Masters of Research

Turning the spotlight on the "wizard behind the curtain": How do transgender women experience and navigate male privilege and entitlement, pre- and post-transition?

Margaret Kelly

Supervised by: Associate Professor Robert Reynolds and
Associate Professor Shirleene Robinson

Abstract

The aim of this project is to explore how transgender women experience and navigate male privilege when they lived as men and now as they live as women. The project conducted qualitative in-depth interviews with twelve transgender women from diverse backgrounds and the data was analysed through the lens of Raewyn Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, and masculinity's ideology of supremacy and claim to authority. Transgender women participants' responses echoed the main elements of Connell's concept and evidenced that privilege is unevenly distributed among multiple masculinities. This unevenness is reflected in participants' experiences of and attitudes to male privilege and hegemonic masculinity, pre- and post-transition. Furthermore, participants described how the defense of masculinity's uneven allocation of authority and privilege and the subordination of women is normalised and institutionalised. Participants' responses reflect Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity and turn a spotlight on a complex social structure difficult to identify, define and, therefore, to challenge. This project argues that it is the very complexity and elusiveness of the structure and the invisibility of the advantages it bestows on some men that is one of its strengths. And it is transgender women's reflections on their pre- and post-transition experiences of privilege that illuminate these often hidden and taken-for-granted gender norms and social structures and the gender inequality they perpetuate.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my supervisors, Associate Professor Robert Reynolds and Associate Professor Shirleene Robinson.   This thesis would not have been possible without their support, encouragement and insights.

I would like to acknowledge Kelly Glanney, Director of the Carmen Rupe Trust for her assistance in defining the recruitment parameters and recruiting participants. Kelly's support and confidence in this project was a boost in difficult times and is much appreciated.

As well, I would like to thank the transgender women who gave generously of their time, and talked openly and honestly about their life challenges. Their thoughtful insights and reflections provided a bank of rich data that, due to time and word-count constraint, is only partially represented in these pages.

And appreciation and thanks go to the members of my writing group and its initiator, Dr. Michelle Jamison. Phillipa, Marian, Merrill, Eva, Nicola and Libby, thank you for giving valuable feedback, support and encouragement.

Declaration

I declare this work is substantially my own, and where any part of this work is not mine I have acknowledged the source of that part of the work. This thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution. My ethics approval is Reference Number 5201600273.

Signed:

Margaret Kelly
Student Number: 43230350

Glossary of Terms

Trans – change, across, beyond (Vidal-Ortiz, 2008, p. 432)

Transgender – is a person who lives full time as the gender that does not align with his or her anatomical sex without necessarily undergoing sex reassignment surgery (SRS).   However, the term is widely used as an umbrella term that includes transsexuals, transvestites, genderqueer, and others who do not conform to the male/female gender binary (Thanem & Wallenberg, 2016, pp. 251–253).

Transsexual – identifies as the gender other than that assigned at birth and undergoes hormone treatment and most likely sex reassignment surgery to align his or her physical appearance with their gender identity (Thanem & Wallenberg, 2016, p. 251).

Transvestite – dresses in clothes usually associated with the opposite sex. Many identify with both the gender they were assigned at birth and the opposite gender (Thanem & Wallenberg, 2016, p. 251).

Queer – refers to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014) and people who do not identify as heterosexual.

Genderqueer – individuals who do not identify with the gender binary, they consider themselves as neither entirely male nor entirely female (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014).

Gender Non-conforming – individuals whose gender expression is different from societal expectations (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014).

Transgender people/Transpeople – "has become the generic category used to describe everyone in the above categories" (Connell, 2010, p. 34).

Transgender studies – focus on the "everyday experiences of transpeople including embodiment and its impact on their social identities" (Vidal-Ortiz, 2008, p. 436).

Transition – is the time when a person starts living as the gender with which they identify rather than the gender they were assigned at birth. This may or may not include medical and legal aspects (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014).

Sex Reassignment Surgery (SRS) – the surgical procedures to change a person's body to better reflect the person's gender identity. This may include breast

augmentation or the removal of or alteration of genitals (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014).

Cisgender – comes from the Latin *cis* which is the antonym of trans. It means anyone who is not transgender (Thanem & Wallenberg, 2016, p. 252), and refers to people whose assigned gender aligns with their gender identity.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

The gender hierarchy and gender order requiring the compliance of multiple masculinities, the subordination and marginalization of some masculinities and the subordination of all women remain entrenched in western society and in the workplace. Raewyn Connell states that the concept of hegemonic masculinity is the current justification for such inequality (Connell, 1987, p. 187). According to this ideology, power, authority and privilege are allocated to men according to their high status on the masculinity-authority power axis identified by Connell (1987, p. 109), while femininity, forming the base of the axis, is aligned with weakness and denied authority and privilege. This seemingly straightforward allocation of authority and privilege is then complicated and confused by a second, diffuse axis that denies authority and privilege to some men according to a complex and often contradictory ranking system (p. 109). This research project hones in on one aspect of this intricate structure, that is, the allocation of male privilege and entitlement. Precisely, the project considers the puzzle of what happens to male privilege when the recipient confuses their rank on the masculinity-authority axis and is no longer embodied in the male body. By going some way to unraveling the puzzle of male privilege, this project aims to shine a spotlight on some of the often masked and hidden structures that support the gender hierarchy and gender order and enable gender inequality.

Transgender women have experienced life being socially accepted as men, albeit with the particular stress associated with gender alignment performance, discrimination and body dysphoria. They also experience life as women, again with the stress associated with this experience. Therefore, transgender women's unique life experiences afford them a unique perspective on male privilege and entitlement. For this reason, twelve transgender women from diverse backgrounds were recruited and in-depth interviews explored the question of male privilege and entitlement from the standpoint of transgender women, pre- and post-transition.

The project's main research question asks how transgender women experience and navigate male privilege and entitlement, pre- and post-transition. This question incorporates a number of related questions. These include an exploration of transgender women's insights into male privilege and entitlement, and if these insights changed due to their experiences pre- and post-transition. The study also explores whether transgender women identify with the discrimination of cisgender women or if they believe they suffer more or less or in a different way. Participants' responses to these lines of enquiry address this project's aim—to better define and understand male privilege, how it is embodied, allocated and enacted, and how it reinforces, polices and sustains the gender order and gender inequality. By increasing the understanding of male privilege and entitlement, this project contributes to the discourse on the persistence of hegemonic masculinity and the seeming intractability of gender inequality.

Section 1.2 situates the project in the discipline of sociology and the sub-discipline of the sociology of gender. Within the academic discipline of gender studies, Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity is the most cited reference on the subject and is the theoretical framework for this project. The rationale for this decision and an outline of the main elements of the concept, together with critiques and Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005) reformulation of the concept are detailed in Section 1.3. Section 1.4 covers the methodology employed in this project. Section 1.5 outlines the structure followed in the findings chapters and Chapters Two to Four present the findings. Chapter Five discusses the analysis, future research and offers concluding comments.

1.2 Background

This project is situated within the discipline of sociology and the sub-discipline of the sociology of gender. Sociology is the study of society, its origins, development, organization, networks, institutions and power structures and how society manages change. The discipline ranges from the study of individuals' encounters with phenomena to global social processes (Giddens, 2001). Sociology has evolved into a concern with social relations, social movements, power and the management of change, in both public and private domains (Touraine, 1989, p. 5). Thus sociology asks for a broader view of "why we are as we are, and why we act as we do", and challenges taken-for-granted ideas and beliefs (Giddens, 2001, p. 2). It is because of this that the discipline of sociology is the most useful for this study. The discipline offers a theoretical framework and analytical tools to explore social change in the private and public domains, social relations, social movements, particularly the feminist and LGBTI movements, and the capacity of society to transform itself in the face of challenges to established power structures.

The sub-discipline of the sociology of gender considers patriarchal power structures as practices in which "men dominate, oppress and exploit women" (Walby, 1989, p. 214). And, during the past 30 years, sociology of gender scholars have illuminated how gender as a "sociocultural construction" has infused all arenas of life (Saltzman Chafetz, 2006, p. vii), institutionalizing social differentiation and social stratification (Davidson & Gordon, 1979). These scholars study the effects of this inequality, thereby aiming to empower individuals to hold agency over their own circumstance, thus transforming society (Connell, 1987). The concepts of agency and societal transformation and gender's instability and embodiment are major focuses of contemporary gender studies (Connell, 2014).

Key to this project are these two sociology of gender concepts: the instability of gender identity and patriarchal power structures that enforce heteronormativity through the practice of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Duncanson, 2015; Hearn, 2004). It is for the reasons outlined above that the discipline of sociology and the sub-discipline of

the sociology of gender are the ideal locations for this project and the exploration of the research question.

1.3 Literature Review

The gender binary and the gender hierarchy are entrenched structures; the transgender person is located between and possibly beyond these. This project explores the lived experiences of transgender women and their ability to illuminate these entrenched and often hidden structures. The purpose of this literature review is to consider recent research for its insight and relevance to the project's topic. In order to do this, the review encompasses three fields of sociological knowledge. The first is the concept of hegemonic masculinity, from the development of the original theory of hegemony to its adaptation by Connell (1987) to the sociology of gender. The second field of enquiry is the lived experience of transgender women. These studies include the exploration of experiences of discrimination and violence against transgender people (Hill, 2003; Jauk, 2013), the transgressive opportunity the transgender experience presents (Muhr, Sullivan, & Rich, 2016), as well as studies on transgender individuals in the workplace (Connell, 2010; Schilt & Connell, 2007; Schilt & Wiswall, 2008; Wilson, 2002). Finally, the third field constitutes the intersection of the lived experience of transgender women and the concept of hegemonic masculinity, with particular reference to male privilege and entitlement. Additionally, Connell's understanding of hegemonic masculinity is analysed in relation to its usefulness and contemporary relevance as a concept on which to base an exploration of the research question.

