**Pilot Study**

 As we alluded to in the text, we ran one other study that is not reported in the main text, but for full transparency we have included it here. The targets in this study would best be described as sex nonconforming (that is, their behaviors and/or identities did not match with cultural expectations for children of their natal sex). Evaluations of the sex nonconforming children have previously been studied (Blakemore, 2003; Conry-Murray & Turiel, 2012; Levy et al., 1995; Martin & Ruble, 2010). In this study, we varied whether the children defied sex stereotypes through their behavior (i.e., behaved stereotypically masculine or feminine), through their identification (i.e., said they were a boy/girl) or both. Importantly, these varied vignettes were used because sex nonconforming children comprise a diverse group ranging from children who identify with a gender other than the one that is aligned with their sex at birth to children who identify with the gender aligned with their sex yet show consistent cross-gender behaviors and preferences. Specifically, vignettes of children who are sex nonconforming through their identification and behavior were used to describe transgender children, whereas vignettes of children who are sex nonconforming through their identification only or behavior only were used to describe sex nonconforming children who do not necessarily identify as a different gender. Because not all of the targets presented to participants in this study were transgender, and because of several design errors made in the creation of the study (i.e., even distribution of conditions across participants; more on this below) results from this pilot study are not included in the main paper (which focuses on transgender targets). Nonetheless, as seen below, the conclusions of the paper do not change if this study is included as all overall patterns are the same.

 Similar to the studies in the main text, the pilot study examined participants’ evaluations and categorization of sex conforming and nonconforming children. Participants were asked to rate how much they liked a series of sex conforming and nonconforming children, and how they would categorize each target child’s gender.

 In addition to assessing cisgender children’s liking and categorization of sex conforming and nonconforming peers, the pilot study also examined participants’ gender essentialism or their belief that gender is inborn, immutable, and biologically-based. Finally, this study also included a behavioral measure—asking children to allocate a resource to targets who were sex conforming or sex nonconforming.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were 62 cisgender children (*M* = 8.14 years, range = 5.33 – 10.92 years, 31 females, 88% White, 8% Asian, 2% Hispanic, 2% Alaskan Native). Participants were recruited through a university database of local children in the Pacific Northwest (USA), whose parents expressed interest in participating in research on child development. Data from 3 additional participants were dropped from all analyses because they did not complete any of the tasks.

**Measures and Procedure**

Participation occurred in a university research lab. Before testing, parental consent and child verbal assent were obtained. Participants were given a categorization task, a liking task, an essentialism task, and a discrimination task. Each measure is described in detail below. After completing the measures, participants received a small toy as a token of appreciation.

**Liking task.** In the Liking task, the experimenter read participants 6 short vignettes. Each vignette began at the target’s birth, with a doctor declaring the target character’s sex at birth (as boy or girl). Then the child’s gender identity and/or behavior were described. One-third of scenarios only described the child’s identification (the child insisted he/she was a boy/girl – *identity only condition*), one-third of scenarios described only the child’s behavior (whether the child did stereotypically feminine/masculine activities and appeared stereotypically male/female – *behavior only condition*), and one-third described both (*identity and behavior condition*). Each type of scenario was presented to children twice—once in a sex-conforming (e.g., a natal female who identified as a girl) and once in a sex-nonconforming way (e.g., a natal girl who behaved in a stereotypically masculine way). Table 1 shows the different possible conditions.

