



I'm not robot



Continue

## Gender identity articles pdf

More Twitter Facebook LinkedIn Feed ABSTRACT EmailsIn social sciences, many quantitative search results as well as presentations of demographic data are related to the gender of participants. Most often, the genus is represented by a dichotomous variable with possible responses of woman/man or female/male, although the genus is not a binary variable. However, it is rarely defined what is meant by gender. In this article, we deconstruct the concept of gender as consisting of several aspects and argue that the researcher must identify the relevant aspects of gender in relation to their research application. Let's make an in-depth exposition of considerations that the researcher should keep in mind when asking questions about each aspect, in order to exemplify how complex this construct is. We also remind the researcher that gender is not a binary category and discuss the challenges in balancing existing gender diversity and yet sorting participants into gender categorizations that work in statistical analyses. To help in this process, we provide an empirical example of how gender identity can be classified when using a free text response. Finally, we suggest that other measurements than the sex of the participants may be better predictors of the result variable. Many quantitative and demographic research results in the social sciences are gender-related, but what is gender and how can it be operational? As for most variables, researchers strive to generate valid instruments with low measurement errors. Despite this, traditional use of binary gender measurements prevails in most fields of social sciences (Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015), although gender is not a binary category (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014; Hyde, Bigler, Joel, Tate, & van Anders, 2019; Richards et al., 2016). In comparison, few researchers argue that age is better measured with the two categories of response young and old, but gender is even more often measured as a dichotomous variable. The problem with the binary gender system is twofold. First, treating gender as a categorical variable, without operationalization, risks measurement errors (Frohard-Dourlent, Dobson, Clark, Doull, & Saewyc, 2017). For example, diversity in gender identities is not captured with binary response options, which means that standard measures do not recognize results for other identities than traditional genders of women/men. The worst result of this is that the search results are inaccurate, or at least misrepresented. Secondly, including gender as a variable with only two response options is a practice that discriminates against individuals who do not define themselves as one of options (Nowakowski, Sumerau, & Mathers, 2016). An individual should be able to self-define their gender identity without being discriminated against in research. Because of this, the use of a binary gender category raises ethical issues (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017). Gender includes many important aspects to think about to understand how and why gender is associated with certain result variables, such as attitudes, behaviors, and health. However, gender is often included in analyses without deliberately reflecting why. For example, the lack of clarity in empirical gender measurement makes it difficult to understand how gender differences (i.e. presented as differences between women and men) in health are produced and maintained (as discussed by Hart, Saperstein, Magliozzi, & Westbrook, 2019). In addition, gender is rarely operational in more detail than categorization of individuals in the binary system of woman/man or female/male. In addition, when gender distributions among participants are described in the methods section, few researchers report how this information was collected. Many scholars have already raised the importance of updating demographic issues on gender (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014; Broussard, Warner, & Pope, 2018; Fraser, 2018; Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017; Hughes, Camden, & Yangchen, 2016; Hyde et al., 2019; Magliozzi, Saperstein, & Westbrook, 2016; Reinsner et al., 2015; Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015), and we add to that collection of researchers. In this paper, we provide a broad definition of gender and discuss how researchers could perform the operationalization of gender variables. If gender is relevant to research demand – how is it relevant? Each researcher should reflect on why they include gender as a variable, how it is related to their research demand, and what gender aspects can best serve as predictors for result variables. To help with this process, we provide systematic deconstruction of this kind in four aspects and discuss how to perform the operation of each aspect. The aim is not to make a recommendation on best practices, but to help researchers reflect on the concept of gender and make informed decisions about gender measurement. In reviewing the literature on gender measurement, we came across a number of different practices and recommendations that are sometimes in conflict with each other. Here are the different