The term hegemony has multiple origins (Boothman, 2008, p. 213) and was first used by Antonio Gramsci in his *Prison Notebooks* (1929, 1935) to describe the power of the bourgeois over the working class. This power was by way of trading concessions in return for their active consent, reducing the need for force to predominate "excessively over consent" (Gramsci, Q13S37, 1971, p. 80 n. 49). Hegemony's power is that it is entrenched in all civil society structures—the church, the education system, government, business and the press. In this way hegemony legitimates the dominance of the ruling class, encouraging both dominant and subordinate groups to endorse social structures (Schippers, 2007, p. 90).

In much the same way, gender hierarchy's power lies in the acceptance of the concept of essentialism. Essentialism is the idea that physical differences in human bodies are imbued with meaning through the imposition of a binary construct wherein all variation collapses into two socially and legally recognised gender statuses—"man" and "woman" (Budgeon, 2014, p. 318). As relational concepts, masculinity and femininity act as opposites, masculinity is dominant and femininity submissive. Hence, male dominance is normalised and, therefore, women do not experience men's dominance as oppressive (Risman, 2004, p. 432). This cultural opposition is the rationale for hegemonic social relations at every level of social function and legitimizes men's domination over women (Schippers, 2007, p. 93).

Hegemony as applied to gender was first used in a field study about the social inequality in Australian schools (Connell, Dowsett, & Kessler, 1981). Following on from this, Carrigan, Connell, and Lee (1985) put forward a model of power and multiple masculinities. This was then formulated into a sociological theory in *Gender and Power* (Connell, 1987), the most frequently cited source concerning hegemonic masculinity. Connell refers to hegemonic masculinity as a "collective project" (p. 108) conflating masculinity with power and authority and enforcing the subordination of all women and some men. Importantly, as a sociological theory, hegemonic masculinity is not a description of a certain masculine character type but rather a "configuration of gender practice" (Hearn, 2004, p. 58) and an analytical tool for understanding its social dynamic (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 14).

This project employs Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity as an analytical tool to explore how transgender women navigate and experience male privilege and entitlement, pre- and post-transition. To do this it is essential to identify the main elements of the concept of hegemonic masculinity. Connell argued that the concepts of patriarchal ideology, hegemonic masculinity and the resultant patriarchal dividend enjoyed by most men required the enforcement of a gender-based hierarchy (1995, p. 77). This hierarchy established masculinity's "ideology of supremacy" (p. 83) and imposed its "claim to authority" (p. 77) and its will. As the antithesis, femininity was conflated with weakness and, therefore, lack of authority (p. 68). According to this axis all subordinate rankings on the

hierarchy are calculated based on the superiority of masculinity and the hegemonic ideal versus femininity. This ideology is normalised, institutionalised and embedded in culture and society (p. 73).

This main power axis is complicated and sometimes contradicted by the intersection of a second, more diffuse axis dealing with subordinate and marginalised masculinities. Marginalization refers to the relations between masculinities in dominant and subordinate or ethnic groups and results, for example, from the intersection of race and class with gender. The degree of marginalization and subordination suffered is relative to the hegemonic authority of the dominant group to all subordinate groups, and to the hierarchy between and within subordinate groups (Connell, 1995, p. 80). It is this complex and inter-connected layering of rank and authority, dominance, subordination, compliance and marginalization, which forms the interwoven hierarchy of masculinities within gender categories (p. 81).

Hegemonic masculinity is reliant on the consent of women. Promoting such consent, western culture and the media reify idealised versions of the compliant female or "emphasised femininity" (Connell, 1987, p. 183). Connell defined "emphasised femininity" (p. 183) as compliance with patriarchy and "orientated to accommodating the interests, needs and desires of men" (p. 184). Women are rewarded for aspiring to "emphasised femininity" and punished for straying from this ideal (Schippers, 2007). Multiple masculinities must also comply with their marginalised and subordinate ranking, making them complicit in supporting masculinity's hegemonic position (Connell, 1987, p. 185). While hegemony does not mean ascendancy by force, intimidation and the threat of violence underpin the system and, when consent is denied, violence is called on to uphold masculinity's hegemonic position (Connell, 1995, p. 83).

Thirty years of scholarly research involving the concept of hegemonic masculinity has inspired numerous critiques and new theoretical frameworks built on its foundation. Some critics claim that the concept was ambiguous (Donaldson, 1993; Martin, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999) while others argue that it was unstable in meaning. The term was also criticised for confusing the importance of power and domination (Christensen & Qvotrup, 2014; Hearn,

2004). Ironically, the concept of hegemonic masculinity was developed as a critique of sociological determinism, revealing the potential instability of the gender order and opening the way for "resistance and subversion" (Wedgewood, 2009, p. 335).

Another criticism held that the concept essentialised the character of men (Peterson, 2003), risking "fairly thin readings of boy's and men's power" (Moller, 2007, p. 274). Countering this, Wetherell and Edley (1999) argued for a complex multiplicity of masculinities, while Hearn (2004) built on Connell's concept, proposing the term "hegemony of men" (Hearn, 2004, p. 59). Hearn argued that this term better describes the complexity of men as a category within the gender order and as a dominant group made up of individuals and practices (Hearn, 2004, p. 49). Refuting these claims, Connell and Messerschmidt pointed to substantial new masculinities research based on the concept of hegemonic masculinity precisely because the underlying concept is *not* essentialist (2005, p. 9). They argued that the concept was developed with an awareness of the complex and contradictory layering of individuals, groups, institutions and social life forming the "strategies used to sustain hegemony" (p. 15). Furthermore, Connell and Messerschmidt insisted that masculinity is not a unitary subject (p. 15). Even so, Connell makes it clear that gender hierarchy has only one position at its apex (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 17).

Hegemonic masculinity relies on the consent of women to the dominant position of men. The concept has received some criticism for not paying enough attention to femininities (Budgeon, 2014, p. 330; Schippers, 2007). This may be partly because Connell insists that there is no hegemonic femininity (1987, p. 187), as femininity is always oriented and subordinate to the interests of men. Going some way to addressing the under-theorization of femininities in scholarly research, Schippers (2007) builds on Connell's concept by conceptualizing a theoretical framework to account for the relationships and "networks of meaning" formed by multiple hegemonic femininities and masculinities, and how these intersect with race and class (p. 101).

One of the most important developments in recent feminist thought is the concern with intersectionality (Risman, 2004, p. 442). Connell's concept has

been criticised for its lack of any conceptualization of how gender intersects with class, race/ethnicity, sexuality and age (Christensen & Qvotrup Jensen, 2014, p. 68; Demetriou, 2001). In reply, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) stated that the concept of hegemonic masculinity assumes the inherent domination in gender relations and this is not reducible to class or race (p. 18). Acknowledging the interplay of class, race and gender, they insist, "hegemony in gender relations is a major social issue, not a marginal question" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 18). While agreeing with this statement, it is clear that the intersectionality of gender with race and class, particularly as it relates to the transgender lived experience, has been under researched (Connell, 2010, p. 53; Jauk, 2013; Vidal-Ortiz, 2008).

In light of these critiques, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) rethought and reformulated the original concept of hegemonic masculinity, while contending that the mainstay of the concept remained relevant. That is, hegemonic masculinity is at the apex of a complex combination of multiple masculinities within a gender hierarchy. Durability of the structure is achieved through compliance, together with subordination and marginalization, combining incorporation and oppression (p. 19).

Included in the 2005 reformulation of the concept of hegemonic masculinity is a reconsideration of the reading of bodies. The importance of embodiment is emphasised, with bodies seen as more involved, and masculinities as a weaving of "embodiment and social context" (Connell, 1995, p. 20). Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005) reconsideration is important for this project as it points to the need for a more developed and nuanced understanding of embodiment when considering transgender practices. Transgender people's dilemma is the fact that their very "personhood requires expression through the body" (Rubin, 2005, p. 21). The distress and alienation transgender people feel from their bodies would suggest, "the body is not clearly separate from subjectivity" (Schrok, 2005, p. 330). Transgender bodywork has import to self-monitoring, a sense of authenticity and self-worth, and "practical consciousness" and, therefore, the transgender experience should not be considered as disembodied (p. 330). Masculinity is also embedded in the male body with male bodies seen as agents of "patriarchal collectivities" (Hearn, 2014, p. 12). Male

embodiment is a social process and men's physicality is highlighted in social interactions, the workplace, the armed forces, sport, sexuality, inter-personal relationships and fatherhood. Therefore, fields of gender study would benefit from further exploration of the ways hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities are "constructed through the body", and the relationship between embodiment and the social context (Messerschmidt, 2012, pp. 18–20).

Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005) reformulated concept reiterates the original concept's contention that there is no unitary masculinity, and that gender relations are re-negotiated over time and through complex layers of social interaction. In other words, while the hegemonic ideal is omnipresent, it mutates according to social, local, regional and global circumstances (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 23). The interplay of masculinities with globalization and the emergence of far-right extremist groups in Europe, America and the Islamic world (Kimmel, 2003) is just one example. This interplay highlights the mutability, complexity and the "the layering, the potential internal contradiction" (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 23) within all masculinity practices, leading most scholars to agree that the gender system is "potentially unstable" (Hearn, 2014, p. 14) and open to change. While Connell believes that hegemonic masculinity is open to challenge (1995, p. 16), Duncanson (2015) argues that Connell's work failed to theorise how this process of change could occur. Duncanson (2015) and Schippers (2007) insist that "attentiveness to intersectionality" and the relational aspects of gender are essential for a progressive change in hegemonic masculinity (Duncanson, 2015, p. 239; Schippers, 2007). Duncanson (2015) explores the potential for change in military masculinity, proposing that incorporating peace building, communication and compassion skills—traditionally feminine attributes—into the military would highlight inconsistencies and the instability of patriarchy, arguing that this challenge would eventually open the way for incremental change in "relations of equality" (p. 244).

Transgender people are often tasked with championing this change by disrupting the gender binary, illuminating its constructed nature and interrogating gender hierarchy power (Muhr & Sullivan, 2013, p. 418). However, studies investigating the transgressive potential of transgender people in the workplace,

for example, have found that while they have the opportunity to throw corporations' gender-neutral assumptions into "high relief" (Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 597), transgender people are often made to feel either anchored to their birth gender or encouraged to take on the accepted appearance and behaviours of their preferred gender (Levitt & Oppolito, 2014; Schilt & Connell, 2007; Schilt & Westbrook, 2009; Wilson, 2002). Constrained by their "real-life need to keep their jobs" (Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 598), transgender people are disciplined by their own and their workmates need for "gender congruency" (Muhr, Sullivan, & Rich, 2016, p. 57). The outcome is that binary gender norms tend to become re-established in the workplace after transition, thus limiting the transgressive possibilities of transgender people (Schilt & Connell, 2007). In this way, the heteronormative sex/gender/sexuality system is maintained and re-enforced, valuing masculinity over femininity and denigrating women, particularly transgender women (Schilt & Westbrook, 2009, p. 460; Schilt & Wiswall, 2008). These studies evidence that while transgender women may be unable to disrupt the gender order, by giving voice to their reflections it is possible to turn a spotlight on the often subtle and hidden processes that ensure entrenched inequality in workplaces and society (Schilt & Westbrook, 2009, p. 460).

As transgender people negotiate social identities before, during and after transition, they are sensitised to gendered nuances and differences in treatment when living as men and then, after transition, living as women. This allows them a unique perspective on changes in gendered victimization patterns (Jauk, 2013, p. 815). Their transition process makes it clear to them that society's expectations are that men do dominance and women do deference (Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 600). These expectations translate to real outcomes as transgender women lose income, authority and respect (Schilt and Wiswall, 2008, pp. 18–19) and are "rejected from powerful homosocial men's networks or classified as less able workers" (Schilt & Connell, 2007, 614). Conversely, transgender men gained rank and status (Connell, 2010; Dozier, 2005; Schilt, 2006) and were awarded authority and respect, greater talking time in meetings and involvement in decision-making (Connell, 2010, p. 52). Persistent, institutionalised and often hidden workplace disparities and inequalities are foregrounded by these experiences.

Although some progress has been made in addressing inequality, it is slow, and so it may be time for the sociology of gender to consider new ways to look at hegemonic masculinity and inequality. To this end, Messerschmidt (2012) analysed academic articles focusing on the concept of hegemonic masculinity and found that 13 percent took the study of gendered knowledge in new directions. Essentially these are: how hegemonic masculinity can be contested and challenged; and, how women reinforce and contribute to the continuation of hegemonic masculinity. Pertinent to this project, Messerschmidt proposes that for a more nuanced understanding of the practice of hegemonic masculinity, research must extend its reach to the "social interplay" of femininities and masculinities both hegemonic and non-hegemonic (Duncanson, 2015; Messerschmidt, 2012, p. 15; Schippers, 2007).

This social interplay, plus the interplay of more formal structures, and the allocation of authority and privilege, is addressed in this project from the unique perspective of transgender women exploring their experiences navigating between ranks on the gender hierarchy. Some transgender women try to comply with accepted gender norms while many transgender people express gender identities that "fall beyond a traditional binary framework" (Hines, 2006, p. 63). However, all transgender women constantly face the complex and context-sensitive task of negotiating and managing their behaviour and presentation (Connell, 2010, p. 51). These negotiations uncover the taken-for-grantedness of gender norms (Connell, 2010, p. 32). In giving voice to the lived experience of transgender people, both before and after transition, the spotlight is turned on these gender norm assumptions and the interplay between hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities and femininities.

One particular aspect of gender inequality—male privilege and entitlement—is brought centre stage in this project. Transgender women's experience of and attitude to male privilege when they lived as men and navigated and reflected upon post transition illuminate aspects of gender inequality concealed in a society where the gender order is normalised and institutionalised. To date, research has largely focused on the discrimination transgender people suffer post transition rather than on their reflections and insights when comparing their pre- and post-transition experiences and attitudes. There is only one

recording of a transgender woman's reflections comparing her experiences of male privilege and entitlement before and after transition. This research was conducted in the 1980s, in Sydney. Connell (2010) interviewed a transgender woman, Robyn, exploring her relationship with power and privilege prior to transition. Robyn explained that she was content to be a man, "I always worked as a man, I enjoyed my authority. I enjoyed the power I had" (p. 6). On the other hand, Robyn acknowledged masculinity's oppression of women and was "truly scathing of men's privilege, arrogance and violence" and the way they treated women (p. 16).

When considering further research into the transgender lived experience, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) were clearly "not confident" of the implications of mapping the transgender experience on Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity (p. 21). Their uncertainty derived from the impossibility they perceived in accounting for transgender people with "a simple model of social construction" (p. 21). This project attempts to address such concerns, extending the important contribution of Connell's (2010) conceptual work by interviewing 12 transgender women from diverse backgrounds. The interviews focus on participants' experiences of male privilege and entitlement, pre- and post-transition and, importantly, on their insights and attitudes to their changed circumstances.

Research indicates that the gender binary is proving intractable, especially in the workplace where it is embedded in workplace structures and interactions (Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 606). Therefore, the gender binary must be re-thought if inequality is to be alleviated (p. 601). This prompts the concerns implicit in this project's research question. That is, can transgender individuals transgress the gender binary, impact the gender hierarchy and help to alleviate inequality by shining a spotlight on the opaque and complex system that supports hegemonic masculinity and the allocation of male privilege?   By empowering transgender voices society may begin to see into the workings of these structures and assumptions and be better able to "articulate the complexity with which gender shapes our experiences in the larger social world" (Lenning & Buist, 2013, p. 55).

While the debate continues about how transgressive transgender bodies can be (Muhr, Sullivan & Rich, 2015, p. 55), transgender people experience day-to-day challenges to their sense of self, gender and sex category. While the transgender lived experience does not of itself necessarily disrupt doing gender (Connell, 2010, p. 42), recorded insights and reflections of the day-to-day challenges of the transgender person, when mapped on to the concept of hegemonic masculinity, illuminate gender binary distinctions and inform the discourse on privilege, entitlement and inequality. Hence, despite valid criticisms and in light of the discussion in this review, the concept of hegemonic masculinity remains a solid platform from which to study this research topic. Through an exploration of male privilege studied within the framework of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, this project aims to make a meaningful contribution to the on-going critical discourse on gendered power structures, inequality, and the implications of the practice of hegemonic masculinity on the transgender and wider community.

1.4 Methodology

Introduction

There are two distinct clusters of research strategy in the social sciences (Bryman, 2012, p. 35). Quantitative research is empirical and committed to a positivist epistemology, focusing on objective knowledge and employing deductive reasoning to test hypotheses developed from existing theory (p. 36). The other strategy, interpretive or qualitative research, is concerned with comprehending phenomena, the how and why of people's actions. Qualitative research encompasses a constructionist ontological orientation, considering social reality as constantly changing due to individuals' interactions (p. 36). It is predominantly inductive and the generation of theory comes from the data (p. 36). Qualitative research relies on the management of variables, careful interpretation of the data, and self-reflection of the researcher. Examples are life histories, phenomenology, autobiography, one-on-one interviews and focus groups. These methods require small sample sizes to allow for deep exploration with an "increased sensitivity to diversities [and] differences" (Plummer, 2001, p. 12).

This study is concerned with the thoughts, feelings, reflections and insights of a sample of a marginalised group. It is for this reason that qualitative research and particularly life stories is employed as the research method in an attempt to understand how participants create and change their world within contemporary society's normative expectations (Plummer, 1995, p. 20).

Life-history interviews

Life story interviewing is an organic process. It is "situated, transient, partial and provisional", valuing both the participants' and the researcher's voices (McCormack, 2004, p. 220). Davies and Davies (2007) emphasised the organic nature of life story interviewing and argued that the reflection and retelling of life stories recreated the phenomena into a "new event, a new experience" (p. 1141). Furthermore, McCormack (2004) pointed to the reconstruction conducted by the researcher in transcribing, analyzing and interpreting the data, as well as the readers' response (p. 220). This complexity of knowledge construction is particularly important when studying atypical situations because the task of capturing and analyzing is inherently a task based on contradiction and

complexity. Therefore, life stories is the most appropriate research method to use when exploring a marginalised group such as transgender women living at a "cultural crossroads" (Plummer, 2001, p. 134). By studying how these individuals construct their realities while navigating society's gendered normative expectations much value can be added to the wider discourse on sexed and gendered identities and gendered social structures.