Table 1

*Types of vignette conditions used in the liking and categorization* *tasks*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target Natal Sex | Sex Conformity | Vignette type |
| Identity only | Behavior only | Identity & Behavior |
| Male | Conforming | Identifies as a boy | Acts like a boy | Identifies as and acts like a boy |
| Nonconforming | Identifies as a girl | Acts like a girl | Identifies as and acts like a girl |
| Female | Conforming | Identifies as a girl | Acts like a girl | Identifies as and acts like a girl |
| Nonconforming | Identifies as a boy | Acts like a boy | Identifies as and acts like a boy |

Below is an example of a vignette describing a sex nonconforming male in the identity and behavior (IB) condition:

*When Casey was born, the doctor said Casey was a boy because all of Casey’s body parts were the parts of a boy. When Casey was older and could talk, Casey insisted Casey was a girl* [identity]*. Casey liked to wear dresses and play with dolls. Casey had long hair and most people who met Casey said Casey looked like a girl* [behavior]*.*

Gender-neutral names were used in all vignettes, and target characters were never referred with third-person pronouns. Because participants were presented only 6 vignettes, each participant received only a subset of all possible combinations (there were 12 possible items: sex at birth x sex conforming vs. not x 3 types of vignettes), but all possible combinations were presented equivalently across participants. There were four versions of the Liking task, to which children were sequentially assigned. Each possible vignette appeared in two versions. At the end of each vignette, participants were asked to rate how much they liked the target character on a 6-point pictorial Likert scale (1: really don’t like, don’t like, kind of don’t like, kind of like, like, 6: really like). To ensure that participants understood the scale, after explaining the scale, the experimenter asked the participant two training questions: “If I told you about someone who you kind of liked, which face would you point to?” and “If I told you about someone you didn’t like, which face would you point to?” The experimenter confirmed correct responses and corrected incorrect responses to the training questions. Data from 9 additional participants were not included in the analyses of this task because they did not complete the liking task.

**Discrimination task.** In the discrimination task, participants were presented with pairs of children and asked to distribute resources in whichever way they wanted. Each participant was presented with two pairs of target children who varied in terms of their sex and conformity to that sex (boy vs. girl; conforming vs. not). Within each pair, one child was sex conforming and one child was sex nonconforming. For each participant, the sex conforming targets presented across the two trials were identical in sex; participants either saw two sex conforming males (one contrasted with a sex nonconforming male, and the other contrasted with a sex nonconforming female), or two sex conforming females (one contrasted with a sex nonconforming male, and the other contrasted with a sex nonconforming female). Across four versions of the task (sequentially assigned between subjects), we counter-balanced the order of presentation for sex conforming vs. sex nonconforming children in the pairs. On each trial, the experimenter provided descriptions of each target child’s natal sex and sex conformity, in a way similar to the identity and behavior (IB) condition in the liking task. After hearing descriptions for both characters, participants were given a bag of candy to give to one of the targets, to examine their likelihood of distributing resources to sex conforming vs. sex nonconforming peers. Responses were scored as ‘1’ if participants chose to share with the sex conforming target, and ‘0’ if they chose to share with the sex nonconforming target, and scores for the two trials were averaged such that higher scores indicated greater bias for sex conforming children. Data from 5 participants were not included in these analyses, as they did not complete the discrimination task.

**Categorization** **task.** Participants were presented with 6 vignettes that were nearly identical to the ones presented in the liking task (only the names and exact details of behavior changed; see Table 1 for types of vignettes). After hearing each vignette, participants were asked whether they thought the target character was “really a boy or a girl”. Responses were coded such that if participants identified the target based on their natal sex, they received a score of ‘1’, and if they identified the target based on the “opposite” of their natal sex (or for the sex nonconforming targets, this meant the selection based on their gender identity or expression instead of their natal sex), they received a score of ‘0’. Thus, higher scores indicated a tendency to use sex at birth as predictor of *real* identity. This task measured cisgender children’s beliefs about the biological and inborn nature of gender. Two participants were dropped from these analyses because they did not complete the categorization task.

