

## Gender Differences in Self-Reported Camouflaging in Autistic and Non-Autistic Adults

Journal:	<i>Autism</i>
Manuscript ID	AUT-19-0085.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Camouflaging, Autism, Masking, Compensation, Gender Differences, Females, Adult
Abstract:	<p>Social camouflaging describes the use of strategies to compensate for and mask autistic characteristics during social interactions. A newly-developed self-reported measure of camouflaging (the Camouflaging of Autistic Traits Questionnaire; CAT-Q) was used in an online survey to measure gender differences in autistic (<math>n = 306</math>) and non-autistic adults (<math>n = 472</math>) without intellectual disability for the first time. Controlling for age and autistic-like traits, an interaction between gender and diagnostic status was found: autistic females demonstrated higher total camouflaging scores than autistic males (partial <math>\eta^2 = .08</math>), but there was no camouflaging gender difference for non-autistic people. Autistic females scored higher than males on two of three CAT-Q subscales: Masking (partial <math>\eta^2 = .05</math>), and Assimilation (partial <math>\eta^2 = .06</math>), but not on the Compensation subscale. No differences were found between non-autistic males and females on any subscale. No differences were found between non-binary individuals and other genders in either autistic or non-autistic groups, although samples were underpowered. These findings support previous observations of greater camouflaging in autistic females than males, and demonstrate for the first time no self-reported gender difference in non-autistic adults.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

## **Gender Differences in Self-Reported Camouflaging in Autistic and Non-Autistic Adults**

9 Laura Hull <sup>a</sup>, Meng-Chuan Lai <sup>b c d</sup>, Simon Baron-Cohen <sup>c</sup>, Carrie Allison <sup>c</sup>, Paula Smith <sup>c</sup>, K V  
10  
11 Petrides <sup>e</sup> & William Mandy <sup>a</sup>  
12  
13

14 <sup>a</sup> Research Department of Clinical, Educational & Health Psychology, University College  
15 London, London, UK  
16  
17

18  
19 <sup>b</sup> Centre for Addiction and Mental Health and The Hospital for Sick Children, Department of  
20 Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
21  
22

23  
24 <sup>c</sup> Autism Research Centre, Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge,  
25 UK  
26  
27

28  
29 <sup>d</sup> Department of Psychiatry, National Taiwan University Hospital and College of Medicine,  
30 Taipei, Taiwan  
31  
32

33  
34 <sup>e</sup> London Psychometric Laboratory, University College London, London, UK  
35  
36

### **Corresponding Author**

37  
38  
39

40  
41 Laura Hull  
42  
43

44 Department of Psychology, University College London, 26 Bedford Way, London, United  
45 Kingdom, WC1H 0AP  
46  
47

48  
49 laura.hull.14@ucl.ac.uk

+44 02076795365  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Maya Bowri, Emogen Campbell, Andrew Dunlop and Lily Levy for assistance with data collection. A selection of these findings were presented at INSAR, May 2018 in Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

### **Ethical approval**

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

### **Funding**

Meng-Chuan Lai is supported by the O'Brien Scholars Program within the Child and Youth Mental Health Collaborative at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) and The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, the Academic Scholars Award from the Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, the Slight Family Child and Youth Mental Health Innovation Fund and The Catherine and Maxwell Meighen Foundation (both via CAMH Foundation), the Ontario Brain Institute via the Province of Ontario Neurodevelopmental Disorders (POND) Network, Women's Xchange, and the University of Toronto Department of Psychiatry Excellence Fund.

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**Abstract**

Social camouflaging describes the use of strategies to compensate for and mask autistic characteristics during social interactions. A newly-developed self-reported measure of camouflaging (the Camouflaging of Autistic Traits Questionnaire; CAT-Q) was used in an online survey to measure gender differences in autistic (n = 306) and non-autistic adults (n = 472) without intellectual disability for the first time. Controlling for age and autistic-like traits, an interaction between gender and diagnostic status was found: autistic females demonstrated higher total camouflaging scores than autistic males (partial  $\eta^2 = .08$ ), but there was no camouflaging gender difference for non-autistic people. Autistic females scored higher than males on two of three CAT-Q subscales: Masking (partial  $\eta^2 = .05$ ), and Assimilation (partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ ), but not on the Compensation subscale. No differences were found between non-autistic males and females on any subscale. No differences were found between non-binary individuals and other genders in either autistic or non-autistic groups, although samples were underpowered. These findings support previous observations of greater camouflaging in autistic females than males, and demonstrate for the first time no self-reported gender difference in non-autistic adults.

**Keywords**

Autism, camouflaging, masking, compensation, gender differences, females, adult

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Social camouflaging is defined as the use of strategies to present a less visibly autistic  
7  
8 persona to others during a social interaction (Hull et al., 2017; Lai et al., 2011).

9  
10 Camouflaging behaviours may be conscious or unconscious, and specific strategies as well as  
11  
12 their impact vary across individuals. Behaviours used to camouflage may also be a  
13  
14 consequence of the development of cognitive compensatory strategies (Livingston & Happé,  
15  
16 2017). Some common strategies include compensation for inherent autistic social differences,  
17  
18 such as consciously learning ‘scripts’ for regular social interactions, or implicitly developing  
19  
20 techniques to mask the appearance of autism, such as using speech patterns or sounds more  
21  
22 often shown by non-autistic people (Hull et al., 2017; Parish-Morris et al., 2017).

23  
24 Camouflaging strategies are performed with the aim of reducing discrimination, smoothing  
25  
26 social interactions, and achieving success in employment or education (Hull et al., 2017),  
27  
28 although it still unknown to what extent these aims are achieved. Frequently-reported  
29  
30 consequences of camouflaging are exhaustion, loss of identity, and mental health difficulties  
31  
32 including suicidal thoughts (Bargiela, Steward, & Mandy, 2016; Cassidy, Bradley, Shaw, &  
33  
34 Baron-Cohen, 2018; Tierney, Burns, & Kilbey, 2016).

35  
36 It has been suggested that females may experience and express their autism in different ways  
37  
38 to males, resulting in under-diagnosis of females; this is known as the ‘female autism  
39  
40 phenotype’ (Dworzynski, Ronald, Bolton, & Happé, 2012; Gould & Ashton-Smith, 2011;  
41  
42 Lai, Lombardo, Auyeung, Chakrabarti, & Baron-Cohen, 2015). The proposed female  
43  
44 phenotype may represent differences in quantity of behaviours (such as higher levels of  
45  
46 internalising disorders such as depression or anxiety; Lai et al., 2015) or in quality of  
47  
48 behaviours (such as differences in friendship experiences; Sedgewick, Hill, Yates, Pickering,  
49  
50 & Pellicano, 2015) between males and females at group levels, with significant individual  
51  
52 variation within each gender.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Greater camouflaging of autistic characteristics, especially during clinical assessments or outside of the home, has been proposed as one way in which autistic girls and women may be missed by assessments that focus on 'typical' autism behaviours (Kopp & Gillberg, 1992).