practices and their advantages and disadvantages. Our goal is to provide researchers with topics and reflections that lead to decisions based on how to measure the gender of participants. We also include some empirical data that shows typical gender responses as a free text answer question. In the final section, we propose a series of gender-related measures that could be better predictors of result variables than the sex of the participants. Defining gender is very important and complex. Hegarty (2001) suggests that the quantitative researcher approach this definition from a performative perspective to de-build the concept of gender. In this way, gender is a non-essential category that is instead repeatedly performed on the basis of social norms (Morgenroth & Ryan, 2018). Since the division of gender is culturally and specific, internally contradictory and tailor-made to change (Hegarty, Ansara, & Barker, 2018, p. 59), quantitative research could support constructive arguments (Hegarty & Pratto, 2004). Gender construction as binary is performed, for example, in the social sciences when treated as a binary category (Morgenroth & Ryan, 2018). These benefits are completed, each time a researcher formulates an element in a survey or questionnaire in which the gender is evaluated as a dichotomous variable with only two (mutually exclusive) response options, because the notion of gender as binary is then maintained. Instead, we suggest operating the genre as consisting of several aspects, which can be divided into the four main aspects of: (a) physiological/physical aspects (sex); (b) self-defined gender or gender identity; (c) legal gender; and (d) social gender in terms of norm-related behaviors and gender expressions (the American Psychological Association refers to this as a sexual role, APA, 2015). These aspects can change over a lifetime, due to an external impact, such as from society (Reinsner et al., 2015). Other scholars focus on how these aspects affect each other (Moerman & van Mens-verhulst, 2004). In addition to these aspects, the generic term transgender (Thanem, 2011) refers to individuals whose gender assigned at birth does not correspond to their self-defined gender identity. Transgender individuals can identify themselves inside, outside, or beyond the traditional woman/man dichotomy. In comparison, cisgender refers to individuals whose sex assigned at birth corresponds to their self-defined gender identity (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017; van Anders, Caverly, & Johns, 2014). Cisgenderism refers to the idea that it is possible to visually see the gender identity or deduce an individual's bodily characteristics based on their appearance (Ansara & Hegarty, 2013, 2014). Such assumptions imply a discriminatory ideology that delegitimizes the self-designated gender of individuals, due to the assumption that appearance and bodily characteristics are related to gender identity (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). Cisgenderism is also related to the performance of a binary gender system with two discrete genres that are biologically determined (Hyde et al., 2019). As Westbrook and Saperstein (2015) describe, researchers sometimes rank their participants in the binary system of woman/man or female/male based on their physical appearance. The term cisnormativity indicates the idea that sex and gender are aligned, which includes the basic hypothesis that all women have bodily attributes associated with a female sex, such as a vagina, while all men are presumed to have associated with a male sex, like a penis (Geist, Reynolds, & Gaytán, 2017). Let's hope this article illustrates how non-scientific cisgenderism and cisnormativity are. Finally, regardless of the complexity of the gender/gender function, researchers should be important for their research applications. In 2005, Hyde proposed a gender similarity hypothesis, which argues (based on meta-analysis) that women and men from a psychological perspective are primarily similar – not different. This hypothesis challenges gender as a relevant variable/predictor in the social sciences. As a result, we suggest that the sex of the participants may not be relevant in itself. And if gender is to be included, only the analysis of differences between women and men is not enough (Nowatzki & Grant, 2011). Instead, researchers need to carefully consider which aspects of the genre are important for their research demand and how best to re-examine them during study design (Reinsner et al., 2015). In this article, we propose other approaches beyond gender categorization. Both theoretically and linguistically, the terms gender and gender are refused. In English, physiological/bodily aspects are often referred to as sex concerning genitals, chromosomes and body attributes, while social aspects are referred to as gender (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017; West & Simmerman, 1987), including cultural meanings associated with behavior, personality and expressions conventionally labeled as feminine or masculine (Reinsner et al., 2015). Despite this conflation, sex seems to be a poor proxy for gender, because it is not correct to assume that sex precedes and determines gender (Bittner & Goodyear-Grant, 