**Property inference (essentialism) task.** The property inference task was identical to the one used in Gelman, Collman and Maccoby (1986). In each of 4 trials, participants were given information about two children: a child who looked like and was labeled as a boy, and a child who looked like and was labeled as a girl. On each trial, the experimenter provided contrasting information about the two children, regarding their biological properties (has estro/andro in her/his blood), toy preferences (plays with dolls/ trucks), clothing preferences (likes to wear dresses/pants), or whether they will grow up to be a mommy or a daddy. The third, target child matched one of the first children in terms of the label used by the experimenter to describe them, and the other in terms of appearance. For example, the target child might have been labeled as a girl but looked like a boy. Thus, participants were asked to make inferences about the third child’s biology, preferences, or future, based on either category label or appearance similarity. Participants received a score of ‘1’ on each of 4 trials in which they used the category label to draw an inference, and a score of ‘0’ each time they used an appearance cue to draw an inference. Therefore, higher scores were considered an indicator of gender essentialism, as per past research (Diesendruck & haLevi, 2006; Gelman et al., 1986). There were two versions of the task, such that half of the participants received the version of the task where all target individuals were labeled as boys (but looked more like the girls in the task), and half of the participants received a version where all target individuals were labeled as girls (but looked more like the boys in the task). Participants were sequentially assigned to one of two conditions. Data from 8 participants were not included in the analyses of this task, as they did not complete the property inference task.

**Results**

**Liking**

To examine children’s preferences for sex conforming and sex nonconforming target peers, we ran a repeated-measures ANOVA with target sex conformity (2: sex conforming, sex nonconforming) as the within-subjects variable. Results from this analyses yielded a significant main effect for target sex conformity, *F*(1,52) = 5.22, *p* = .026, *ηp²* = .09, where participants liked sex conforming peers (*M* = 4.25) better than sex nonconforming peers (*M* = 3.95).

Recall that in the liking task, there were 3 types of vignettes (identity only, behavior only, and identity and behavior). However, we did not have sufficient power for a comparison of vignette types, and were unable to include vignette type in the present analyses. In addition to the three types of vignettes, target characters varied in terms of their sex across the vignettes. However, because all conditions were not presented to all participants, formal analyses could not be conducted crossing type of vignette and target sex. Nonetheless, descriptive statistics for each type of vignette and target sex can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

*Mean (standard deviation) ratings of liking in each vignette condition in Study 1.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target | Vignette type |
| Identity only | Behavior only | Identity & Behavior |
| Sex conforming girl | 3.62 (1.27) | 4.06 (1.06) | 4.11 (.92) |
| Sex nonconforming boy | 3.75 (.93) | 3.87 (1.06) | 3.96 (1.00) |
| Sex conforming boy | 3.9 (1.17) | 4.16 (1.07) | 3.89 (1.17) |
| Sex nonconforming girl | 3.45 (1.23) | 3.70 (1.07) | 3.47 (1.26) |

**Discrimination**

A one-sample *t*-test comparison to chance (.5) showed that, across the two trials, participants did not differentiate between sex conforming and sex nonconforming peers when distributing resources, *t*(56) = 1.59, *p* = .12. Additionally, we examined response patterns to see if these results reflected participants’ desires to be fair (through sharing with the sex-conforming target on one trial and the sex non-conforming trial on the other trial), or whether certain participants consistently preferred to share with sex conforming or nonconforming targets. We found that 15.8% of participants consistently shared candy with sex nonconforming targets, whereas 29.8% consistently shared with sex conforming targets, and the remaining participants (54.4%) shared equally with sex conforming and nonconforming targets. A chi-square goodness of fit test indicated that these percentages did not differ from chance levels (25%, 25%, 50%, respectively), *χ2* (2, n = 101) = 4.68, *p* = .096.

**Categorization**

We analyzed responses on the Categorization task using a repeated-measures ANOVA, with target sex conformity (2: sex conforming, sex nonconforming) as the within-subjects variable. This yielded a significant main effect of target sex conformity, *F*(1,59) = 27.91, *p* < .001, *ηp²* = .32, such that children were more likely to identify sex conforming (*M* = .92) targets based on their natal sex compared to sex nonconforming targets (*M* = .63). Additional one sample *t*-test comparisons to chance (.5) were conducted, and showed that participants categorized both sex conforming and sex nonconforming peers by their natal sex more often than chance, *t*(59) = 17.91, *p* < .001 and *t*(59) = 2.61, *p* = .010 respectively.