There may be many factors contributing to this gender-variant presentation. Biological or developmental differences between genders may lead to greater cognitive abilities related to camouflaging (Lehnhardt et al., 2013); while females may also be held to higher standards of social skills (Hull et al., 2017). Autistic females may also experience greater stigmatisation for appearing autistic than males, and this may relate to the intersection of multiple marginalised identities which create unique pressures for people who are both autistic and female, compared to either group separately (Cage & Troxell-Whitman, 2019). All these factors may interact to produce greater expectation, necessity, and ability to camouflage autism for females compared to males.

If gender differences in camouflaging in the hypothesised direction are found in autistic individuals, but not in non-autistic individuals, this supports the role of camouflaging in the female autism phenotype. In contrast, if similar gender differences are found in non-autistic males and females, this suggests that gender differences in camouflaging may reflect general social expectations for females to be more sociable and amenable than males (Kreiser & White, 2014). The present study is the first known to test these hypotheses by comparing self-reported camouflaging behaviours in a large sample of autistic and non-autistic adults. There has also been limited research into the extent of camouflaging in individuals who do not identify as either male or female; this study seeks to address this by including non-binary individuals in analyses of gender differences.

One approach to measuring camouflaging focuses on the 'discrepancy' between underlying social and cognitive abilities, and behavioural expression of autism/social abilities (Lai et al., 2017). Using this approach, camouflaging can only be measured in those identified as having

1  
2  
3 difficulties in the areas of interest compared to the standards expected of neurotypical  
4  
5 individuals, since non-autistic individuals would theoretically have minimal discrepancy  
6  
7 scores (although see Livingston, Colvert, Bolton, & Happé, 2018, for evidence of  
8  
9 compensation for mentalizing difficulties in non-autistic individuals). Autistic women show a  
10  
11 greater discrepancy between internal autistic status and external behavioural presentation than  
12  
13 autistic men (Lai et al., 2017), and the level of which is associated with neural activation  
14  
15 related to self-referential cognition in autistic women specifically (Lai et al., 2018).

16  
17 Behavioural assessment of camouflaging suggests that autistic girls use more linguistic  
18  
19 strategies to camouflage their social communication difficulties than boys (Boorse et al.,  
20  
21 2019; Parish-Morris et al., 2017). Autistic girls also tend to have higher parent-observed  
22  
23 adaptive difficulties and autistic characteristics when they present comparable levels of  
24  
25 clinician-rated autistic behaviours compared to autistic boys (Ratto et al., 2018).

26  
27 An alternative approach which aims to directly identify and measure camouflaging strategies  
28  
29 allows for comparison between groups regardless of diagnostic status or perceived difficulties  
30  
31 (Hull et al., 2018). Following this 'observational/reflective' approach, Dean and colleagues  
32  
33 (2017) observed suggestive evidence of camouflaging in certain environments seen in autistic  
34  
35 girls, but not in autistic boys or non-autistic children. This suggests that gender differences in  
36  
37 camouflaging may be unique to autistic individuals, and that non-autistic males and females  
38  
39 do not differ in the extent to which they display any camouflaging behaviours. However, this  
40  
41 study focused only on a small number of children in a playground setting; these findings need  
42  
43 to be tested in larger samples across broader age ranges. In a study of adults, autistic men and  
44  
45 women were equally likely to spontaneously report using camouflaging strategies (Cage, Di  
46  
47 Monaco, & Newell, 2017).

48  
49 Differences in camouflaging levels across genders may lead to differences in risk of mental  
50  
51 health problems and reduced wellbeing (Lai et al., 2017); it is therefore important to assess  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 how much autistic individuals of different genders are camouflaging in everyday life, and  
4  
5 compare this to camouflaging in non-autistic individuals. Camouflaging, like autistic traits,  
6  
7 likely exists on a continuum across the entire population. However, individuals with higher  
8  
9 levels of autistic characteristics are also likely to camouflage these more (Hull et al., 2018),  
10  
11 and so higher levels of camouflaging in one gender may simply reflect more autistic  
12  
13 characteristics to camouflage. As a supplementary analysis, and to thoroughly test the  
14  
15 hypothesis that autistic females camouflage more than males because of differences in social  
16  
17 expectation and/or behavioural presentation (Cage & Troxell-Whitman, 2019; Lai et al.,  
18  
19 2011), it is also important to control for autistic traits, separately to assessing the extent of  
20  
21 real-life camouflaging across genders. There may be age-related differences in the extent to  
22  
23 which individuals camouflage, based on social demands, experience, mental health, and other  
24  
25 factors (Cage & Troxell-Whitman, 2019; Hull et al., 2017), and so age should be included in  
26  
27 comparisons of camouflaging across groups and genders.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 A new self-report measure of camouflaging, the Camouflaging Autistic Traits Questionnaire  
38  
39 (CAT-Q; Hull et al., 2018), has been developed based on autistic adults' lived experiences of  
40  
41 camouflaging to provide a measure of self-recognised intentions to camouflage, regardless of  
42  
43 behavioural outcome. The CAT-Q uses an observational/reflective approach to measuring  
44  
45 camouflaging. Items describing camouflaging strategies were developed from autistic adults'  
46  
47 self-reported camouflaging behaviours, and thus reflect behaviours experienced by autistic  
48  
49 individuals themselves, which may not all be identified through external observation. Unlike  
50  
51 other measures of camouflaging, the CAT-Q has demonstrated equivalency of psychometric  
52  
53 structure in males and females with and without an autism diagnosis (Hull et al., 2018), and,  
54  
55 therefore, can be used to compare camouflaging behaviours between these groups.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



The present study had two key aims. First, this was the first study to test gender differences in self-reported camouflaging behaviours in both autistic and non-autistic adults, including people of non-binary gender. We hypothesised that autistic females would camouflage more than autistic males, following the predictions of the female autism phenotype hypothesis and in support of some previous research. Gender differences for non-binary autistic individuals' camouflaging, or that of any non-autistic participants, were not hypothesised as there has been no prior research examining this.

Second, we also aimed to examine whether gender differences in camouflaging of autistic traits reflect underlying levels of autistic traits, and whether this is comparable across diagnostic groups. Autistic traits were added as a covariate in supplementary analyses, to determine whether any gender differences in real-life identified in autistic or non-autistic groups remained once variation in autistic traits between genders was controlled for.

## Methods

### Participants

Autistic and non-autistic participants were recruited through social media, through the [removed for review] database, and through word-of-mouth. Participants self-reported an official autism diagnosis from a qualified healthcare professional and were asked to detail the label of diagnosis (e.g. Autism, Asperger's Syndrome, Autism Spectrum Disorder), the age they were diagnosed, and the type of healthcare professional who diagnosed them. Those who reported being self-diagnosed were automatically excluded from the study and did not complete any further questions. Gender was measured by asking participants to report the gender they identified as (male, female or 'other gender'). Characteristics of the sample and mean scores on all variables are included in Table 1.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

Power analysis using G\*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) determined that a minimum sample of 54 per group would be necessary to detect medium-sized differences (partial  $\eta^2 = 0.5$ ) in an ANCOVA between autistic and non-autistic males, females, and non-binary individuals' camouflaging score while controlling for age and autistic-like traits. Individuals who identified as non-binary (neither male nor female;  $N = 43$ ; 16 with autism, 27 without autism) were included in analyses, but results are presented and discussed as preliminary only, as this sample was not well-powered enough to detect the predicted effect sizes. The final sample included 778 participants in total (see Table 1). An additional 53 individuals did not report their gender, and were not included in any analyses.