2017; Butler, 1990; Fausto-Sterling, 2012; Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). Instead, conflation is regulatory and excludes many individuals with other experiences and/or identities. As a result, some scholars suggest using the terms gender/sex together to move away from the idea that sex is an objective category or an objective biological phenomenon (van Anders et al., 2014). Traditional dichotomous response alternatives to sex are woman/man, while traditional dichotomous response alternatives to gender could be woman/man or female/male (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014; Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). However, the most common way in social science research is to ask about gender with the two possible male/female response alternatives (Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). This exemplifies how researchers, and people in general, with the use of language, make implicit and probably unconscious assumptions that confuse sex with gender. Therefore, a question that asks about gender and has women/men as answer options obscures what researchers are aiming for and what participants respond to: body attributes, legal sex, or self-defined gender identity. The conflation of sex and gender also implies a binary gender system, both implicitly and explicitly, where only two response options neglect the (Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). Some individuals (often referred to as by with intersex variations) have anatomies that do not fit the typical female/male dichotomy according to current medical norms (Lundberg, Roen, 2019), and then also fall outside the traditional sexual dichotomy (Nowatzki & Grant, 2011; Richards et al., 2016). When the bodily/physiological aspects are relevant to the research demand, it is advisable to ask about these aspects in particular. The researcher may, for example, be interested if the participants menstruate. If so, menstruation should be evaluated instead of asking about the sex or sex of the participants and making the hypothesis that all women or even females menstruate. An important aspect of the genre is self-defined identity, which can be more or less fluid, or change over time and in contexts. For some people, gender identity is stable throughout life and context, while for others it varies from one time to another in life, or in time and context in daily life. To open up to this internal diversity and fluidity, the question of gender identity can be formulated in different ways. Some suggest that the question should be formulated as "How do you currently identify?" (Tate, Ledbetter, & Youssel, 2013). Despite the way the question is formulated, quantitative research requires possible answers to rank. Unlike the female/male response categories, the terms woman/man are more open and may refer to an individual's self-defined gender identity regardless of their bodily characteristics and the sex assigned at birth. Later, a trans woman, for example, might feel more comfortable and confident when the answer options are woman/man instead of female/male, especially if she doesn't share all the body attributes commonly assumed in the definition of female. Therefore, the terms female/male should not be used interchangeably with the terms woman/man (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). However, two response options still falsely imply that gender is binary and consists of mutually exclusive gender/man alternatives (Richards et al., 2016; Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). There are many other gender identities; therefore, a binary system excludes all individuals who identify between or beyond the traditional gender dichotomy; who have a fluid gender identity; or that do not identify with gender at all (Nowatzki & Grant, 2011). The binary response procedure may appear neutral, but it is neglecting individuals of all other non-binary or fluid gender identities outside and/or between the binary categories of woman/man. A non-binary gender identity can therefore be defined as belonging to the generic term transgender (Thanem, 2011). However, not all individuals with non-binary identities describe themselves as transgender. So far, predefined gender categories are more common because they facilitate data processing. The addition of a third category of was a way to include and recognize more/other gender identities than woman/man. After extensive literature research, we conclude that the third most used options appear to be 'transgender', 'non-binary' or 'other'. One problem with a third answer option is that it implies gender options are mutually exclusive, and especially if you can select only one option. Another problem is that the researcher defines in advance the possible response options. Here are the limitations with a third response option. Transgender as a third alternative implies a category that is mutually exclusive compared to the binary categories of woman/man. This third option could be rooted in the basic assumption that transgender and cisgender are distinctly different from each other (a problem discussed by Ansara & Hegarty, 2014), and that transgender identities constitute a homogeneous group (Beauregard, Arevshatian, Booth, & Whittle, 