As in the liking task, overall descriptive statistics for each type of vignette are presented in Table 3, for exploratory purposes.

Table 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ID+Behavior | ID only | Behavior only |
| Sex conforming girl | .97 (.19) | .87 (.34) | .97 (.19) |
| Sex nonconforming boy | .62 (.49) | .68 (.48) | .65 (.48) |
| Sex conforming boy | .97 (.18) | .93 (.26) | .81 (.40) |
| Sex nonconforming girl | .55 (.51) | .79 (.41) | .36 (.50) |

**Property inference**

A one-sample t-test comparison to chance (.5) showed that participants were more likely to make inferences based on category label than appearance, indicating essentialist reasoning, *t*(53) = 4.66, *p* < .001.

**Discussion**

In the present study, we investigated potential biases in 5- to 10-year-old cisgender children’s attitudes toward sex conforming and sex nonconforming children. Consistent with previous literature (Blakemore, 2003; Conry-Murray & Turiel, 2012; Levy et al., 1995; Martin & Ruble, 2010), participants liked sex conforming peers better than sex nonconforming peers. When asked to categorize sex conforming and nonconforming peers on our categorization task, children consistently identified both groups of peers by their natal sex rather than their “opposite” sex, although they identified sex nonconforming children by natal sex less often than sex conforming children. Similarly, on the property inference task, in which participants saw a target who appeared as one sex (e.g., girl) but was given a category label of the opposite sex (e.g., a boy), participants tended to make inferences in line with the category label (i.e., boy). Thus, on both the categorization and property inference essentialism measures we found a bias toward seeing participants as members of their sex-based category, using the label provided (by the doctor in the identification vignettes, or the experimenter in the property inference task) to make inferences about the target character.

These findings led us to believe that, when asked about sex nonconforming peers (i.e., a heterogeneou group of children who are transgender, and children who do not explicitly identify as a different gender but show cross-gender behaviors), participants reasoned differently than when they were asked about socially transitioned transgender children (as in the studies of the main paper). In particular, it is clear that participants in this study were categorizing sex nonconforming targets based on sex, whereas participants in the studies in the main paper were not sure how to categorize transgender peers. These findings further suggest that the findings in the main paper—in which children did not systematically categorize transgender targets by natal sex—may suggest that the target’s social transition, or switching appearance to live as a transgender person, reduced the tendency of children to categorize by sex. As stated in the introduction to this study, because the design of the pilot study did not allow for us to disentangle children’s reasoning about sex nonconforming and transgender targets (because not every participant saw all types of targets), because the study included sex nonconforming targets, and because there are clear differences in their reasoning across the two studies, we did not include this study in the main paper.

**Essentialism Measure in Study 1**

In Study 1 we also ran an essentialism measure, however, because we did not have enough power to run correlation analyses, because this measure was not included in Study 2, and because it is not the focus of this work, we did not include it in the main manuscript. However, for maximum transparency, we include it here.

**Island task.** In this task (adapted from Taylor, Rhodes & Gelman, 2009), participants were given 4 vignettes about individual children who were each raised on an island by individuals who were either all the same sex as the child, or all the opposite sex of the child (e.g., a girl who was raised by a group of men). Each participant heard about two girls and two boys, and among each gender, one child was raised by same-sex individuals, and one was raised by opposite-sex individuals. After each vignette, participants were asked four questions about the child’s preferences when he or she grew up, namely whether the child would show female- (wearing dresses, playing with dolls) or male-typed preferences (having short hair, playing football). The key test trials were those where the target children were raised by opposite-sex individuals. Same-sex trials were filler trials and were not analyzed; because environment and inborn properties of gender overlap, it is impossible to tell whether participant responses stem from essentialism or theories about environmental influence. We examined participants’ likelihood of attributing preferences aligned with the target child’s natal sex or their opposite sex, by giving participants ‘1’ point for each time they selected a sex-stereotypic trait (e.g., saying a girl raised by men would play with dolls) and each time they rejected a counter-stereotypic trait (e.g., saying a girl raised by men would not play football). Scores were averaged such that they ranged from 0 to 1 and higher scores indicated gender essentialism, because they were indicating participants’ belief that in spite of (presumed) environmental input children will show preferences in-line with their natal sex. In contrast, lower scores would indicate that they weighted environmental influences more heavily for determining gendered preferences. Participants were sequentially assigned to one of four versions of the task, across which order of presentation was counter-balanced. Data from 5 participants were excluded from these analyses, as they did not complete the task.