## Measures

### **Camouflaging of Autistic Traits Questionnaire (CAT-Q; Hull et al., 2018).**

This is a 25-item self-report questionnaire measuring strategies used to camouflage autistic traits and comprising three factors (Compensation, Masking, and Assimilation) which are summed up to produce a total score from 25 to 175, with higher scores representing greater levels of camouflaging. The CAT-Q has been validated in autistic and non-autistic male and female samples, and has demonstrated measurement equivalence across gender and diagnostic groups (Hull et al., 2018). Internal consistency in this sample was high ( $\alpha = 0.94$ ).

### **Broad Autism Phenotype Questionnaire (BAPQ; Hurley, Losh, Parlier, Reznick, & Piven, 2007).**

This is a 36-item self-report measure of traits associated with the broader autism phenotype (BAP). BAP characteristics are associated with greater genetic liability for autism, and are found across the population and at especially high levels in relatives of those with an autism diagnosis. Although it was designed as a measure of autistic-like traits in relatives of autistic

1  
2  
3 people, the BAPQ has been demonstrated to be a good measure of autistic-like traits across  
4  
5 the general population, including in autistic individuals (Nishiyama et al., 2014). The BAPQ  
6  
7 has good sensitivity (Sasson et al., 2013) and specificity (Hurley et al., 2007) for the broader  
8  
9 autism phenotype. Internal consistency in this sample was high ( $\alpha = 0.96$ ). Minimum score is  
10  
11 0, maximum score is 6 when scores are averaged across the total questionnaire.  
12  
13

### 14 15 **Procedure**

16  
17  
18 Participants followed an online link to the study, hosted by Qualtrics, where they read the  
19  
20 information sheet and completed an informed consent form. They completed demographic  
21  
22 questions and then the CAT-Q and BAPQ as part of a broader battery of questionnaires,  
23  
24 online.  
25  
26

27  
28 Ethical approval for this study was obtained from [removed for review] Research Ethics  
29  
30 Committee (ID numbers [removed for review]). Informed consent was obtained from all  
31  
32 individual participants in this study.  
33  
34

### 35 36 **Analysis**

37  
38 All analyses were performed in R (R Core Team, 2013) and SPSS Version 23 (IBM Corp.,  
39  
40 2015).  
41  
42

43  
44 The following analyses of covariance were performed to test the effect of gender and  
45  
46 diagnostic group, and the interaction between gender and diagnostic group, on CAT-Q total  
47  
48 and on each of its three subscales (Compensation, Masking, and Assimilation). Initial  
49  
50 analyses were performed in the total sample, with follow-up analyses performed in the  
51  
52 autistic and non-autistic samples, and in male, female, and non-binary subsamples,  
53  
54 separately. Bonferroni corrections were used for all follow-up analyses to account for  
55  
56 multiple comparisons, with a corrected significance value of  $\alpha = .005$ . Partial eta squared was  
57  
58 used as a measure of effect size for MANCOVA and ANCOVA (where values under .04 =  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 small effect, values of .04 - .10 = moderate effect, and values above .14 = large effect), and  
4  
5 Cohen's  $d$  used as a measure of effect size for planned comparison tests (where values under  
6  
7 0.4 = small effect, values of 0.5 – 0.7 = moderate effect, and values above 0.8 = large effect).  
8  
9 Both effect sizes were interpreted following Cohen (1988; reported in Lenhard & Lenhard,  
10  
11 2016).  
12  
13  
14

15 Firstly, main and interaction effects of gender and diagnostic group were examined while  
16  
17 controlling for participant's age, through analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) for Total CAT-  
18  
19 Q and MANCOVA for CAT-Q subscales. Univariate ANCOVAs were run separately in  
20  
21 autistic and non-autistic groups to examine main effects of gender (with planned comparisons  
22  
23 between each of the three genders when significant main effects were found), and in each  
24  
25 gender to examine main effects of diagnostic group. These analyses aimed to identify the  
26  
27 real-life levels of camouflaging across genders and groups.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Secondly, all analyses were repeated while controlling for participants' age and autistic traits  
33  
34 (BAPQ total score). These analyses aimed to identify whether gender and group differences  
35  
36 in camouflaging simply reflect differences in the amount of autistic characteristics that need  
37  
38 to be camouflaged, or are a result of other factors.  
39  
40  
41

## 42 Results

43  
44  
45 Two-way ANOVA comparing age revealed main effects of diagnostic group (autistic  
46  
47 participants were significantly older than non-autistic participants ( $F[1, 785] = 52.40, p <$   
48  
49  $.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ ), gender ( $F[2, 785] = 12.02, p < .001$ ), and an interaction between  
50  
51 diagnostic group and gender ( $F[2, 785] = 4.64, p = .01$ ). Follow-up comparisons indicated that  
52  
53 in the autistic sample, males were older than females ( $p < .001$ ) and non-binary individuals ( $p$   
54  
55  $< .001$ ); there was no difference between females' and non-binary participants' ages. In the  
56  
57 non-autistic sample, there were no gender differences in age. Autistic participants (mean  
58  
59  
60

BAPQ score = 4.30, SD = 0.71) had significantly higher levels of autistic-like traits than non-autistic participants (mean BAPQ score = 3.18, SD = 0.74;  $t(777) = 20.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Gender distributions on unadjusted Total CAT-Q scores in autistic and non-autistic samples are presented in Figure 1. Distributions on the CAT-Q subscales are presented in Supplementary Figures 1a-c. ‘Density’ represents the proportion of participants in each group who scored at each level of the CAT-Q or its subscales; distributions for non-autistic samples have been reflected to allow group comparison, and still represent positive values.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

### **Gender and Group differences with Age as a covariate**

Figure 2 shows interactions between gender and diagnostic group for total and subscale CAT-Q scores, when age was included as a covariate. See Table 1 for unadjusted means for all variables.

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

#### *Total CAT-Q score*

The first ANCOVA revealed no main effect of gender ( $F[3,781] = 0.23$ ,  $p = .63$ ), a significant main effect of diagnostic group, with autistic participants scoring higher than non-autistic participants ( $F[3,781] = 232.24$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and an interaction between gender and diagnostic group for Total CAT-Q score ( $F[3,781] = 26.27$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The assumption of equality of error variance was met for this model.