2016). Ansara and Hegarty (2014) recommend that this third option should not be used because it falsely implies that all transgender individuals identify as trans people, even if transgender people are not primarily a gender identity, rather an experience or generic term (Stryker, 2006). For example, people with trans experiences may not identify as transgender, but as women or men. Other individuals identify as both trans and as woman/man, or neither as trans nor as a woman/man. The procedure with fixed response options could force participants to hierarchies their identities (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017) – is she a trans woman mainly transgender or female? Therefore, participants should at least be able to choose more than one answer. However, three options consisting of woman/man/transgender still imply that there are no other possible identities, reflecting reductionism (see for example Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). Non-binary, as a third option, both recognize that gender is not a binary category and that transgender is not a third option sufficient to integrate woman/man. However, this alternative also implies that the gender variable has fixed categories (Richards et al., 2016). In fact, there are many other gender identities than women, men and non-binary (e.g. genderfluid, genderqueer, agender, etc.). Thus, the non-binary term could in fact be seen as a descriptor or umbrella term, and as a possible gender identity (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017). Other is also often used as a third option. The advantage is that it is open, which means that individuals who do not identify with any of the woman/male or non-binary categories can self-identify here. However, this is also a disadvantage – if the researcher adds 'more' as a third option, they do not know what it means (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). One solution is to add a free text response to the option, so that participants themselves can specify how they define other (Reinsner et al., 2015). However, this practice can still be seen as rooted in the implicit norms gender as a binary category, because more could be perceived as fundamentally different (for a discussion of some genders/s as a norm, see Fraser, 2018; Pratto, Korchmaros, & Hegarty, 2007). Talking about individuals or groups like others is a form of other – a which can strengthen and reproduce subordination by defining who differs from the norm (Johnson et al., 2004). The deviant aspect is also included in the presentation order in such a way that the norm is most often presented first (Bruckm'ler, Hegarty, & Abel, 2012; Hegarty & Buechel, 2006; Kahneman & Miller, 1986). Another practice is to maximize the number of response categories (e.g. woman, man, transgender, cisgender, genderqueer, etc.; Broussard et al., 2018). This procedure can be used with an instruction to control everything that applies (Harrison, Grant, & Herman, 2012). However, even if this strategy is ambitious and well thought out, it could still reflect reductionism (Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). Due to the countless terms that individuals use to self-identify, it is impossible to create a question that includes all possible answers (Magliozzi et al., 2016). In order to decide what strategy to use in asking about gender information, our recommendation is, once again, to review the research application and to ask in particular what is relevant to it. If the gender identity of the participants (i.e. the way in which they will identify themselves) is interesting, the question should be formulated to ask explicitly in this regard. If the researcher is interested in whether participants have trans experiences, they should explicitly ask about this. In other words, if applicable, it should be considered a two-question method (Tate et al., 2013) in which the researcher asks, for example, both the current gender identity and the trans experience or current gender identity and gender assigned to birth. Instead of pre-defining possible gender identity response categories, researchers could provide participants with an empty text box in which to write their self-defined sex (as described by Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). Depending on the researcher's goal, this question may need instructions. If the researcher is interested in the self-defined gender identity of the participants, he can specify it. But, for many cis people, it may seem uncomfortable to answer questions about their gender identity – most cis people probably haven't thought about the relationship between (their) bodily attributes, the gender assigned at birth, and gender identity. At the same time, individuals with non-binary gender identities are probably well aware of their gender identity (and how it relates to other aspects of gender). As a result, a suggestion is to provide a brief description, for example if you identify as a woman, answer woman. With such education, all individuals are able to answer the question, regardless of whether they have reflected on their gender identity or not. The answers of free sometimes provoke ridiculous responses from participants; for example, because they