**Results**

To understand the extent to which participants viewed sex as immutable and predictive of future behaviors and preferences, we conducted a one-sample *t*-test comparison to chance (.5). Results showed that participants essentialized sex (*M* = .74) at a rate significantly above chance, *t*(49) = 6.48, *p* < .001. A one-way ANOVA showed that participant sex did not affect degree of essentialism, *F*(1,48) = .11, *p* = .75. Additionally, a repeated measures ANOVA with participant sex as a between-subjects variable, and target gender as a within-subjects variable yielded a main effect of target gender, *F*(1,48) = 11.22, *p* = .002, *ηp²* = .19, where boys (*M* =.82) were essentialized more than girls (*M* =.68).

**Discussion**

Although we utilized a different measure of sex essentialism in Study 1, the overall findings were consistent with the pilot study. Namely, participants in this study essentialized sex, viewing it as inborn, immutable and informative. In this study, participants essentialized sex in boys more than girls. Such a difference is consistent with research indicating that young children and adults are more comfortable with gender role flexibility in girls than in boys (e.g., Blakemore & Hill, 2008).

**Meta-analyses**

 We meta-analyzed our three studies on the main dependent variables of liking and categorization of cisgender (or sex conforming) vs. transgender (or sex nonconforming) peers using fixed effects in which the mean effect size was weighted by sample size, using the calculator spreadsheet by Goh, Hall and Rosenthal (2016) (note that, because the sample sizes were roughly equal, fixed and random effects meta-analyses revealed the same results, and therefore we only report results once). For each study, we first converted Cohen’s *d*s into Pearson’s correlations, which were then Fisher’s *z* transformed for analyses and converted back to Pearson correlations for ease of presentation here. Results for the liking meta-analyses were highly significant, *M r* = .28, *Z* = 4.91, *p* < .001, two-tailed, such that participants liked cisgender (or sex conforming) peers more than they liked transgender (or sex nonconforming peers). Figure 1 shows findings across the three studies.

Results for the categorization meta-analyses were also highly significant, *M* *r* = .71, *Z* = 10.98, *p* < .001, two-tailed, such that participants identified cisgender (or sex conforming) peers based on their natal sex more often than transgender (or sex nonconforming) peers. Figure 2 shows findings across the three studies.

Because the two other essentialism measures used in Studies 1 and 2 differed (the property inference and island tasks, respectively), and measured conceptually different facets of essentialism, we did not include these measures in our internal meta-analyses.

**Correlations with Age and Between Tasks**

In addition to the meta-analyses of main effects, we combined data across all three studies to examine potential age-related changes in participants’ liking of transgender children and the extent to which participants categorized transgender children by natal sex (vs. gender). We conducted partial correlations, controlling for study. Results showed no significant relation between liking and categorization of transgender peers, *r*(161) = -.10, *p* = .226. Finally, we examined whether there was a relationship between participants’ preferences for cisgender vs. transgender peers and their categorization of transgender children by natal sex. We conducted partial correlations, controlling for study, with the same difference scores of liking (cisgender minus transgender) and categorization (cisgender minus transgender). Results showed no age-related changes in preferring cisgender over transgender peers, *r*(161) = -.02, *p* = .79, though there was a negative correlation between age and categorization, *r*(161) = -.17, *p* = .033, such that older children were more likely to categorize transgender peers by their natal sex. Because two different essentialism measures were included in the Pilot Study and Study 1, and because of the low number of participants who received essentialism measures (such a measure was not used in Study 2), we did not conduct correlation analyses for essentialism.

