gender & Society* 20(4):465-90.
- Seguino, S. 2000. "Gender Inequality and Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Analysis." *World Development* 28(7):1211-30.
- Singh, Anneliese A. 2013. "Transgender Youth of Color and Resilience: Negotiating Oppression and Finding Support." *Sex Roles* 68(11-12):690-702.
- Spade, Dean. 2007. "Documenting Gender." *Hastings LJ* 59:731.
- Spade, Dean. 2015. *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. Duke University Press.
- Tate, Charlotte Chuck, Jay N Ledbetter and Cris P Youssef. 2013. "A Two-Question Method for Assessing Gender Categories in the Social and Medical Sciences." *Journal of Sex Research* 50(8):767-76.
- Tilcsik, András. 2011. "Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(2):586-626.
- Waite, Sean and Nicole Denier. 2015. "Gay Pay for Straight Work: Mechanisms Generating Disadvantage." *Gender & Society* 29(4):561-88.
- Weichselbaumer, Doris. 2003. "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in Hiring." *Labour Economics* 10(6):629-42.
- Westbrook, Laurel and Kristen Schilt. 2014. "Doing Gender, Determining Gender: Transgender People, Gender Panics, and the Maintenance of the Sex/Gender/Sexuality System." *Gender & Society* 28(1):32-57.