do not see the need for an open category and/or do not approve of other possible responses with respect to women/men. As a result, free text responses will most likely lead to some missing data. However, this should not be more systematic than missing data response options that exclude certain individuals (see Jaroszewski, Lottridge, Haimson, & Quehl, 2018, and for a discussion on missing gender identity data, see the Gender Identity in U.S. Surveillance [GenIUSS] Group report, 2014). The following example provides some empirical illustrations of the ridiculous answers. To avoid a problem of missing data, some recommend the use of an extensive list of categories (Fraser, 2018). Our arguments, however, are that it is preferable to give all participants the opportunity to give a satisfactory answer to the question of their gender identity, rather than forcing them to choose between categories of response that may not be appropriate for them. Our goal is also to use gender identity as a self-defined category, in order to avoid measurement errors. To validate our suggestion to evaluate participants' gender as a test-text response, we tested this practice ourselves. As a result, 794 participants from the United States pointed to their gender identity as a free text response. They were recruited by MTurk and were between 18-81 years old (M = 38.3, SD = 11.3); criteria for inclusion was to be a fluent English speaker. Table 1 shows the raw data of the answers. As shown in Table 1, 790 participants (99.50%) wrote a response of which 765 participants (96.34%) wrote female or male. Table 2 shows the answers after a first cleanup, in which the female, f, feamle, woman, femake, femlae responses were encoded as a woman and where the male, m, mle responses were coded as men. As revealed in Table 2, 417 participants (52.52%) self-identified as women, while 367 participants (46.22%) self-identified as men. The other six participants (0.76%) provided various answers. Two participants (0.25%) identified as transgender ('trans' or 'transman') and the last four participants (0.50%) provided answers that did not indicate a gender identity, but rather a sexual identity ('asexual, bisexual, single, homophobit'). These answers indicate that some individuals may find the free text question about gender identity confusing. However, most participants (n = 786; 98.99%) answers that could easily be encoded as gender identity. In this data collection, no one has given ridiculous answers. Categorization is key to conducting statistical analysis in quantitative research (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017). Categorization based on free text responses takes, of course, longer than extracting category responses to a data file. However, we experience that categorization is easily done by computerized methods that develop rapidly even within the social sciences. methods must not be complicated; Simple frequency analysis can easily organize the most frequent responses together (as in the previous example), minimizing manual coding. Readily available software packages such as SPSS, Excel, or R can be used for this purpose. Gender often functions as a variable that the complexity of gender identities and expressions to more quantifiable forms of data (Labuski & Keo-Meier, 2015). If you use a standard population-based sample, most participants will most likely be included in the categories of woman or man (as in our example). Therefore, in a data collection that does not specifically aim to reach individuals with trans experiences and/or non-binary identities, response categories other than those of women and men may not have enough participants to be included in the analyses. However, some researchers recommend that participants with non-binary gender identities should not be excluded from the analyses (Magliozzi et al., 2016), and propose that researchers create a gender coding scheme with a wide range of genders (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). However, if the sample is not very large, there will probably not be enough statistical power to differentiate sub-groups within a third gender category (or even a third category on its own). In that case, a suggestion is to include descriptive statistics in a table, to recognize all participants despite gender identity (Fraser, 2018). However, if the sample is not very large, there will probably not be enough statistical power to differentiate sub-groups within a third gender category (or even a third category on its own). In that case, a suggestion is to include descriptive statistics in a table, to recognize all participants despite gender identity (Fraser, 2018). When the third category on the left is large enough to be included in the analyses, it is not optimal because it can consist of a diversity of heterogeneous identities (this is, however, also true for the women's and men's categories). Thus, even when the researcher considers gender identity as a non-binary variable, they still need to classify the answers in some way. In this process of categorization, it is necessary to make many hypotheses. When some answers are ordered in the same category, this inevitably implies a form of reductionism (Magliozzi et al., 2016). Should non-binary and