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The problem of faces
The problem of measurement
Measuring perceived gender
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Maculine  Feminine
My research

1. Do binary measurements of gender increase results of binary gender?
2. Can we facilitate the categorization of gender beyond the binary?
“Please use the text boxes below to describe in 3 sentences what the person in the image is doing. Please be as specific as possible and provide as much detail as you can. In your description of this individual, it is important that you use the pronouns ‘[hen/she/he/]’ This will help to standardize the accounts provided by all participants in this survey, which will make them easier to interpret. (p.3)”
Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kvinna</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Icke-binär</th>
<th>Vet ej</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

Ange hur många av personerna du bedömer är:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roliga</th>
<th>Tråkiga</th>
<th>Pålitliga</th>
<th>Opålitliga</th>
<th>Kvinnor</th>
<th>Män</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
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Results 1

![Bar charts showing the proportion of respondents for multiple and binary responses.](image)

**Results 1**

In the bar charts, we compare the proportion of respondents for multiple and binary responses.

- **Multiple responses**:
  - **Beyond Binary**: 0.5
  - **Binary**: 0.5

- **Binary responses**:
  - **Beyond Binary**: 0.25
  - **Binary**: 0.75

The categorization is as follows:

- **Categorization**
  - **Beyond Binary**
  - **Binary**

These charts illustrate the distribution of responses, with clear visual representation of the proportions.
Results 2
What does it mean

- Phrasing of question can influence categorization
- Unclear effects of hen on categorization beyond the binary
Gender Trouble in Equal Employment Opportunity Statements

Amanda Klysing, amanda.klysing@psy.lu.se
Recruitment Discrimination

- Workplace discrimination of gender and sexual minorities
  - 21% of LGBTI individuals
  - 35% of trans people

- Recruitment discrimination of gender and sexual minorities
  - 10% of LGBTI individuals
  - Direct recruitment discrimination of LGT individuals

- Exclusionary language use

FRA. (2020). A long way to go for LGBTI equality.

Klysing, A., Renström, E. A., Gustafsson Sendén, M., & Lindqvist, A.
Gender Binary in Recruitment Situations

- Social identity contingency signals

- Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) statements

- Context-based gender trouble

"Vi har högt ställda mål när det kommer till mångfald i vår rekrytering. Till exempel har vi mål på andelen kvinnliga ledare i vår organisation och andelen ledare med internationell bakgrund.” Volvo

"Tillsammans bygger vi en inkluderande arbetsmiljö som präglas av mångfald, öppenhet och ärlighet, och vi söker alltid efter fler personer som delar vår positiva inställning och våra värderingar.” IKEA

Klysing, A., Renström, E. A., Gustafsson Sendén, M., & Lindqvist, A.
Experimental Design

No gender ideology signals - Control

“The Organization strives to be a pleasant place to work and works actively to improve the work environment.”

Signals of a binary gender ideology

“The Organisation strives to be an equitable workplace and works actively to support equality between men and women.”

Signals of an identity-inclusive gender ideology (multi-gender)

"The Organisation strives to be an equitable workplace and works actively to support equality. Women, men, and individuals with a non-binary gender identity have equal opportunity for career advancement with us.“

Signal of an identity-blind gender ideology (de-gender)

“The Organisation strives to be an equitable place of work and works actively with equality. Everybody, regardless of gender identity, have equal opportunity for career advancement with us.”
Results

- **Study 1a**
  - No impact on organisational attractiveness of language use
  - Higher perceived diversity for multi-gendered or de-gendered language

- **Study 1b**
  - No impact on organisational attractiveness of language use for gender majority participants
  - Preference for multi-gendered language from gender minority participants
  - Higher perceived diversity for multi-gendered or de-gendered language
Conclusions

Organisation descriptions can include multi-gendered EEO statements that explicitly include gender minorities to increase their attraction to a broader pool of applicants.

Organisations that include a multi-gendered EEO statement in their materials are perceived to have a more gender diverse staff body.

www.genderfair.se
Key References


Participants

- **Study 1a**
  - 404 Swedish participants from gender majority groups

- **Study 1b**
  - 743 US participants including 53.70% gender majority participants and 46.39% gender minority participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Study 1a (N = 404)</th>
<th>Study 1b (N = 743)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>46.78%</td>
<td>‘Female’ 28.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>50.74%</td>
<td>‘Male’ 25.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary Individuals</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>‘Genderqueer / Gender non conforming’ 26.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>‘Trans female / Trans woman’ 5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Trans male / Trans man’ 13.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“From what you have read about the organisation, which two people do you believe work within the organisation?”
Study 1: Hypotheses and design

How do different types of equal employment opportunity (EEO) statements influence how attractive an organisation is an employer?

We also explored if type of EEO statement influenced perceived gender diversity within an organisation.

Control condition
No mention of gender

Binary gender condition
Equality between women and men

Multi-gendered condition
Equality between women, men, and individuals with non-binary and other gender identities

De-gendered condition
Equality regardless of gender

An organisation with a multi-gendered EEO statement will be seen as less attractive by gender majority participants $H_{1a}$, but a as more attractive by gender minority participants $H_{1b}$.

An organisation with a de-gendered EEO statement will be seen as more attractive by gender majority participants $H_{2a}$, but as less attractive by gender minority participants $H_{2b}$. 
Study 1b: The effect of EEO statement on organisational attractiveness through identity threat for gender minority participants. Unstandardized regression coefficients, condition dummy coded with control as reference.

Klysing, A., Renström, E. A., Gustafsson Sendén, M., & Lindqvist, A.
Study 1b: Indirect effects for the effect of EEO statement on organisational attractiveness through identity threat, conditional on participant gender group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Index of moderated mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE) 95% CI</td>
<td>b (SE) 95% CI</td>
<td>b (SE) 95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>-0.10 (0.10) -0.30:0.10</td>
<td>0.01 (0.13) -0.24:0.28</td>
<td>0.12 (0.17) -0.21:0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-gender</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.10) -0.21:0.19</td>
<td>0.58 (0.12) 0.35:0.84</td>
<td>0.60 (0.16) 0.29:0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-gender</td>
<td>0.08 (0.09) -0.10:0.27</td>
<td>0.43 (0.13) 0.19:0.69</td>
<td>0.35 (0.16) 0.04:0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 1b: Regression results for gender minority participants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Identity threat</th>
<th>Organisational attractiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ (SE)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.45 (0.15)</td>
<td>2.15:2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary EEO</td>
<td>0.24 (0.24)</td>
<td>-0.23:0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-gendered EEO</td>
<td>0.04 (0.24)</td>
<td>-0.42:0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-gendered EEO</td>
<td>-0.19 (0.22)</td>
<td>-0.61:0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender group (minority)</td>
<td>1.35*** (0.26)</td>
<td>0.84:1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary $\times$ Gender group</td>
<td>-0.27 (0.39)</td>
<td>-1.04:0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-gendered $\times$ Gender group</td>
<td>-1.40*** (0.35)</td>
<td>-2.09:-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-gendered $\times$ Gender group</td>
<td>-0.83* (0.36)</td>
<td>-1.53:-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity threat</td>
<td>-0.43*** (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.51:-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity threat $\times$ Gender group</td>
<td>0.01 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2_{adj} = .09$  $R^2_{adj} = .43$

$F(7,735) = 9.26, p < .001$  $F(9,733) = 54.19, p < .001$

Study 1b: Unstandardised regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) with confidence intervals for estimating the indirect conditional effect of EEO statement on all organisational attractiveness through identity threat, moderated by participant gender group.