In order to further explore this interaction, follow-up ANCOVA in the autistic sample revealed a main effect of gender ( $F[2, 306] = 9.67$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ ), with pairwise comparisons indicating autistic females scored higher than males ( $p < .001$ ,  $d = .65$ ), and no difference between non-binary individuals and males or females. In the non-autistic sample,

1  
2  
3 follow-up ANCOVA demonstrated a main effect of gender ( $F[2, 478] = 8.98, p < .001,$   
4  
5 partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ), with pairwise comparisons indicating non-autistic non-binary individuals  
6  
7 scored higher than females ( $p < .001, d = .73$ ) but not males. Non-autistic males did not score  
8  
9 differently to any other gender at the corrected alpha level.

10  
11  
12  
13 Follow-up ANCOVAs were performed to examine diagnostic group differences separately  
14  
15 for each gender. Autistic females scored higher than non-autistic females ( $F[1, 437] = 218.95,$   
16  
17  $p < .001,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .34$ ). Autistic males scored higher than non-autistic males ( $F[1, 300] =$   
18  
19  $29.16, p < .001,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .09$ ). No difference was found between autistic and non-autistic  
20  
21 non-binary participants ( $F[1, 46] = 2.96, p = .09,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ ).

#### 22 23 24 25 *CAT-Q Subscales*

26  
27  
28 Overall for the three subscales, MANCOVA revealed no main effect of gender ( $F[3, 781] =$   
29  
30  $1.70, p = .19$ ), a main effect of diagnostic group with autistic participants scoring higher than  
31  
32 non-autistic participants ( $F[3, 781] = 241.12, p < .001$ ), and an interaction between gender  
33  
34 and diagnostic group ( $F[3, 781] = 15.71, p < .001$ ). The assumption of equality of covariance  
35  
36 matrices was not met for this model, therefore Pillai's Trace was used as a robust multivariate  
37  
38 statistic.

39  
40  
41  
42 Follow-up ANCOVA in the autistic sample revealed a significant multivariate effect of  
43  
44 gender (Pillai's Trace = .02,  $F[6, 604] = 4.23, p < .001,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ), and univariate  
45  
46 effects of gender in the Masking ( $F[2, 306] = 6.29, p = .002,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ) and  
47  
48 Assimilation ( $F[2, 306] = 783.25, p < .001,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ ) subscales. No main effect of  
49  
50 gender was found for the Compensation subscale when adjusting for the corrected alpha ( $F[2,$   
51  
52  $306] = 4.07, p = .02,$  partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ). Pairwise comparisons were conducted to assess gender  
53  
54 differences in the Masking and Assimilation subscales. Autistic females scored higher than  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

autistic males on the Masking subscale ( $p = .001$ ,  $d = .43$ ) and the Assimilation subscale ( $p < .001$ ,  $d = .51$ ). No other differences were significant at the corrected alpha level.

In the non-autistic sample, follow-up ANCOVA demonstrated a significant multivariate effect of gender (Pillai's Trace = 0.44,  $F[6, 948] = 3.52$ ,  $p = .002$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ), and univariate effect of gender for the Compensation subscale only ( $F[2, 478] = 9.21$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ). Pairwise comparisons revealed that non-autistic males scored higher than females ( $p = .005$ ,  $d = .23$ ), and that non-binary participants scored higher than females ( $p < .001$ ,  $d = .72$ ) on Compensation.

Follow-up ANCOVAs were conducted to examine the effect of diagnostic group separately in each gender. A main effect of diagnostic group was found in females (Pillai's Trace = .43,  $F[3, 433] = 108.60$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .43$ ), with autistic females scoring higher than non-autistic females on Compensation ( $F[1, 437] = 212.28$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .33$ ), Masking ( $F[1, 437] = 24.47$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .05$ ), and Assimilation subscales ( $F[1, 437] = 262.38$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .38$ ). A main effect of diagnostic group was also found in males (Pillai's Trace = .25,  $F[3, 296] = 32.82$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .25$ ), and autistic males scored higher than non-autistic males on the Compensation ( $F[1, 300] = 37.89$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .11$ ) and Assimilation subscales ( $F[1, 300] = 52.06$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .15$ ). In non-binary participants, no main effect of diagnostic group was found at the corrected significance level (Pillai's Trace = .23,  $F[3, 42] = 4.20$ ,  $p = .01$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .23$ ).

### **Gender differences with Age and Autistic Traits as covariates**

#### *Total CAT-Q score*

The first ANCOVA revealed no main effect of gender ( $F[3,737] = 0.01$ ,  $p = .99$ ), a significant main effect of diagnostic group with autistic participants scoring higher than non-autistic participants ( $F[3,737] = 11.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and an interaction between gender and diagnostic

group for Total CAT-Q score ( $F[3,737] = 12.87, p < .001$ ). The assumption of equality of error variance was met for this model.

Figure 3 shows interactions between gender and diagnostic group for total and subscale CAT-Q scores, when age and autistic-like traits were included as covariates.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

Follow-up ANCOVA in the autistic sample revealed a main effect of gender ( $F[2, 299] = 6.98, p = .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$ ), with pairwise comparisons indicating autistic females scored higher than males ( $p < .001, d = .47$ ), and no difference between non-binary individuals and males or females. In the non-autistic sample, follow-up ANCOVA demonstrated no main effect of gender ( $F[2, 442] = 2.61, p = .07, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ).

Follow-up ANCOVAs were performed to examine diagnostic group differences separately for each gender. Autistic females scored higher than non-autistic females ( $F[1, 415] = 14.98, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04$ ). No difference was found between autistic and non-autistic males ( $F[1, 283] = 0.12, p = .73$ ) or non-binary participants ( $F[1, 39] = 0.20, p = .65$ ).

#### *CAT-Q Subscales*

Overall for the three subscales, MANCOVA revealed no main effect of gender ( $F[3, 735] = 2.23, p = .08$ ), a main effect of diagnostic group with autistic participants scoring higher than non-autistic participants ( $F[3, 735] = 36.00, p < .001$ ), and an interaction between gender and diagnostic group ( $F[3, 735] = 7.70, p < .001$ ). The assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not met for this model, therefore Pillai's Trace was used as a robust multivariate statistic.