genderqueer responses be classified together? As a result, there is a feminist critique of the quantification of gender identities (Westbrook & Saperstein, 2015). The important question for the researcher is how to classify gender identities without losing diversity, but still have enough power for statistical analysis? Perhaps a new data collection that targets a more diverse gender population can be a solution to better understand the results. At other times, if the sample is composed of a relatively large number of gender identities other than the common genders of woman/man, a much more detailed categorisation is justified and possible. However, if the researcher is conducting population-based or representative studies, they cannot change the percentage of different gender participants. In these cases, a table with descriptive statistics is recommended, as suggested by Fraser (2018). In most societies, an individual is classified as female or male at birth, for more based on a visual inspection of the child's genitals (Fausto-Sterling, Coll, & Lamarre, 2012). This procedure defines the legal sex of the newborn, which is important, for example, in a passport or birth certificate and can be as a gender assigned at birth. The way individuals identify or express their gender does not have to match their gender assigned at birth. In addition, although body variation is much greater, individuals with a body variation often referred to as intersex are even more often assigned one of the binary birth genera (Lundberg, 2017). So far, only a handful of countries allow more than two legal genders (e.g. Australia, India, New Zealand). Official statistics often use the legal gender to assess gender differences, for example to address wages, health or other disadvantages that can occur structurally. Legal gender is a way of sourcing gender, and the advantage is its convenience. The legal gender is recorded in official and public statistics; therefore, it is easy to analyse how the relevant measures differ by gender, without having to collect such information from the population. It is important to stress that legal gender can reveal gender inequality (mainly between women and men) at the social level. However, because gender is not a binary variable and because legal gender is not an optimal proxy for gender identity, legal gender is an inaccurate measure – it fails to take gender diversity into account. In addition, many gender people do not change their legal sex. As a result, the so-called representative data are not representative (Nowakowski et al., 2016). Including more legal genders of women/men would be desirable, although the legal gender still says little about gender from a social science perspective. Instead of just asking about the legal gender with a question, some researchers recommend including two questions about gender assigned at birth and legal gender today (Frohard-Dourlent et al., 2017; Magliozzi et al., 2016; Reinsner et al., 2015; Tate et al., 2013). The advantage of this practice is that it recognizes (binary) trans experiences. Others recommend these measures only when it is relevant to the issue of research (Ansara & Hegarty, 2014). However, this practice still implicitly considers gender to be a binary category (with the exception of nationalities where there is a third legal gender). When the legal gender is at the center of the search application, it is recommended to explicitly ask. The researcher should also bear in mind that he may have more than two possible alternative answers, depending on the nationality of the participants in the formulation of the question. The researcher should also consider that the legal genre could be a bad proxy for the result variable. For example, there is a risk that health inequality patterns that correspond to gender identity rather than legal sex may be overlooked (Hart et al., 2019). By other aspects of the genre are probably more relevant to the social science researcher. Another aspect of this kind is the expression, which is rarely accounted for in the social sciences. When it's interesting to evaluate participants' gender expression, a simple way to ask participants how female and male they see themselves, and how female and male believe others see them (Magliozzi et al., 2016). It is important to stress that all participants, regardless of their gender identity, should answer both questions about femininity and masculinity, to take into account individual diversity. Validated scales such as the multi-gender identity questionnaire (Multi-GIQ, Joel, Tarrasch, Berman, Mukamel, & sv, 2014), can be used which is discussed in more detail below. Gender expression is also linked to social gender in terms of norms, both in appearance and behavior. Gender norms vary over time and context, and it can be difficult to formulate elements that specifically address expressions. Alternatively, broader questions could be asked about gender norms in a broader sense. The researcher could define the specific context of interest and ask how participants relate to gender norms in that particular context. For example, norms for women's gender expressions vary between homosexual and heterosexual contexts (Huxley, Clarke, & Halliwell, 2014). To validate gender norms, the researcher could perform a pre-study that specifically identifies gender norms in the relevant context and then use these norms when asking their questions. Although the researcher manages to manage the difficulties in the way of managing the gender of the participants, the genre is often a poor proxy for many gender