Appendix A

The 6-point Likert Scale Used in the Liking Tasks of Studies 1 and 2



Appendix B

Vignettes Used in Liking Task of Study 1

1. Cisgender girl

When Casey was born, many people thought Casey looked like a girl. When Casey was older and could talk Casey insisted Casey was a girl. Casey liked to wear shiny crowns and play with toys for cooking like an oven. Casey had long hair and most people who met Casey said Casey looked like a girl.

How much do you like Casey?

1. Transgender girl

When Kendall was born, many people thought Kendall looked like a boy. When Kendall was older and could talk Kendall insisted Kendall was a girl. Kendall liked to wear skirts and watch princess movies. Kendall had long hair and most people who met Kendall said Kendall looked like a girl.

How much do you like Kendall?

1. Cisgender boy

When Payton was born, many people thought Payton looked like a boy. When Payton was older and could talk Payton insisted Payton was a boy. Payton liked to wear pants and play with toys for building like a hammer. Payton had short hair and most people who met Payton said Payton looked like a boy.

How much do you like Payton?

1. Transgender boy

When Riley was born, many people thought Riley looked like a girl. When Riley was older and could talk Riley insisted Riley was a boy. Riley liked to wear superhero clothes and play with soldier toys. Riley had short hair and most people who met Riley said Riley looked like a boy.

How much do you like Riley?

Appendix C

Vignettes Used in Categorization Task of Study 1

1. Cisgender girl

When Harper was born, many people thought Harper looked like a girl. When Harper was older and could talk Harper insisted Harper was a girl. Harper liked to wear dresses and play with dolls. Harper had long hair and most people who met Harper said Harper looked like a girl.

What is Harper really – a boy or a girl?

1. Transgender girl

When River was born, many people thought river looked like a boy. When River was older and could talk River insisted River was a girl. River liked to wear skirts and watch princess movies. River had long hair and most people who met River said River looked like a girl.

What is River really – a boy or a girl?

1. Cisgender boy

When Jamie was born, many people thought Jamie looked like a boy. When Jamie was older and could talk Jamie insisted Jamie was a boy. Jamie liked to wear cowboy boots and play with trucks. Jamie had short hair and most people who met Jamie said Jamie looked like a boy.

What is Jamie really – a boy or a girl?

1. Transgender boy

When Avery was born, many people thought Avery looked like a girl. When Avery was older and could talk Avery insisted Avery was a boy. Avery liked to wear baseball shirts and watch space alien movies. Avery had short hair and most people who met Avery said Avery looked like a boy.

What is Avery really – a boy or a girl?

Appendix D

Vignettes Used in Study 2

Transgender Girl

[1] One day, a little baby was born. [2] This baby’s name was Jack, because he had a boy body. [3] Jack’s parents bought him toy cars and trucks to play with.

[4] Every day, Jack would play outside. [5] But Jack didn’t like to play with his toy cars and trucks. [6] He only wanted to play with his sister’s fairy dresses.

[7] Jack’s mom was very confused. She asked him, “Don’t you want to play with your trucks, like other boys?” [8] But Jack said, “No, mom, I’m not a boy. I don’t want to play with trucks. I want to play with fairy dresses and unicorns, just like my sister, because I’m a girl.”

[9] So Jack’s parents decided to buy some fairy dresses and unicorns for him. This made Jack very happy, and he played with them all the time.

[10] Jack was still a little sad, though, because he didn’t like his name. Jack knew he was a girl, but he had a boy’s name, and everyone called him ‘he’ instead of ‘she’. [11] So Jack asked his parents if he could change his name to Annie, because Annie is a girl’s name. Jack’s parents said “Of course, we’ll call you Annie from now on.”

[12] Annie was much happier being called Annie. She was glad that she didn’t have to be called Jack any more. [13] Annie grew her hair really long, just like her sister, and Annie was very happy.