Follow-up ANCOVA in the autistic sample revealed a significant multivariate effect of gender (Pillai's Trace = .08,  $F[6, 588] = 3.81, p = .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04$ ), and univariate



1  
2  
3 effects of gender in the Masking ( $F [2, 299] = 6.20, p = .002, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04$ ) and  
4  
5 Assimilation ( $F[2, 299] = 7.50, p = .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$ ) subscales. Pairwise comparisons  
6  
7 were conducted to assess gender differences in the Masking and Assimilation subscales.  
8  
9  
10 Autistic females scored higher than autistic males on the Masking subscale ( $p = .001, d = .44$ )  
11  
12 and the Assimilation subscale ( $p < .001, d = .40$ ). No other differences were significant at the  
13  
14 corrected alpha level.  
15

16  
17  
18 In the non-autistic sample, follow-up ANCOVA demonstrated no significant multivariate  
19  
20 effect of gender (Pillai's Trace = 0.25,  $F[6, 874] = 1.86, p = .08, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ) and so  
21  
22 further analyses were not performed.  
23

24  
25 Follow-up ANCOVAs were conducted to examine the effect of diagnostic group separately  
26  
27 in each gender. A main effect of diagnostic group was found in females (Pillai's Trace = .07,  
28  
29  $F[3, 410] = 9.99, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .07$ ), with autistic females scoring higher than non-  
30  
31 autistic females on Compensation ( $F[1, 415] = 28.59, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .07$ ) only. A main  
32  
33 effect of diagnostic group was also found in males (Pillai's Trace = .07,  $F[3, 278] = 6.99, p <$   
34  
35  $.001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .07$ ), but diagnostic group differences on each subscale were not significant  
36  
37  $.001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .07$ ), but diagnostic group differences on each subscale were not significant  
38  
39 at the corrected alpha level. In non-binary participants, no main effect of diagnostic group  
40  
41 was found (Pillai's Trace = .18,  $F[3, 37] = 2.66, p = .06, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .18$ ).  
42  
43

## 44 Discussion

45  
46  
47 This was the first study to compare self-reported camouflaging behaviours between autistic  
48  
49 and non-autistic men, women, and non-binary people.  
50

51  
52  
53 A consistent finding was that autistic females had higher camouflaging scores than autistic  
54  
55 males. Effect sizes were moderate, with the largest differences found for Total CAT-Q. This  
56  
57 supports our hypothesis that autistic females camouflage more than males, and suggests that  
58  
59 autistic women may use more masking strategies, and experience greater pressure than men  
60

1  
2  
3 to adapt their behaviours in order to assimilate with others. No gender difference was found  
4  
5 on the Compensation subscale, suggesting autistic individuals of all genders may use  
6  
7 compensatory strategies to a similar extent.  
8  
9

10  
11 Non-binary autistic people had higher total CAT-Q scores than females when controlling for  
12  
13 age only, suggesting that these individuals may be at particular risk of the negative outcomes  
14  
15 associated with camouflaging. However, this difference was not found when autistic traits  
16  
17 were controlled for, suggesting that their higher levels of camouflaging may arise because  
18  
19 they have more autistic traits to camouflage than females. However, the number of autistic  
20  
21 non-binary participants in this sample was very small, and so the analyses were likely  
22  
23 underpowered to detect small group differences.  
24  
25

26  
27 In contrast, gender differences in non-autistic individuals were minimal, and were not  
28  
29 maintained when autistic traits were controlled for. Non-autistic males reported slightly  
30  
31 higher levels of camouflaging than non-autistic females, but this difference was not  
32  
33 maintained when we controlled for levels of autistic traits. The implication is that, compared  
34  
35 to non-autistic females, non-autistic males may use slightly more camouflaging, reflecting the  
36  
37 fact that they have somewhat higher levels of autistic traits (Robinson et al., 2011). Non-  
38  
39 binary non-autistic individuals had higher Total CAT-Q and Compensation scores than  
40  
41 females, which may be accounted for by their higher mean levels of autistic traits (see Table  
42  
43 1), as these differences were not found when controlling for autistic traits. Again, however,  
44  
45 the sample size was underpowered to detect small differences between non-binary and other  
46  
47 participants.  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Consistent group differences were found between autistic and non-autistic females, which  
54  
55 were maintained when controlling for autistic traits. Again, this suggests that there is **an**  
56  
57 interaction between being female and being autistic which produces greater camouflaging  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 than the simple additive effects of each separately. Interestingly, differences between autistic  
4 and non-autistic males were not maintained when autistic traits were controlled for,  
5  
6 suggesting that males across diagnostic groups camouflage their autistic characteristics to a  
7  
8 similar extent (but that autistic males have higher levels of autistic traits, and so use more  
9  
10 camouflaging strategies in real life). No differences between autistic and non-autistic non-  
11  
12 binary participants were found, which is likely to reflect the small samples of each.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Overall, the pattern of gender differences suggests a relatively similar use of specific  
18  
19 compensatory strategies in autistic males, females, and non-binary people (as measured by  
20  
21 similar scores on the Compensation subscale), but greater use of specific Masking and  
22  
23 Assimilation strategies by females. One explanation for this may be differences in the  
24  
25 gendered experiences of autistic females and males, as a product of both cultural gender  
26  
27 norms and being held to the standards of typically developing females and males respectively  
28  
29 (Cage & Troxell-Whitman, 2019). Kreiser and White (2014) describe an interaction between  
30  
31 cultural, inter- and intra-personal, and biological factors affecting gender and individual  
32  
33 development, which they suggest may produce variation in both innate autistic experience  
34  
35 and external autistic presentation. Autistic females may perceive greater expectations to be  
36  
37 acting similarly to typically developing peers than are felt by autistic males (Bargiela,  
38  
39 Steward & Mandy, 2016; Dean et al., 2014), and so may camouflage to a greater extent in  
40  
41 order to try and fit in (Kreiser & White, 2014; Tierney et al., 2016). This pattern of  
42  
43 difference was not found in the non-autistic sample. This indicates that although the kind of  
44  
45 intention and behavioural strategies measured by the CAT-Q are utilized across autistic and  
46  
47 non-autistic adults, impact of gender (and theoretically, gendered contexts) is more evident  
48  
49 and unique in the autistic compared to non-autistic population.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 Participants in this study were mostly European or North American and in early/middle  
58  
59 adulthood on average, and so mostly grew up in Westernised cultures during the 1970s, 80s,  
60

1  
2  
3 and 90s. Gender-based stereotypes and rigid gender binaries during childhood and  
4  
5 adolescence may have contributed to this greater pressure to camouflage autistic  
6  
7 characteristics for autistic females than males. It will be important for future research to  
8  
9 understand why such impact is more obvious in the autistic than the neurotypical population  
10  
11 (e.g., do autistic people of this age conform more to gender norms than their neurotypical  
12  
13 peers?) and whether the same will be found in the younger generations, for whom  
14  
15 conventional, binary gender norms are relaxing. It may be that the combined identities of  
16  
17 being autistic and female result in greater stigmatisation of difference, which leads to more  
18  
19 efforts to fit in for autistic women than other groups (Cage & Troxell-Whitman, 2019). As  
20  
21 such, it will be a task to look at autistic individuals of all genders who develop their (autistic)  
22  
23 identities under the current, more fluid conceptions of gender and neurodiversity in many  
24  
25 Westernised cultures (although it remains to be seen as to whether gender equality in society  
26  
27 impacts social conceptions of gender; MacPhee & Prendergast, 2019; Prendergast &  
28  
29 MacPhee, 2018), and see whether the observed gender differences remain.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Gender differences in the autistic sample remained significant even when controlling for  
37  
38 autistic-like traits, suggesting that higher levels of camouflaging in females are not due to  
39  
40 having more autistic traits to camouflage than males, but due to greater extent of  
41  
42 camouflaging of the autistic traits they do have, perhaps because of greater social  
43  
44 expectations for females than males (Bargiela, Steward & Mandy, 2016). Autistic women  
45  
46 may experience unique and more extreme pressures than either autistic men or typically  
47  
48 developing women, in part because of the intersection of their identities as neurodivergent  
49  
50 and female (Cage & Troxell-Whitman, 2019), which may lead to differences in behavioural  
51  
52 expression of autistic characteristics compared to the 'typical' male presentation. This  
53  
54 supports suggestions that camouflaging forms part of the female phenotype of autism (Head,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 McGillivray, & Stokes, 2014; Kirkovski, Enticott, & Fitzgerald, 2013; Lai et al., 2015;  
4  
5 Lehnhardt et al., 2015).