differences observed in the social sciences. Since the social concept of gender implies different levels that can be illustrated and operational in different ways, there are still aspects to consider. Other measures may be more relevant, depending on the research issue. We will now present some of the most commonly used measures that could add knowledge about gender identities or participants' gender attitudes, which can be better and more informative predictors than a categorical gender variable. A review of other measures could be found in Haupert (2019). The first and perhaps best known alternative to gender measurement as a dichotomous and categorical variable is the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974). The important hypothesis in BSRI is the notion that gender does not constitute two categories that are mutually exclusive or poly opposite in terms of femininity/masculinity. Instead, femininity and masculinity are seen as two independent dimensions where an individual can score high on one size and low on the other, high on both or low on both. In BSRI, femininity and masculinity are measured and analyzed separately. The elements evaluate respectively the personality traits related to the femininity and masculinity, which means that BSRI can be defined as a measure of gender at the social level in terms of personality and behavior, which may be related to gender expression and/or social gender. The results are presented in four categories, where an individual may have female scores, mostly masculine, scores both female and male, or neither female nor male scores. Although the BSRI has been criticized, and wonders if it is good enough to use today, the BSRI still deserves to be mentioned in the current context since Bem has been a pioneer regarding the notion of gender as a non-dichotomous or one-dimensional (Carr, Hagai, & zurbriggen, 2017). An important criticism of BSRI is that the traits used to evaluate femininity and masculinity also impose definitions of what femininity and masculinity are, and are based on stereotypes when assigning scale scores (Connell, 2005). In addition, the traits were defined in the United States, in the 1970s and evaluate the prevailing stereotyped characteristics of femininity and masculinity in that particular time and culture (Bem, 1987, see also Hoffman & Borders, 2001 for a wide review on this). However, previous research has shown that BSRI and other tools measure traits associated with femininity and masculinity (e.g. Personal Attributes Questionnaire, PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) can still explain more variance – and thus be better predictors – than categorical (binary) measures of the participants' gender identity. For example, the traits associated with masculinity were better predictors for aggression than binary gender (Hammock & Richardson, 1992). The multi-sex identity questionnaire (Multi-GIQ; Joel et al., 2014) is an alternative to BSRI. Similar to BSRI, Multi-GIQ defines femininity and masculinity as two independent dimensions. However, instead of measuring personality traits, Multi-GIQ elements evaluate self-identification with femininity and masculinity on levels related to gender identity, gender expression, legal gender, and body aspects. All participants, regardless of gender identity, indicate the extent to which they feel like a woman and feel like a man; to what extent they wish to be a woman and a man, etc. The results of large non-clinical samples indicate that humanity is not made up of typical women and typical men; instead, there has been a great diversity of responses in gender identification and expression, regardless of gender identity (Jacobson & Joel, 2018; Joel et al., 2014). One of the advantages of Multi-GIQ is that the tool treats gender as a complex issue that may differ between context and aspects. This is also a disadvantage – Multi-GIQ is an extended tool with 32 elements and there is a lack of sufficient information on coding procedures (Joel et al., 2014)It should be noted that neither BSRI nor Multi-GIQ were developed to measure gender identity diversified in itself, but rather to illustrate gender diversity. However, we suggest that some elements of Multi-GIQ (Joel et al., 2014) can serve as a gender expression scale. Examples of such elements are: In the last 12 months, have you felt you have to work to be a woman? 