Research design and interview questions

Plummer (2001) outlined five concerns in designing and conducting life-history interviews. These are: defining substantive, concrete and empirical questions. In other words, what does the researcher want to know? Defining the epistemology or knowledge foundation of the research. Is the researcher searching for stories conveying lived experience or is she more interested in the participants' reflections and interpretations of that experience? Also, what are the technical, logistical questions to be considered? Finally, what are the ethical considerations for the research? This last concern is particularly significant when dealing with marginalised groups. Furthermore, Plummer emphasizes a commitment to research outcomes that play a "positive social role" for the marginalised group being studied (2001, p. 120).

This project gathers subjective data through a single in-depth, one-on-one, semi-structured interview with each of the 12 participants. Due to the one-and-a-half to two-hour time constraint for each interview, participants were prompted to reveal parts of their life stories most relevant to the project's main themes. The logistical questions such as age and years since transitioning were asked at the commencement of the interview so as not to interfere with the flow of intimate revelations by participants once the interview progressed.

Interview process

At the commencement of each interview, participants were told that the data gathered and analysed would be used in the production of a Master of Research Thesis. Participants were reassured regarding confidentiality and that their names would be masked and their responses analysed thematically rather than as case studies. They were asked for their permission to tape the interview. The interview questions found in the Appendix were used as a guide to direct and

encourage an "open-ended, in-depth exploration" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 85) of participants' lived experience, pre- and post-transition, as well as their reflections. Occasionally, questions were re-framed or re-worded in response to participants' sensitivities or aversions.

The final three questions guided the participants to reflect on discriminatory behaviour they had experienced, witnessed or performed when socially identified as males, and if they thought differently about this behaviour now that they identified as women. Being highly sensitive, these questions were placed at the end of the interview, allowing the researcher time to establish trust and rapport and for participants to process their responses and possibly their "reappraisal of a taken-for-granted discourse and its social foundations" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 85). This lengthy and "messy human affair" (Plummer, 2001, p. 122) garnered insightful understandings of the construction of gendered social life.

Ethical considerations

Each participant was given a copy of the Ethics Committee Letter outlining the personal care and safeguards approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Committee. The letter stipulated that the interview would be recorded, confidential, and the participants' names masked.

Sensitive to the possibility that the interview may expose emotionally laden memories, the Ethics Committee letter included contact details of counseling services. As well, two to three days after each interview, the participants were contacted to check that they did not have a negative reaction to the interview, or need psychological support or wish to talk through any issues.

Participant recruitment

The sample consisted of 12 adult self-defined transgender women who had transitioned at least five years prior and were advanced in processing and reflecting on their transition. Seventy percent of participants were from cities with support services and 30 percent from regional areas with few or no support services. Twenty-five percent were from linguistically and culturally diverse

backgrounds, and all were from a range of socio-economic groups with different education and economic status, and age groups (22–69 years of age).

The number of participants was large enough to cover a broad range of participant experiences while, at the same time, small enough to accommodate staying within the time frame set for the completion of the thesis and the word limit. Crouch and McKenzie (2006) proposed small sample sizes when studying the relationship between the participants' subjective social meanings and social context. The authors argued that a small data set allowed the researcher to keep the totality of the data in mind during analysis (p. 493).

The participants were recruited in collaboration with Kelly Glanney, Director, Carmen Rupe Trust. Kelly contacted twenty potential participants and of these, twelve transgender women were willing to participate. An email introduction was followed by a telephone call offering more detail about the study, answering questions and arranging the time and place for the interview.

Participants selected the venues on the basis of their convenience and comfort. Nine participants requested the interviews be conducted in their homes (two via Skype) and three participants asked that the interviews be conducted in the hotel where the researcher was staying in the centre of their city.

Analysis
The recorded interviews were transcribed orthographically. The researcher transcribed ten of the twelve transcripts and a professional typist transcribed the remaining two.

Thematic analysis was employed to analyze and interpret the data, thus gaining a deeper understanding of the how and why of the phenomena being studied (Braun & Clarke, 2012). Thematic analysis is a method of identifying and organizing data into patterns of meaning or themes, both in individual transcripts and across the complete data set. Initially, five transcripts were coded and these codes were compared across the five transcripts to identify themes and concepts. This process was repeated for the remaining seven transcripts. Then, the total data set of twelve transcripts was compared to identify main themes and collate

key points. This process involved moving back and forth between transcripts, comparing data and main themes, eventually constructing an "overarching structure" (Plummer, 2001, pp. 151–152). In this way the coding process was both analysis and interpretation (Cant & Taket, 2008, p. 42), encouraging a deeper understanding of the collective or shared meanings of the interviews in relation to the research question.

Thematic analysis may be inductive or deductive or a mix of both. An inductive approach is driven by the content of the data and the theory is the outcome of the data analysis (Bryman, 2012, p. 26). On the other hand, a deductive approach has the researcher consider the theoretical knowledge applying to the topic to deduce a hypothesis that is subject to "empirical scrutiny" (p. 24). Often a combination of approaches is used as researchers always contribute a theoretical base to the data (p. 26). This project was exploratory and mostly employed the inductive approach where the concepts and themes emerged out of the data. The deductive approach used Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity as the lens through which to view the data.

The containment lines of the process outlined above offered a solid framework for the development of a legitimate argument in response to the research question, incorporating data from all the interviews. This meant that the central thematic patterns detected across the data set were supported with evidence from all 12 transcripts. In this way, this lengthy process was not a generalization formed through the melding of participants' responses but was rather an exploration of how the gender hierarchy and male privilege and entitlement impacted all participants' lived experience pre- and post-transition.

Validity, reliability, representativeness and reflexivity
Plummer pointed to the need for validity, reliability and representativeness in qualitative research and detailed their relevance for life stories in particular (2001, p. 153). Regarding representativeness in life story interviews, Plummer argued that rather than general representativeness, it was more helpful to ensure the recruitment of "key informants who have a profound and central grasping of a particular social world" (p. 154). Validity ensures the research technique employed is studying what it is supposed to, and reliability ensures that the study

would reveal similar findings if it were conducted by another researcher (p. 154). Plummer argued that reliability and validity might effectively cancel each other out in life history interviewing (pp. 153–154). Therefore, validity should be prioritised in order to elicit the subjective story (p. 155). However, Plummer cautioned that validity in life-history stories may be compromised by the bias of the participant, the researcher or their interaction, and awareness of potential biases was important for validity (p. 156). Essentially, if the aim of the interview was to gather the participants' subjective reality, then his or her "definition of the situation" was a valid one (p. 159).

The researcher must constantly question and be aware of their position and understand how it influences the phenomenological experience (Plummer, 2001, p. 208). This awareness requires both self-reflection and critical appraisal of the participants' responses (p. 208). In the end, qualitative research findings are meaningful only if the researcher acknowledges the "active processes through which such knowledge becomes produced" (p. 208). In other words, the researcher must be aware of the standpoints of the participant, the researcher and their relationship, and how these are situated within the broader social context (p. 208).

Project limitations
One criticism of this project may be that the sample size is small and not representative. In reply, this project is exploratory, aiming to illuminate what happens when Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity is transposed on to the lived experience of a number of transgender women, pre- and post-transition. It is envisaged that this exploration may prompt further research with a larger sample.

Another criticism may be that the sample is not diverse enough and not representative of the wider trans community. It was with this possible criticism in mind that Kelly Glanney and the researcher devoted much time outlining the recruitment criteria. These were: age groups 20 through to 70; living in metropolitan and regional centres; from varied socio-economic and linguistically and culturally diverse groups. While these parameters do not cover all the diversity present in the trans community, they do cover most. Three participants were from linguistically and culturally diverse groups and all were from lower

socio-economic groups. These interviews provided the researcher a glimpse into the intersectionality of race, class and gender and it is envisaged that this study will prompt further research into this issue from a larger culturally and linguistically diverse and socio-economically diverse sample.

A third criticism may be that transgender men were not included. The researcher focused on the experiences of transgender women in this Masters thesis and aims to extend the scope of the research topic to include interviews with transgender men for her PhD.

1.5 Thesis Structure

This project interviewed 12 transgender women, whose responses clustered under five main headings: gender hierarchy, gender order, privilege, discrimination and violence. These five headings mapped on to the main elements of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity as outlined in Section 1.3 of this thesis. The transcripts echo and elaborate on these elements and evidence how Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity manifests in the every-day lived experience of these transgender women. Therefore, Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity proved a relevant and practical analytical tool for exploring how transgender women navigate and experience male privilege and entitlement, pre- and post-transition.