6  
7  
8 Camouflaging of autistic traits may be more predominant in autistic females, and may  
9  
10 partially account for the missed and later diagnosis of autism found for many females  
11  
12 (Duvekot et al., 2017; Dworzynski et al., 2012; Shattuck et al., 2009). Previous research has  
13  
14 also suggested that camouflaging may lead to mental health difficulties amongst autistic  
15  
16 females, particularly anxiety and exhaustion related to the pressures of maintaining the  
17  
18 'façade' (Bargiela et al., 2016; Tierney et al., 2016), and suicidal thoughts (Cassidy et al.,  
19  
20 2018).  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Our findings contradict those by Cage and Troxell-Whitman (2019), who did not find  
26  
27 difference between autistic males and females using the total CAT-Q score. These  
28  
29 researchers did not control for autistic traits, therefore it is possible that male participants in  
30  
31 their study had higher levels of autistic traits to camouflage than females, resulting in  
32  
33 comparable overall camouflaging scores. Further research in a range of broader samples is  
34  
35 necessary to determine the exact nature and size of any gender differences in camouflaging,  
36  
37 using a range of methodologies. We would also suggest that, once the literature reaches a  
38  
39 sufficient size, meta-analysis is the best way to produce a definitive answer on the direction  
40  
41 and size of gender differences in camouflaging using a variety of samples and methods.  
42  
43  
44 However, autistic males in the current study camouflaged at significantly higher levels than  
45  
46 non-autistic males, and at equivalent levels to autistic non-binary individuals, when  
47  
48 controlling for age only. These findings support previous research arguing that camouflaging  
49  
50 is not an exclusively female phenomena (Cage et al., 2017; Lai et al., 2017; Livingston et al.,  
51  
52 2018). **As demonstrated in the first set of analysis, controlling only for age,** autistic males and  
53  
54 non-binary individuals are also likely to experience the negative consequences associated  
55  
56 with camouflaging, and there may even be greater impact on mental health for men than  
57  
58  
59  
60

women, possibly due to reduced experience of camouflaging and other gender-related demands (Hull et al., 2017; Lai et al., 2017).

### **Limitations and Strengths**

A significant limitation of this study is that only adults who were able to access and answer the online questionnaire were included in the study. While the online nature of this study enabled participation by individuals who prefer written to spoken language, there was no representation of autistic individuals who may be unable to reflect upon and express their behaviours through written English. Furthermore, the average age of autism diagnosis was 31.92 years, suggesting that these findings may be limited to individuals who are diagnosed in adulthood. These individuals may be more likely than others to camouflage their autism, having remained unidentified for so long. Therefore, it is still an open question as to whether the findings could be generalised to autistic people who were diagnosed earlier in life (e.g. in childhood).

In addition, participants' autistic status was based on self-reported disclosure, and was not independently verified. However, participants were also asked to give details of who gave them the diagnosis, and those who reported being diagnosed by someone other than a clinician or healthcare team were excluded from the study. More information about participants' diagnostic experiences, and other individual characteristics such as ethnicity, is important for future research to understand factors affecting variability in camouflaging.

Although we have reported all results with regards to non-binary participants, we emphasise that both autistic and non-autistic samples of non-binary individuals were underpowered to detect the expected effect sizes. This may account for the non-significance of most results regarding non-binary participants. We therefore interpret these results with caution, and suggest that further study with larger samples of non-binary individuals is conducted before

any conclusions are drawn regarding non-binary camouflaging levels. Additionally, the CAT-Q has not been psychometrically validated in non-binary populations, therefore it may not be an appropriate measure to use with this group. However, as a relatively large proportion of autistic individuals identify as non-binary (Cooper, Smith, & Russell, 2018; Dewinter, De Graaf & Begeer, 2017), we believe these results are an important first step to learning more about the mechanisms and consequences of camouflaging across all genders.

Despite the aforementioned limitations, this study had multiple strengths. First, it is unique in that a psychometrically validated measure was used to assess and compare camouflaging behaviours between autistic and non-autistic males, females, and non-binary individuals. Second, it is based on the largest sample used to assess gender differences in camouflaging so far, strengthening previous findings of greater camouflaging in autistic females. Third, by controlling for age and autistic-like traits we demonstrate that self-reported camouflaging is not exclusively related to the development of typical social skills, and that gender differences in camouflaging exist for autistic individuals only.

The findings suggest that autistic women camouflage their autistic traits to a greater degree than autistic men, and therefore clinicians and other service providers should consider camouflaging when assessing women's autistic characteristics and their impact on daily functioning and wellbeing. However, autistic men and non-binary individuals also camouflage their autism at high levels, and should also be included in research looking at the consequences of camouflaging. Validated measures such as the CAT-Q may be used by individuals and in clinical settings to identify relevant camouflaging strategies and adapt behaviour as necessary to minimise negative outcomes.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Maya Bowri, Emogen Campbell, Andrew Dunlop and Lily Levy for assistance with data collection. A selection of these findings were presented at INSAR, May 2018 in Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**References**

- Bargiela, S., Steward, R., & Mandy, W. (2016). The experiences of late-diagnosed women with Autism Spectrum Conditions: An investigation of the female autism phenotype. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(10), 3281–3294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-016-2872-8>
- Boorse, J., Cola, M., Plate, S., Yankowitz, L., Pandey, J., Schultz, R. T., & Parish-morris, J. (2019). Linguistic markers of autism in girls : evidence of a “ blended phenotype ” during storytelling. *Molecular Autism*, 1–12.
- Cage, E., Di Monaco, J., & Newell, V. (2017). Experiences of autism acceptance and mental health in autistic adults. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 5–8.
- Cage, E., & Troxell-Whitman, Z. (2019). Understanding the Reasons, Contexts and Costs of Camouflaging for Autistic Adults. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 0(0), 0. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-03878-x>
- Cassidy, S., Bradley, L., Shaw, R., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2018). Risk markers for suicidality in autistic adults. *Molecular Autism*, 9(42), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13229-018-0226-4>
- Cohen, J. (1988). Set Correlation and Contingency Tables. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 12(4), 425–434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662168801200410>
- Cooper, K., Smith, L. G. E., & Russell, A. J. (2018). Gender Identity in Autism : Sex Differences in Social Affiliation with Gender Groups. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 0(0), 0. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-3590-1>
- Dean, M., Harwood, R., & Kasari, C. (2017). The art of camouflage: Gender differences in the social behaviors of girls and boys with autism spectrum disorder. *Autism*, 21(6),

678–689. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361316671845>

Dean, Michelle, Kasari, C., Shih, W., Frankel, F., Whitney, R., Landa, R., ... Harwood, R.