'In the last 12 months, you've heard that you have to work at A man? (p. 319). These elements refer to gender expression because they measure the performative aspect of gender. Another strategy is to ask how important sex identification is, using an adapted version of Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES). This scale measures the importance of identification with a social group; for example, social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). All social groups to which an individual belongs are seen as constituent parts of their identity – as they are defined and seen. Identification with social groups is also associated with attitudes towards both one's own and other groups. More importantly, categorization can lead to group favoritism (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). It could also, but not necessarily, lead to outgroup negativity (Brewer, 1999). CSES can be used to measure identification with sex. Examples of such elements are My gender identity is an important part of my self-image and My gender identity is an important reflection of who I am. This adaptation of CSES has proven to be a better predictor of attitudes towards fair language than the participants' self-defined (categorically) gender identity, and gender differences disappear when checking for CSES (Gustafsson Sendén, Bäck, & Lindqvist, 2015; Lindqvist, Gustafsson Sendén, & Bäck, 2016). These results illustrate why gender identity could be an incomplete proxy for the result variable, depending on what that variable is and what the theory behind what it should affect is. In the social sciences, much research is related to the gender of the participants. Gender is an important factor to be analysed; however, the operationalisation of gender should be considered more carefully. To this end, we have deconstructed the concept of gender as consisting of four aspects: physiological/bodily aspects, self-defined gender identity, legal gender and gender expression (including social norms related to appearance and behavior). Our recommendation is that the researcher should consider the concept of gender from all these aspects, to identify relevant aspects of gender and include relevant issues to assess these particular aspects. To help in this process, we discussed several options on how to achieve this goal. The decisive factor in the assessment of gender must come from the question of research. Social science researchers are rarely interested in physiological/bodily aspects (e.g. genitals, chromosomes, body attributes) or the legal gender, but are more often interested in how individuals identify or express themselves from a social perspective. information on the gender of participants is a complex task, even when relevant aspects are identified. In this paper, we addressed this complexity and discussed how gender questions might be more specific depending on the gender aspects they aim to capture. A summary of our debate is presented in Table 3. Ours it also implies that other aspects may be more important than gender as a categorical variable (although the variable is treated as non-binary). An example is how important gender identification is, which can be measured by an adaptation of CSES (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). This could also be a better predictor for the result variable than the particular gender identities of the participants (Gustafsson Sendén et al., 2015; Lindqvist et al., 2016). To sum up, social science researchers need to reflect on both ethical issues and measurement errors related to the way gender is operating. To this end, the four aspects of the genre could function as a checklist. Other times, the sex of the participants may not be interesting in itself. On the contrary, other related measures may be of greater predictive value. Table 1. Raw data of 794 participants' free text responses of gender identity. ResponseFrequencyPercentFemale40350.70Male36245.60F81.00M40.50Feamle20.30Woman20.30Asexual10.10Bisexual10.10Cellbate10.10Femake10.10Femlae10.10Homesex10.10Mle10.10Trans10.10Transman10.10MISSING40.50Total794100Table 2. Clean free text response data on gender identity from 794 participants. ResponseFrequencyPercentWoman41752.52Man36746.22Asexual10.13Bisexual10.13Cellbate10.13Homosex10.13Trans10.13Transman10.13MISSING40.50Total794100.000Table 3. Practice to ask about the sex of participants. Initial question: What aspect of the genre is relevant to the search application? FacetRecommendation Physical/bodily aspectsAsk on that particular aspect, such as the experience of menstruation. Gender identityUse a free text response. Consider adding CSES adaptation to measure gender identification, from Luhtanen and Crocker, 1992. Consider whether it's relevant to ask about trans experiences. Legal genderAsk on legal gender. NB, some nationalities have more than two legal genders, keep in mind that when formulating response options. If the gender assigned at birth is relevant, be sure to ask specifically. Gender expressionIdentify the relevant aspect of gender expression. Examples of items to use can be found in Magliozzi et al. (2016) and Joel et al. (2014). The authors did not report any potential conflict of interest. Authors.

6312747.pdf  
25837.pdf  
2532419.pdf  
ri craft apk for pc  
run minecraft pc on android  
test for starch in food.pdf  
lider transaccional ejemplo  
verb tenses.pdf  
divinity original sin 2 undead lizard  
the c programming language 5th edition  
angielski dla poczatkujacych.pdf  
default cmmc password  
capacity to do work  
delitos y amenazas del comercio electronico  
java swing guide.pdf  
dot product of vectors example.pdf  
principles of mathematical analysis by walter rudin  
normal\_5f89f7a1ch15a.pdf  
normal\_5f92e0a956024.pdf  
normal\_5f91781b2e1eb.pdf