Chapters Two to Four detail the project's findings. These chapters do so by following the main heading clusters outlined in the previous paragraph. Chapter Two establishes the essential backdrop for studying male privilege and entitlement by considering its foundation in the gender hierarchy and the gender order. It is important to understand this foundation to appreciate how the gender order is normalised and institutionalised, and how this normalization then leads to a sense of entitlement to privilege for some of those in the dominant group. Chapter Three discusses male privilege and the sense of entitlement to often invisible and unearned advantages. It also looks at discrimination as a means of sustaining the privilege enjoyed by some men and the oppression of some men and all women. Chapter Four considers what happens when members of subordinate groups deny their consent and challenge masculinity's dominant position. In these cases, intimidation, the threat of violence and acts of violence are the means of enforcing hegemonic masculinity and maintaining male privilege. This chapter highlights the importance of understanding the extent of the forces that may be called upon to defend hegemonic masculinity and male privilege in order to fully appreciate the difficult task of challenging the gender order. Chapter Five draws together the project's five key findings and points to avenues for future research.

Chapter Two

2.1 Gender Hierarchy

As briefly mentioned in Section 1.5, in order to answer the research question it is
essential to understand male privilege and entitlement. To do this, it is necessary
to recognize western society's normalised and institutionalised gender hierarchy
and gender order. It is the firm foundation of the gender hierarchy and gender
order that both justifies, and is reinforced by, hegemonic masculinity's ideology
of supremacy. This structure, in turn, allows for the allocation or denial of male
authority and privilege according to a complex calculation contingent on
Connell's intersecting axes, comprising the main masculinity-authority axis and
the second, diffuse axis (Connell, 1987, p. 109). The following two sections, 2.1
and 2.2, discuss the gender hierarchy and gender order as foundational to the
allocation of privilege and entitlement to some men.

Transgender women participants' responses to questions of male privilege
depended on their experience and understanding of the gender hierarchy and
hegemonic masculinity. The concept of hegemonic masculinity places the hyper-
masculine male at the apex of the main masculinity-authority axis of the gender
hierarchy, and all but one of the participants volunteered this placement. To
support those at the apex, the hierarchical structure relies on the subordination and
marginalization of multiple masculinities and the subordination of women
(Connell, 1987, p. 187).   Within the hierarchy of multiple masculinities, the
contestation for high ranking is premised on competition along the main power
axis (p. 109), with the higher ranks gaining status according to the proximity to
the hegemonic masculine ideal. In other words, the closer the display of
masculinity to the hegemonic masculine ideal, the higher the rank on the
hierarchy, with the corresponding award of more authority and privilege.
Participants' experiences support this conceptualization and their navigation of
the contestation for rank is detailed in Section 3.1.

Conversely, the lower ranks are calculated according to the overtness of
the display of femininity. Individuals with lower status are denied degrees of

authority and privilege. The diminution of femininity and the promotion of masculinity's "ideology of superiority" (Connell, 1995, p. 83) is the value system essential to the "patriarchal social order" (Connell, 1987, p. 183). It is this main masculinity-authority axis or, to put it another way, the hyper-masculine versus emphasised femininity axis that transgender people negotiate when they transition. Their altered ranking impacts the respect accorded them both in society and the workplace and their allocation of or denial of authority and privilege post-transition. Rose described this re-ranking, on transition, as "swapp[ing] male privilege [and going] completely down the social scale". Current research confirming the valuing of masculinity over femininity looked at the acceptance of transgender people in the workplace and found that transgender men are allocated a higher rank on this axis while transgender women drop significantly in rank, authority and respect (Schilt & Westbrook, 2009; Schilt and Wiswall, 2008). A number of participants offered their experiences of this phenomenon. Kylie, a 50-year-old journalist who transitioned 28 years ago, was clear that, in her experience, transgender men gain a step up the hierarchy compared with cisgender women. In summary, all participants were well aware of the superior status of masculinity and the inferior status of femininity, with Julie, a senior IT software trainer in her early thirties, insisting, "It is masculinity and maleness that is respected".

Hegemonic masculinity's valuing of masculinity and devaluing of femininity is confused by the existence of transgender women, and all participants saw transgender women as ranked below cisgender women on the gender hierarchy. Participants explained that this was because transgender women not only openly embraced femininity but also rejected the status and privilege accorded masculinity. Rose described transgender women's transition as going "from male to less than female". However, many transgender women's transition is a lengthy process involving many stages. Some participants transitioned from masculine men through a lengthy process to passing as cisgender women. Others described moving from being perceived as an effeminate man, then a gay man and, finally, transitioning over many months and, in some cases, years, from a masculine-looking transgender woman to a transgender women who passed as a cisgender woman. This experience afforded these transgender women rare

insights into the multiple rankings on the axis and the corresponding complex allocation of respect, authority and privilege granted to these different levels.

Julie is one such transgender woman and she explained that when she eventually passed as a cisgender woman she was,

> Seen as having more value and automatically deserved more respect than being a feminine gay man. But for those who perceived me as being a transwoman . . . I stepped down from a feminine gay male.

Similarly, Evelyn, 40 and employed in a media company, complained that she would have suffered less discrimination and abuse if she had been a gay man rather than a transgender woman. These responses emphasize the wide variability within the ranking order and may explain why each participant offered their own variation of the internal rankings of the gender-based hierarchy. For example, Joan placed gay men and straight women in equal second position and allotted lesbians and transgender men the next level down.

This elaborate ranking system is further complicated by the intersection of the second axis with the main masculinity-authority axis. The calculation of marginalization and the denial of authority and privilege according to this intersection, considers race, class and age. The convoluted calculation of this intersection clouds the structure, making it difficult to define and, therefore, to challenge. This project included only three participants from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and an exploration of race marginalization falls outside the remit of this project. These three participants offered insightful perspectives on the gender hierarchy in their cultures, and their life stories evidenced the multi-layered ranking system within subordinate and marginalised groups (Cheng, 1999; Christensen and Jensen, 2014).

Jemma, 64 and of Chinese heritage, talked of the strict gender divide in China where society's top position is unequivocally assigned to the male, with the second-class position given to the female. Evelyn, who is Maori, described the treatment of homosexual men in her Maori culture and in the remote village where she grew up. She left New Zealand being identified as a male and transitioned in Australia. She has not been back and does not feel it is safe to do

so as she fears being assaulted by the local community because of her transgender status. Growing up in the Philippines, Annabel found life difficult before transition and she was frequently asked, "Are you a boy or a girl?" Annabel tried "so hard to be a man" in her home country but people kept calling her "gay" and, in the end, she stopped resisting their categorization. This brief overview gives a glimpse into the effect of marginalization on the hierarchical structure, and hints at both its rigidity and ability to change over time as it adapts to current trends and changing locations (Budgeon, 2013; Christensen & Jensen, 2014; Connell, 1995; Duncanson, 2015).

All participants talked of their pre-transition struggles, attempting to perform to gendered social expectations and to find acceptance within the seemingly impenetrable hierarchical web while, at the same time, trying to cope with their own dissonance. For example, Stephanie, a 43-year-old professional sportswoman and businesswoman, reflected on her experience in Grade 10:

> I was starting to really struggle . . . having to be what's expected [which] felt wrong. So I grew up learning to hide it, to you know, dodge around everything.

Similarly, Rose described her first experience at the age of six or seven of being caught cross-dressing by her father whom she adored and seeing "the disappointment in his face, the sadness, the genuine sadness". Stephanie, Kylie, Elle and Marion believe that their pre-transition gender performance stress sowed the seeds of the mental health issues they all suffer today. Marion explained that she "was about presenting . . . in the end it just got harder and harder and then I just broke". The dissonance, ambivalence and final breakdown experienced by Marion are common for individuals dealing with such dissonance. Goffman (1963) described such individuals as stigmatised, stigma being an attribute, behaviour or reputation that is socially discrediting, thus disqualifying the individual from full social acceptance (p. 20). Stigmatised individuals suffer mental stress due to the constant pressure of consistently performing to an idealised role and, all the while, realizing that full acceptance would never be granted (p. 44). With this in mind, it is hard to imagine the extent of the cognitive dissonance experienced by participants as they matured.

As discussed in this section, the hyper-masculine male holds the top niche of the gender hierarchy. All other rankings are in reference to this ideal version of masculinity. Hence the allocation of authority and privilege values masculinity and devalues femininity. This ranking system is complicated by the intersection of a second, diffuse axis, making the denial of authority and privilege to some men a complex and often contradictory calculation. Understanding this calculation is important when considering the research question as transgender women's experiences of privilege are dependent on their ranking on the hierarchy, both pre- and post-transition. Section 2.2 continues this argument by discussing the gender order and how transgender women navigate the transition from "one side of the gender curtain to the other" (Marion, 40). Transgender women's gender performance is strictly policed, sometimes violently, thus limiting their ability to challenge the gender order. However, transgender women's experiences and insights turn a spotlight on the often hidden workings of the gender order and offer the researcher the opportunity to look behind the curtain.

2.2 Gender Order

The gender order, enforcing the dominance of men over women, is the foundation for the way western society and institutions are ordered, and the rationale for this "system of inequality" (Schwalbe, 2014, p. 49) is human reproduction. The historicity of the gender order based on the rationale of biological difference, together with masculinity's "ideology of supremacy" (Connell, 1995, p. 83), is given as explanation for its normalization and institutionalization. This explanation effectively shuts down consideration of alternate options or challenges. Conversely, Connell and others have argued that the link to reproduction is not biological but, rather, it is a *social* "historical process" (Connell, 1995, p. 71) enshrining the subordination of women to men (Burr, 2015; Connell, 1987, p. 183; Lorber & Farrell, 1991).