(2014). The peer relationships of girls with ASD at school: comparison to boys and girls with and without ASD. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 55(11), 1218–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12242>

Dworzynski, K., Ronald, A., Bolton, P., & Happé, F. (2012). How different are girls and boys above and below the diagnostic threshold for autism spectrum disorders? *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 51(8), 788–797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.05.018>

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, 175–191.

Gould, J., & Ashton-Smith, J. (2011). Missed diagnosis or misdiagnosis? Girls and women on the autism spectrum. *Good Autism Practice (GAP)*, 12(1), 34–41. Retrieved from <http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/bild/14662973/v12n1/s5.pdf?expires=1458573512&id=86436442&titleid=75007062&accname=UCL+LIBRARY&checksum=67DD45F10B3BC0F23C260A42F5F40513>

Head, A. M., McGillivray, J. A., & Stokes, M. A. (2014). Gender differences in emotionality and sociability in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Molecular Autism*, 5(19). Retrieved from <http://www.biomedcentral.com/content/pdf/2040-2392-5-19.pdf>

Hull, L., Petrides, K. V., Allison, C., Smith, P., Baron-Cohen, S., Lai, M.-C., & Mandy, W. (2017). “Putting on My Best Normal”: Social Camouflaging in Adults with Autism Spectrum Conditions. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 47(8). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-017-3166-5>

Hull, Laura, Mandy, W., Lai, M., Baron-Cohen, S., Allison, C., Smith, P., & Petrides, K. V.

(2018). Development and Validation of the Camouflaging Autistic Traits Questionnaire

(CAT-Q). *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 49(3), 819–833.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-3792-6>

Hurley, R. S. E., Losh, M., Parlier, M., Reznick, J. S., & Piven, J. (2007). The broad autism

phenotype questionnaire. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 37(9), 1679–

1690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-006-0299-3>

IBM Corp. (2015). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0. Armonk, NY: IBM

Corp.

Kirkovski, M., Enticott, P. G., & Fitzgerald, P. B. (2013). A review of the role of female

gender in autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*,

43(11), 2584–2603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-013-1811-1>

Kopp, S., & Gillberg, C. (1992). Girls with social deficits and learning problems: Autism,

atypical Asperger syndrome or a variant of these conditions. *European Child &*

*Adolescent Psychiatry*, 1(2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02091791>

Kreiser, N. L., & White, S. W. (2014). ASD in females: are we overstating the gender

difference in diagnosis? *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 17(1), 67–84.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-013-0148-9>

Lai, M.-C., Lombardo, M. V., Ruigrok, A. N. V., Chakrabarti, B., Auyeung, B., Szatmari, P.,

... Consortium, M. A. (2017). Quantifying and exploring camouflaging in men and

women with autism. *Autism*, 21(6), 690–702.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361316671012>

Lai, M.-C., Lombardo, M. V., Auyeung, B., Chakrabarti, B., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2015).

1  
2  
3 Sex/gender differences and autism: setting the scene for future research. *Journal of the*  
4  
5  
6 *American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 54(1), 11–24.

7  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2014.10.003>  
9

10  
11 Lai, M.-C., Lombardo, M. V, Chakrabarti, B., Ruigrok, A. N., Bullmore, E. T., Suckling, J.,  
12  
13 ... Baron-Cohen, S. (2018). Neural self-representation in autistic women and association  
14  
15 with ‘compensatory camouflaging.’ *Autism*, 136236131880715.

16  
17  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318807159>  
19

20  
21 Lai, M.-C., Lombardo, M. V, Pasco, G., Ruigrok, A. N. V, Wheelwright, S. J., Sadek, S. A.,  
22  
23 ... Baron-Cohen, S. (2011). A behavioral comparison of male and female adults with  
24  
25 high functioning autism spectrum conditions. *PloS One*, 6(6), e20835.

26  
27  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020835>  
29

30  
31 Lehnhardt, F.-G., Falter, C. M., Gawronski, A., Pfeiffer, K., Tepest, R., Franklin, J., &  
32  
33 Vogeley, K. (2015). Sex-related cognitive profile in Autism Spectrum Disorders  
34  
35 diagnosed late in life: Implications for the Female Autistic Phenotype. *Journal of Autism*  
36  
37 *and Developmental Disorders*, 46(1), 139–154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015->  
38  
39 2558-7

40  
41  
42  
43 Lehnhardt, F.-G., Gawronski, A., Pfeiffer, K., Kockler, H., Schilbach, L., & Vogeley, K.  
44  
45 (2013). The investigation and differential diagnosis of Asperger syndrome in adults.  
46  
47 *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*, 110(45), 755–763.

48  
49  
50 <https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2013.0755>  
51

52  
53 Lenhard, W., & Lenhard, A. (2016). Calculation of Effect Sizes.

54  
55 <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3478.4245>  
56

57  
58 Livingston, L. A., Colvert, E., Bolton, P., & Happé, F. (2018). Good social skills despite poor  
59  
60 theory of mind: exploring compensation in autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Child*

1  
2  
3 *Psychology and Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12886>

4  
5  
6 Livingston, L. A., & Happé, F. (2017). Conceptualising compensation in neurodevelopmental  
7  
8 disorders: Reflections from Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Neuroscience and*  
9  
10 *Biobehavioral Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.06.005>

11  
12  
13 MacPhee, D., & Prendergast, S. (2019). Room for Improvement: Girls' and Boys' Home  
14  
15 Environments are Still Gendered. *Sex Roles*, 80(5–6), 332–346.  
16  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0936-2>

18  
19  
20  
21 Nishiyama, T., Suzuki, M., Adachi, K., Sumi, S., Okada, K., Kishino, H., ... Kanne, S. M.  
22  
23 (2014). Comprehensive comparison of self-administered questionnaires for measuring  
24  
25 quantitative autistic traits in adults. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*,  
26  
27 44(5), 993–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-013-2020-7>

28  
29  
30  
31 Parish-Morris, J., Liberman, M. Y., Cieri, C., Herrington, J. D., Yerys, B. E., Bateman, L., ...  
32  
33 Schultz, R. T. (2017). Linguistic camouflage in girls with autism spectrum disorder.  
34  
35 *Molecular Autism*, 8(1), 48. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13229-017-0164-6>

36  
37  
38 Prendergast, S., & MacPhee, D. (2018). Family Resilience Amid Stigma and Discrimination:  
39  
40 A Conceptual Model for Families Headed by Same-Sex Parents. *Family Relations*,  
41  
42 67(1), 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12296>

43  
44  
45  
46 R Core Team. (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical processing. Vienna,  
47  
48 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from [http://www.r-](http://www.r-project.org/)  
49  
50 [project.org/](http://www.r-project.org/)