Cisgender Boy

[1] One day, a little baby was born. [2] This baby’s name was Dylan, because he had a boy body. [3] Dylan’s parents bought him toy cars and trucks to play with.

[4] Every day, Dylan would play outside. [5] Dylan liked to play with his cars and trucks. Dylan also wanted to play with his brother’s superman costume.

[6] Dylan’s mom was not confused at all. She asked him, “Do you want to play with your toy cars and trucks like other boys?” [7] And Dylan said, “Yes, mom, I’m not a girl. I don’t want to play with fairy dresses or unicorns. I want to play with cars and superman costumes, just like my brother, because I’m a boy.”

[8] So Dylan’s parents decided to buy some more toy cars and trucks for him. This made Dylan very happy, and he played with them all the time.

[9] Dylan was also happy because he liked his name. Dylan knew he was a boy, and he had a boy’s name, and everyone called him ‘he’ instead of ‘she’. [10] Dylan asked his parents if he could keep his name as Dylan, because Dylan is a boy’s name. Dylan’s parents said “Of course, we’ll keep calling you Dylan from now on.”

[11] Dylan was very happy being called Dylan. He was glad that he could be called Dylan. Dylan had really short hair, just like his brother, and Dylan was very happy.

Cisgender Girl

[1] One day, a little baby was born. [2] This baby’s name was Jessica, because she had a girl body. [3] Jessica’s parents bought her toy unicorns to play with.

[4] Every day, Jessica would play outside. [5] Jessica liked to play with her toy unicorns. Jessica also wanted to play with her sister’s fairy dresses.

[6] Jessica’s mom was not confused at all. She asked her, “Do you want to play with your toy unicorns like other girls?” [7] And Jessica said, “Yes, mom, I’m not a boy. I don’t want to play with trucks. I want to play with fairy dresses and unicorns, just like my sister, because I’m a girl.”

[8] So Jessica’s parents decided to buy some more fairy dresses and unicorns for her. This made Jessica very happy, and she played with them all the time.

[9] Jessica was also happy because she liked her name. Jessica knew she was a girl, and she had a girl’s name, and everyone called her ‘she’ instead of ‘he’. [10] Jessica asked her parents if she could keep her name as Jessica, because Jessica is a girl’s name. Jessica’s parents said “Of course, we’ll keep calling you Jessica from now on.”

[11] Jessica was very happy being called Jessica. She was glad that she could be called Jessica. Jessica had really long hair, just like her sister, and Jessica was very happy.

Transgender Boy

[1] One day, a little baby was born. [2] This baby’s name was Hannah, because she had a girl body. [3] Hannah’s parents bought her fairy dresses and unicorns to play with.

[4] Every day, Hannah would play outside. [5] But Hannah didn’t like to play with her fairy dresses. [6] She only wanted to play with her brother’s superman costume.

[7] Hannah’s mom was very confused. She asked her, “Don’t you want to play with your fairy dresses, like other girls?” [8] But Hannah said, “No, mom, I’m not a girl. I don’t want to play with fairy dresses. I want to play with superman costumes and trucks, just like my brother, because I’m a boy.”

[9] So Hannah’s parents decided to buy some superman costumes and trucks for her. This made Hannah very happy, and she played with them all the time.

[10] Hannah was still a little sad, though, because she didn’t like her name. Hannah knew she was a boy, but she had a girl’s name, and everyone called her ‘she’ instead of ‘he’. [11] So Hannah asked her parents if she could change her name to Ryan, because Ryan is a boy’s name. Hannah’s parents said “Of course, we’ll call you Ryan from now on.”

[12] Ryan was much happier being called Ryan. He was glad that he didn’t have to be called Hannah any more. [13] Ryan cut his hair really short, just like his brother, and Ryan was very happy.

Appendix E

Sample Images Accompanying Vignettes in Study 2

The images below accompanied the “transgender girl” vignette, and the numbers match the order of presentation marked in the vignette description in Appendix D.