The discourse concerning the differentiation between men and women, and between sex and gender, and reflecting the biology versus social argument, ranges along a continuum from essentialism to social constructionism. The concept of social constructionism argues that reality is socially constructed and does not rely on a fixed essence. This concept questions the categories of man and woman as naturally occurring different types of human being (Burr, 2015, p. 2). At the other end of the continuum, the concept of essentialism assumes the existence of a fixed essence and that "certain phenomena are natural, inevitable, and biologically determined" (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998, p. 11). According to this understanding, differences in human genitalia alone account for the differences between the two genders.

An appreciation of the range of held beliefs from essentialism to social constructionism is important for this project as it has a profound impact on understanding participants' responses. Transgender women do not form a unified block of opinion when it comes to sex and gender. The range in ages and, therefore, life experiences of participants presented widely varied beliefs on whether "man" and "woman" are fixed categories or form points on a continuum. Kerry, a 40-year-old medical research professional, was adamant that she went from "one side of the binary to the other; male to female". Kerry and Rose (60), who both took female hormones and underwent sex reassignment surgery,

consider transgender people who do not want to adhere to the gender binary as people wanting to change the world rather than fit into it. However, other participants such as Christine (49), Annabel (22), and Marion (40) offered more gender-fluid approaches in their insights. Marion, who does not wish to undergo sex reassignment surgery, sees Caitlin Jenner's coming out as "continuing to cater towards that rigid binary". While Annabel described her maturation process as "being [both] a man and a woman" and proposed that transgender could be "a translation of being a man *and* a woman. Just in the middle".   The wide range of views held by the 12 participants gives voice to the diversity within the transgender community and demonstrates the complex and changing relationship between sex and gender. It is necessary to hold these various beliefs in mind when reading Section 3.1 exploring male privilege, because views ranging from essentialist to social constructionist impact participants' responses when reflecting on masculinity's ideology of supremacy and the taking of privilege.

The strength of the hold of the essentialist theory and its premise that human biology is the natural and logical explanation for the differentiation of man and woman extends to the labour market and the divide between private and public life spheres (Connell, 1987, p. 248). According to this way of thinking, the passive domestic sphere is allocated to women, while men inhabit the public action sphere and enjoy the privilege that goes with it (Connell, 1995, p. 195). The domestic sphere is denied the material gain enjoyed by the public sphere and this allocation reflects hegemonic masculinity's devaluing of the feminine. The naturalness and, therefore, undisputed legitimacy of the gendered divide between private and public spheres was commented on by two of the older participants, Joan (69) and Jemma (64). By way of explanation, Joan described the body as metaphor—the male body is seen as active, penetrating and dominant, and the female body as passive, receptive and submissive. To emphasize her point, Joan paraphrased British anthropologist Mary Douglas's description of the difference in sexual responses as, "the male sexual response is up and in, and the female sexual response is open and receptive". Joan went on to say,

> Now you just can't isolate that from the rest of the being. . . . I am deeply aware of those differences and I see it and feel it in myself . . . [and since transition] I can let my receptivity show. . . . I don't have to be assertive.

The importance of this link between holding an essentialist view of the gender order and attitudes to male privilege is evidenced by Joan's reflections on male privilege when she lived as a man. She reported a sense of entitlement to the privileges enjoyed by men; indeed, these advantages were invisible to her, and it was "just the way things were", assumed fair gain for masculinity's natural superiority.

All participants gave examples of growing up under the shadow of the essentialist view and being socialised by the powerful force of the gender order and the cultural expectations of gendered norms and roles. Joan talked of the decade after the end of World War II, when women were forced out of the factories and back into their homes. She noted that at this time,

> Gender norms were very, very narrow. There was this line down the playground, boys on this side, girls that side. (Joan, 69)

This strict gender order continued into the 1960s and 1970s. Kylie (50) and Elle (34) recalled being aware of the enforced gender power imbalance. Elle added that, at a very early age, she realised that men were expected to be dominant and women submissive. Julie (30) offered more contemporary understandings of gender roles describing her Grade 8 experience: "I am at an all boys school where we have a compulsory requirement . . . to do manual arts . . . our sister school . . . had compulsory home economics." Even as a young child, Julie could see that "society was grooming us for gender roles and the gender role for the woman was to take care of the man".

Appreciating this pervasive and powerful socializing force demanding adherence to the gender order, it is understandable that transgender individuals suffer emotional and psychological stress trying to come to terms with the dissonance they experience. Stephanie described her struggle from the age of five. She felt that she was "living three lives": "The one that the family and society expected as the male person, this one in my head everyday and especially at night before I'd go to sleep as my female self, and then the one that was actually in the world." And, in her twenties and thirties, Stephanie felt she was being stretched like a "rubber band": "Being pulled to the male side because of expectations and then sort of try and stretch the rubber band back out to the

female side before being snapped back in again." Likewise, Kylie described the experience of "watching myself in the third person", adding that she was "always trying to perform to the standards and expectations of others".

Goffman (1963) argued that it is through such constant interactions with others that people develop their sense of gendered identity. The audience validates the person as an appropriate gendered being. In other words, the actor develops their identity as a function of their performance for and interaction with the audience (Goffman, 1959, p. 17). However, the transgender individual lives in constant fear that their performance will be exposed and no matter how convincing the performance, it is still a performance (p. 70). Kylie bore this out, admitting she "lived in constant fear of people finding out". Similarly, Stephanie thought that the stress of always having to perform would lead to her death "before [she was] 35". In turn, all participants talked of feeling relieved and authentic once they transitioned to live as women. Rachel described transition as "like a weight off [her] shoulders". For these individuals, being denied rank, authority and privilege on transition was a price worth paying for the chance to live an authentic life, albeit at the base of the gender hierarchy.

Looking to the future, Julie highlighted the intergenerational challenge to these seemingly entrenched gender norms:

> All these different subcultures that are being developed in the younger generation, the assumption of what you should be is being watermarked, it's starting to fade so people no longer in that generation assume what you should be like. . . . The rules aren't as stringent in the new generation and with more flexible rules comes less punishment for not following them.

Given these new developments, the concept of essentialism would appear to be inadequate to the task of explaining the rich diversity apparent in the human condition (Cheng, 1999, p. 296). Even so, the current constitution of society depends on the enforcement of the gender order and, because of this, there is enormous pressure on transgender people by society and by workplaces to conform to one of the two gender binary options (Levitt & Ippolito, 2014; Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 614; Schilt & Wiswall, 2008; Wilson, 2002).

Marion provided evidence of this pressure to conform. When she was transitioning, the large international company she was working for told her that a transgender person in the process of transition was not a "good cultural fit" with the organization. She was encouraged to either return to her assigned gender or leave, transition and come back and try to get a job as a transgender woman. The practicalities of life such as job security, acceptance and a reduced risk of harassment means that the transgender lived experience is, by necessity, often confined by the gender binary rather than allowed to challenge or subvert it (Levitt & Ippolito, 2014; Schilt & Connell, 2007; Schilt & Wiswall, 2008). Such effective practical policing of the gender order ensures the sustainability of masculinity's hegemonic position and the privilege awarded to this status.

Sections 2.1 and 2.2 discussed the normalization and institutionalization of the gender hierarchy and gender order in western society, emphasizing the importance of understanding how these structures form the foundation for hegemonic masculinity's ideology of supremacy. This ideology allocates privilege to some men while denying it to other men and to all women. Having established the critical backdrop of the gender hierarchy and gender order, Chapter Three discusses the rewards of hegemonic masculinity's ideology of supremacy, that is, male privilege and entitlement. Section 3.1 considers participants' experiences of and reflections on male privilege from the standpoint of once having lived as men and, post-transition, living as women. Section 3.2 explores the abuse of privilege and the use of discrimination as a weapon to police the gender order, thereby reinforcing masculinity's ideology of superiority and right to privilege.

Chapter Three

3.1 Privilege

This chapter goes to the heart of the research question: the examination of male privilege and entitlement from the standpoint of participants who once lived as men, some possessing authority and privilege and some being denied these advantages according to the complex and, often contradictory, ranking system of the multiple-masculinities hierarchy.

Privilege is the gaining of benefits unavailable to others, and entitlement is the sense of having the unearned right to these privileges. Privilege was likened to possessing "an invisible, weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances . . . and blank cheques" and other "unearned assets" (McIntosh, 1998, p. 30). Kimmel uses the metaphor of running with the wind at one's back to describe the invisibility of privilege to those who have it (2002, p. 1). The runner is unable to appreciate the extent to which he is sustained and propelled by the wind. It is only when he stops and turns into that headwind that the wind's invisible power is exposed.

Transgender women make this turn, enduring the psychological and physical pain of the transition process in order to live as women. Although they suffer severe discrimination and abuse in their lives, it is only post-transition, when living as women, that some transgender women realize what hard work it is to run into the headwind of male privilege. They then occupy the unique position of having not only run with the wind at their backs but also having turned *into* the wind. Their navigation of male privilege illuminates how it manifests as an outcome of entrenched and hierarchical gendered social structures and how this influence permeates all aspects of western society (Case, Iuzzini, & Hopkins, 2012; Cose, 1995). Transgender women's reflections reveal the opacity of these structures, together with the complexity of the hierarchy of masculinities and how it bestows authority and privilege unevenly on its male members.