51  
52  
53  
54 Ratto, A. B., Kenworthy, L., Yerys, B. E., Bascom, J., Trubanova, A., White, S. W., ...  
55  
56 Anthony, G. (2018). What About the Girls ? Sex-Based Differences in Autistic Traits  
57  
58 and Adaptive Skills. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 48(5), 1698–  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1711. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-017-3413-9>  
4  
5

6 Robinson, E. B., Munir, K., Munafò, M. R., Hughes, M., McCormick, M. C., & Koenen, K.

7  
8 C. (2011). Stability of autistic traits in the general population: further evidence for a  
9  
10 continuum of impairment. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent*  
11  
12 *Psychiatry*, 50(4), 376–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2011.01.005>  
13  
14  
15

16 Sasson, N. J., Lam, K. S. L., Childress, D., Parlier, M., Daniels, J. L., & Piven, J. (2013). The

17  
18 Broad Autism Phenotype Questionnaire: Prevalence and diagnostic classification.  
19  
20 *Autism Research*, 6(2), 134–143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.1272>. The  
21  
22

23 Sedgewick, F., Hill, V., Yates, R., Pickering, L., & Pellicano, E. (2015). Gender Differences

24  
25 in the Social Motivation and Friendship Experiences of Autistic and Non-autistic  
26  
27 Adolescents. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(4), 1297–1306.  
28  
29 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2669-1>  
30  
31  
32

33 Shattuck, P. T., Durkin, M., Maenner, M., Newschaffer, C., Mandell, D. S., Wiggins, L., ...

34  
35 Cuniff, C. (2009). Timing of identification among children with an autism spectrum  
36  
37 disorder: findings from a population-based surveillance study. *Journal of the American*  
38  
39 *Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(5), 474–483.  
40  
41  
42 <https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819b3848>  
43  
44

45 Tierney, S., Burns, J., & Kilbey, E. (2016). Looking behind the mask: Social coping

46  
47 strategies of girls on the autistic spectrum. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 23,  
48  
49 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2015.11.013>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	Total Sample	Autistic Sample			Non-Autistic Sample		
		Female	Male	Non-Binary	Female	Male	Non-Binary
N	778	182	108	16	252	193	27
Age (SD)	34.56 (14.89)	39.91 (12.75)	46.68 (13.98)	33.50 (11.74)	29.86 (13.40)	30.94 (14.78)	26.52 (10.74)
Highest level of education (%)		Secondary: 36 Undergraduate: 30 Postgraduate: 33 Not Specified: 1	Secondary: 35 Undergraduate: 28 Postgraduate: 35 Not Specified: 2	Secondary: 66 Undergraduate: 17 Postgraduate: 17 Not Specified: 0	Secondary: 47 Undergraduate: 28 Postgraduate: 25 Not Specified: 0	Secondary: 47 Undergraduate: 30 Postgraduate: 23 Not Specified: 0	Secondary: 86 Undergraduate: 7 Postgraduate: 7 Not Specified: 0
Nationality (%)		British: 53 N. American: 23 European: 15 Other: 6 Not Specified: 3	British: 63 N. American: 20 European: 8 Other: 8 Not Specified: 1	British: 38 N. American: 44 European: 12 Other: 6 Not Specified: 0	British: 43 N. American: 28 European: 17 Other: 8 Not Specified: 4	British: 48 N. American: 29 European: 12 Other: 6 Not Specified: 5	British: 37 N. American: 40 European: 3 Other: 13 Not Specified: 7
ASC Diagnosis (%)	N.A.	Asperger's: 67 Autism: 19 ASD: 11 PDD-NOS: 3	Asperger's: 74 Autism: 18 ASD: 6 PDD-NOS: 2	Asperger's: 56 Autism: 19 ASD: 25	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Age at ASC Diagnosis (SD)	N.A.	34.07 (13.13)	37.92 (15.99)	23.76 (13.08)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Who gave ASC Diagnosis (%)	N.A.	Psychologist: 53 Psychiatrist: 35 Other doctor <sup>a</sup> : 2 Other <sup>b</sup> : 9	Psychologist: 53 Psychiatrist: 36 Other doctor <sup>a</sup> : 3 Other <sup>b</sup> : 8	Psychologist: 44 Psychiatrist: 50 Other <sup>b</sup> : 6	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

CAT-Q Total	104.16	124.35	109.64	122.00	90.87	96.89	109.44
(SD)	(28.54)	(23.27)	(26.50)	(17.12)	(27.67)	(24.22)	(27.20)
CAT-Q Comp	33.37	41.85	36.81	43.50	27.18	30.06	35.48
(SD)	(12.73)	(11.11)	(12.14)	(9.89)	(11.50)	(10.92)	(11.32)
CAT-Q Mask	35.80	37.87	32.90	36.06	34.69	36.34	38.70
(SD)	(9.51)	(10.54)	(10.57)	(8.78)	(9.05)	(8.13)	(7.61)
CAT-Q Assim	34.94	44.63	39.93	39.88	29.00	30.48	35.26
(SD)	(12.20)	(7.82)	(11.26)	(6.43)	(11.73)	(10.33)	(12.11)
BAPQ Total	3.63	4.37	4.17	4.30	3.10	3.24	3.53
(SD)	(0.91)	(0.63)	(0.84)	(0.50)	(0.73)	(0.72)	(0.80)

Note. ASC = Autism Spectrum Condition; PDD-NOS = Pervasive Developmental Disorder, Not Otherwise Specified; CAT-Q = Camouflaging Autistic Traits Questionnaire; CAT-Q Comp = Compensation subscale; CAT-Q Mask = Masking subscale; CAT-Q Assim = Assimilation subscale; BAPQ = Broader Autism Phenotype Questionnaire. <sup>a</sup> Including family doctor/general practitioner, paediatrician, and multi-disciplinary team. <sup>b</sup> Including speech and language therapist, school, and nurse practitioner.



Figure 1. *Distribution of Total CAT-Q scores*




Figure 2. Mean Total CAT-Q (a), Compensation (b), Masking (c), and Assimilation (d) scores by Group and Gender, controlling for age






Figure 3. Mean Total CAT-Q (a), Compensation (b), Masking (c), and Assimilation (d) scores by Group and Gender, controlling for age and autistic-like traits



Supplementary Figures 1a-c. Distribution of Compensation (SF1a), Masking (SF1b) and Assimilation (SF1c) subscale scores in Autistic (above x-axis) and Non-Autistic (below x-axis) samples



Supplementary Figures 1a-c. Distribution of total Compensation (1a), Masking (1b) and Assimilation (1c) subscale scores in autistic and non-autistic males and females. Note: females are represented by a dashed line, males by a straight line, non-binary participants by a dotted line; autistic sample scores are presented above the x-axis and non-autistic sample scores presented below the x-axis.

\_\_\_\_ = Female  
 ---- = Male  
 ..... = Non-Binary