The alignment of masculinity with authority and the patriarchal dividend of social advantage and material wealth are conceived as a birthright by those men who defend hegemonic masculinity's dominant position and the gender order (Case et al., 2012; Connell, 1995, p. 82). And, while the spoils of the system are divided unevenly (Coston & Kimmel, 2012), most men support masculinity's "ideology of supremacy" (Connell, 1995, p. 83) and benefit in some way from the "dominant group privilege" (Case et al., 2012, p. 3). Such a commitment to supremacy is then "defended by all the cultural machinery that exalts hegemonic masculinity" (Connell, 1995, p. 241) including the socialization of males to the defense of hegemonic masculinity.

This social training conditions men to derive satisfaction from controlling others and prepares them to take advantage of the varying degrees of privilege that come with their dominant position, thus keeping men complicit in the system (Schwalbe, 2014, p. 121). Rose insisted that society socializes boys to "have a go" and to believe that they are "entitled to adventure into the world". Her male upbringing reflected this socialization and Rose brought this entitled attitude with her when she transitioned, so that by the time she was 60 and living as a woman, she was,

> Entitled. I'll have a go at this. I'll build this. Oh I'll look it up. I'm entitled to adventure and create any way I like because I'm entitled.

Similarly, Marion observed that,

> Men will just jump in and say . . . I'll give it a go. . . . Men's almost cockiness takes them to a whole other level.

Rose and Marion's responses suggest that men, conditioned in this way, grow accustomed to putting themselves forward, expecting to be rewarded and taking what they want whether they are capable or not (Andersen, Ertac, Gneezy, List, & Maximiano, 2013).

Schwalbe named this phenomenon the "ideological conceit of men" (2014, p. 55), positioning men as doers and women as objects, and encouraging men to objectify women, disregarding their thoughts, feelings and personal agency (p. 55). This conceit also encourages men to ignore the possibility of their own

fallibility. For example, Marion continually experiences the downside of men's heightened confidence, noting, "Sometimes it doesn't deliver very well and [the outcome] is quite sloppy". And yet, despite this sometimes inadequate delivery in the workplace, Marion observed that "they [men] make a good pay check from it [heightened confidence] because they gave it a red-hot go". On reflection, Marion believed that she had,

> that woman attitude as a man . . . whereas [post-transition] as a woman . . . I'm actually saying, I'll give that a go. So I've kind of flipped.

Marion's description of "that woman attitude" contrasts sharply with the confidence of the men described by Rose and Marion. The term, "that woman attitude", points to the socialization of girls which generally encourages them to be reticent, to shy away from trying new things and putting themselves forward.

Unlike the socialization of men, women are socialised to constantly question their ability, making them hesitant to promote themselves (Sherman & Zurbriggen, 2014). In this way, women are conditioned to believe that the denial of authority and privilege to all women is just. The power of socialization not only renders privilege invisible to those who have it but the lack of privilege is often not seen or questioned by those who are denied it. Examples of the way such socialization plays out in the business world were offered by Kylie, Julie and Marion, with Marion describing how she tried to find a personal assistant to help with her business. She asked a woman friend if she would like the job. Marion believed that despite possessing the necessary competency skills, her friend was hesitant and unwilling to take the opportunity. Marion noted that she finds "a lot of women if they don't feel a hundred percent confident at something, . . . won't try". As a counterbalance, Julie carries her pre-transition experience of "just being allowed to speak and not being punished for it" into her business life as a transgender woman, and she continues to insist on her "right to be respected". Such an attitude is met with accolades from her female workmates but her male colleagues deride Julie's show of strength.

Julie's behaviour defies the connection of authority with masculinity (Connell, 1987, p. 109), and destabilizes the stereotype of the reticent female. In so doing, Julie's behaviour challenges the gender order and hegemonic

masculinity's claim to superiority. This confrontation threatens the automatic allocation of authority and privilege to men and denial of these advantages to women. Such a threat inspires swift and forceful retribution and Julie's male colleagues cast her as the "bitch . . . the ball breaker". The use of negative stereotypes of women by men is a means of emphasizing men's superiority to, and difference from, women. In this way, women are used as negative "reference points" (Coston & Kimmel, 2012, p. 99; Pratto & Stewart, 2012, p. 42). Therefore, the role of negative stereotypes of women is to preserve societal norms that reinforce hegemonic masculinity's devaluing women and femininity (Gartler, 2015, p. 3). In other words, the dominant group justifies its hegemonic position and privilege by "symbolically pair[ing] with a complementary and inferior quality attached to femininity" (Cheng, 2008; Schippers, 2007, p. 91). Members of the dominant group enforce this symbolic pairing by punishing women for failing to comply with these limited stereotypes.

Negative stereotyping of women is pervasive in both public and private life and Julie and Joan offered many examples including, "the bitch" and the "whore". Kylie gave a more complex layering of how she believes many men think stereotypically about women:

> She's a bitch in the bedroom, mother in the lounge room, the social queen when I'm entertaining. There are these archetypical ways men think about women that create these expectations.

Such "stylised and impoverish[ed]" (Connell, 1987, p. 183) stereotypes of women are institutionalised (Schippers, 2007, p. 91) and reinforced through constant use and promotion in the media (Pratto & Stewart, 2012, p. 42). The denigration of Australia's first female prime minister with public protest signs that read, "Ditch the Witch" is a prime example (Woodley, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2011).

These examples demonstrate the power of negative stereotypes not only to denigrate women but also to deny them power. In this way, power and authority are secured for the dominant group and any challenge by women to men's privilege gains no traction and is negated. Widespread use of negative stereotypes ensures women's place at the base of the hierarchy by reinforcing the assumption

that femaleness is incompatible with power (Schippers, 2007, p. 94; Schwalbe, 2014, p. 63) and authority (Connell, 1987, p. 109). There are the exceptions to this assumption; however, their rarity is evidenced in the limited number of countries that have had elected women leaders, usually for short periods of time, over the past 50 years. Only 63 of the 142 nations studied by the World Economic Forum (1964–2014) had a female head of state (World Economic Forum, 2015).

Another strategy to secure the privilege of the dominant group is the masculine demand for automatic respect. Joan relayed a work incident that exemplified the angry reaction to a woman refusing to adhere to this dictum. Joan stood up against a number of powerful and high-profile businessmen and pushed for a better outcome for her company. The businessmen were outraged by her strong stance and complained to Joan's boss. Her boss accused Joan of showing a "lack of respect" for these senior men and Joan could not help wondering if the men and her boss "weren't surprised that a woman would stand up".   Joan's experience is consistent with Schippers's finding that women received "swift and severe social sanction" (2007, p. 95) when they enacted the authority and demanded respect reserved for hegemonic males. Such deviant behaviour must be squashed in order to protect masculinity's right to privilege.

The rare insights of transgender women, who have "lived on both sides of the gender curtain" (Marion, 40), offer intimate and honest admissions of the ways they dismissed women's right to be heard and respected when they lived as men. Kylie looked back at this behaviour with "guilt and shame", and Joan reported feeling "uncomfortable thinking back because [she] just accepted entitlement as the norm". Elle talked about her family's history of domestic violence and deeply regretted getting caught up for a time in the violence perpetrated by her father on her mother. The anguish confided by these transgender women point to the invisibility of privilege to those who enjoy its benefits (Kimmel, 2002; McIntosh, 1998; Pratto & Stewart, 2012). Pre-transition, Joan considered the unequal gender order and the "way men spoke to women" as the norm, observing, "I had no idea that privilege and entitlement existed because I lived in it as a male. It was there and it was taken for granted". Similarly,

Christine and Marion reported that they did not appreciate their male privilege before transitioning. Christine explained that,

> Male privilege is something that you don't notice while you have it. It's not something that is relevant in your mind. . . . You just go through life blithely thinking that that's the way the world is.

These examples evidence the hidden nature of the mechanisms and structures that form the foundation of the gender hierarchy and order and the unfair advantages gained by some (Coston & Kimmel, 2012; Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 597). Participants' responses and regrets also demonstrate how the invisibility of unfair advantage and power can be used as a weapon against members of the subordinate group who, because of their subordinate status and the elusive structures that support the gendered system, have little recourse to justice.

Research on the phenomenon of the invisibility of privilege has produced a number of theories, such as McIntosh's argument that males learnt to be blind to male privilege just as white children were taught not to be aware of white privilege (1998, p. 30). Pratto and Stewart found that dominant groups, rather than learning to be blind to their advantage, considered their superior status as normal and, although they recognised the disadvantages of subordinate groups, they did not see their advantage as privilege (2012, p. 29). This argument is compatible with Connell's concept of the main masculinity-authority axis (Connell, 1987, p. 109) whereby those enjoying high rank on the axis are entitled to the privileges of that station. According to this ideology, privileges are not seen as unearned advantages but rather as just rewards.

Interestingly, four participants did not regard themselves as enjoying much or, indeed, any privilege when they lived as males. Jemma, of Chinese heritage and a retired blue-collar worker, said she did not have much privilege when she lived as a man. Annabel, from the Philippines and unemployed, suffered from racism, lack of education, unemployment and discrimination because of her transgender status. Evelyn, a Maori, also suffered racial and gender discrimination as well as difficulty with employment and with bouts of mental illness. For these transgender women, race and also class intersected the main

power axis to deny them authority and privilege when they lived as men. Kerry, Caucasian and a white-collar worker from a blue-collar working-class background, remained unconvinced that she had male privilege when she presented as a man. For Kerry, her socio-economic class, plus physical characteristics that were not in line with those of hegemonic masculinity, intersected with the authority-power axis to deny her a high ranking and the privilege that accompanies that status.

One participant, Stephanie, had many of the attributes that would have ensured her a high rank on the masculinity-authority axis. She is Caucasian, a white-collar worker from a middle-class family, has a good education and a strong physique and is successful at sport. However, Stephanie reflected on the stress, emotional tension and mental illness she experienced growing up while trying to manage her conflicting gender issue. For Stephanie, any privilege she may have gained from living as a man was negated by this trauma. Because of this conflict, she became upset when relaying a conversation with her ex-girlfriend, post-transition. Stephanie's ex-girlfriend accused Stephanie of not understanding the discrimination women suffer because she had grown up as a male, with male privilege. Stephanie said that while she, "May not have had to go through what cisgendered females went through, certainly through high school and employment side of things, but I was certainly aware of that on my side of it since finding the strength to be me [to transition]."

In summary, Stephanie, Kerry, Evelyn, Annabel and Jemma did not see themselves as benefiting from male privilege when they presented as men. Their marginalised status reduced or limited the allocation of authority and privilege and any limited benefits that they did attain were poor compensation for their subordination or marginalization and, therefore, were less visible (Coston & Kimmel, 2012, p. 98). These participants' denial of having any substantial levels of privilege when living as men demonstrate that male privilege is not a "zero-sum quantity" (p. 97). It is an "uneven blanket" (Connell, 1987, p. 109), allocating authority and privilege according to the complex, contradictory, and multi-layered intersection of the diffused second axis with the main masculinity-authority axis.

Conversely, Kylie, Christine, Julie, Marion, Rose and Joan were beneficiaries of the uneven blanket of privilege, for when they lived as men they were considered masculine men. Kylie's male pre-transition friends told Kylie that she was the "guy we looked up to" and that she was "a local hero . . . and got all the girls". Therefore, according to the main masculinity-authority axis, she was awarded status and privilege. Hence, when these six participants transitioned they became, sometimes shockingly, aware of the loss of privilege. Julie lamented the magnitude of this loss and noted:

> How important it is. I've lost something. I didn't grow up without it. If you grow up not knowing something, you don't miss it. I grew up with it and I miss it. I miss it. I miss my male privilege at a time when I was perceived as a masculine man.

Similarly, Rose said she "lost a lot of privilege [when she transitioned]" and Kylie reported that transition meant, "giving up of all that privilege and all the status". Christine laughed about reading an article proclaiming, "You know when you have lost privilege that you have truly become a woman." Thus, removal from the dominant group equates to a form of emasculation (Coston & Kimmel, 2012, p. 98) and a denial of high rank on the masculinity-authority power axis (Connell, 1987, p. 109). Thus the dramatic fall from high to low rank made both the loss and the realization of previously unacknowledged privilege all the more real to these transgender women (Schilt & Connell, 2007, p. 615).

Along with the loss of privilege, Julie said she misses the sense of authority and the automatic respect from both men and women in the workplace. Julie explained that before transition, colleagues assumed she possessed the relevant qualifications and therefore had their respect. However, after transition they automatically considered her unqualified and lacking in authority until she was able to prove otherwise. Julie recalled that she, "Had to get through that automatic lack of respect that previously came with my masculine male privilege and I had to earn their respect really really quickly to get them [work colleagues] to the same level of attention." Julie's response is in line with findings by Schilt and Connell (2007, p. 606) and Schilt and Wiswall (2008, p. 18) that male work colleagues expressed uncertainty about both transgender women and cisgender women's abilities. It would appear that transgender women's workplace experiences turn a spotlight on the way unquestioned assumptions about gender

norms, such as women's lack of ability and qualifications, have real consequences, affecting women's ability to gain employment, attain senior positions and secure equal pay (Schilt & Wiswall, 2008, p. 19). These revelations demonstrate how society's constructed beliefs about women's lowly place on the masculinity-authority axis markedly impact continued gender inequality in the workplace, ensuring privilege is awarded to certain expressions of masculinity and denied to all women.

The same transgender women who acknowledged that they had authority and privilege when they lived as men, once they transitioned, became aware of the way women complied with their own subordination. While Julie recognised the powerful influence of socialization, saying, "All these women who are subordinated by it, it's reality and that's just their normal", most voiced a certain degree of frustration at women's unquestioning consent. Marion became quite agitated when she described a recent incident in the office where she was watching female work colleagues being disrespected by men.

> These women were just taking it because they don't know any better. It just became so apparent and it became infuriating.

These and other comments by participants who had privilege when they lived as men suggest that, having grown up accustomed to privilege, respect and authority, these transgender women continue to see the world through the lens of privilege and authority post-transition. This world-view makes it difficult to identify with the way women have been socialised and to comprehend why women comply with their own subordination.

This section discussed male authority and privilege and how men are socialised to expect this advantage. Women, on the other hand, are socialised and are conditioned through negative stereotypes to believe that femininity and power is an anomaly. Transgender women who had power and privilege when they lived as men, on transition, both recognize that they once had it and lament its loss. Even so, it appears that these transgender women continue to view the world through the lens of privilege. Section 3.2 will discuss the abuse of privilege in the form of discrimination and transgender women's reflections on experiences of discrimination, both pre- and post-transition.

3.2 Discrimination

The ranking system on the masculinity-authority axis allocates authority and privilege in varying degrees to most men according to their adherence to hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987, p. 109). The flipside of privilege, authority and rank is disadvantage, powerlessness and subordination, and discrimination is a means of reinforcing this divide between the dominant and subordinate groups. In this way, the privilege of the dominant group is secured. This section discusses gendered discrimination suffered by the subordinate group, women—both cisgender and transgender—and if there are differences in the type of discrimination. It was necessary to discern these differences to reveal further complexity within the gender hierarchy and the construction of hierarchies within gender categories.

Participants were asked if they observed a difference in the quality of discrimination dealt to cisgender women versus transgender women. Also, if they believed discrimination they suffered was because they were perceived as transgender or "passed" as cisgender women. Transgender women confront many physical appearance issues when they transition.[1] These make it difficult to be certain if discrimination is "attributable to their changed appearance rather than to their changed gender" (Schilt & Wiswall, 2008, p. 18). Half the participants said they passed as women and that being perceived as women was the source of the discrimination they suffered. Others relayed incidences of discrimination due to their transgender status, and all participants recalled incidences were they were uncertain as to the source.

Discrimination is enacted in formal and informal ways. One informal method identified by participants is the objectification of women, that is, treating women as objects to be looked at, commented on, judged and possessed, thus

---

[1] See Schilt and Wiswall, 2008, pp. 17–18, for a detailed description of the physical difficulties faced by transgender women versus transgender men in "passing".

disregarding their thoughts and feelings and sense of self (Gartler, 2015, p. 23).
Connell referred to objectification as "widespread intimidation at a lower level"
(Connell, 1987, p. 12). Stephanie recalled this low-level intimidation when she
was with male friends pre-transition. She described feeling uncomfortable
listening to her male friends objectify cisgender women.

> I felt for the people [women], the gazes, the noises, the comments were
> directed at. Even general discussions you'd overhear . . . [men] sexualize
> women as an object, talk about how they treated them.

The increased scrutiny described by Stephanie came as a shock to Kylie on
transition.

> I'd walk past a building site and get cat called and wolf whistled. I used to
> experience that initially as transphobia until I realised that is was a
> universal thing that women put up with.

Kylie's realization of increased, pervasive and intrusive scrutiny and
objectification of women was in line with the findings by Schilt & Wiswall (2008,
pp. 16–17).

The damage this form of discrimination induces in women was well
covered in Holly Gartler's 2015 PhD thesis. In summary, Gartler found that many
women internalize this abuse, resulting in disempowering self-objectifying
behaviour and, in extreme cases, life-threatening conditions such as anorexia (p.
28). By reinforcing the separation of the dominant and subordinate groups and
reducing members of the subordinate group to mere objects, objectification
effectively denies subordinate group members authority and power and the right
to be heard (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009; Waling, 2016, p. 16). The end result is
to negate subordinate group members' challenge to masculinity's superiority and,
at the same time, justify dominant group members taking privilege.

Both informal and formal forms of discrimination are prevalent in the
workplace. This is because the workplace has traditionally been the domain of
men and has only recently allowed women to enter in larger numbers. Many men
still view women's participation in the workplace as an intrusion, restricting their
advancement and therefore the numbers of women in senior positions. The

effectiveness of this strategy is evident in the statistics. Currently in Australia, only 20.5 percent of directors on ASX 100 company boards are women (Workplace Gender Equality Agency, 2015). Discrimination plays a large part in keeping these numbers fairly static and Rose summarised the ways women are discriminated against in the workplace as "legion".

Marion, Joan, Julie, Rose and Elle offered examples of the informal discrimination technique of men talking down to or over women, and Marion reported being "talked down to a lot, as in man-splaining" and "talked over" by male work colleagues. Likewise, Elle works with groups of men and often notices, "My voice is always the last to be heard and my opinions less appreciated . . . I have to argue twice as hard to make a point, to be taken seriously." Similarly, Julie described watching a female work colleague,

> [H]ave fantastic ideas and try . . . to get the floor in a meeting and just get constantly pushed aside by the guys that are running the meeting. They don't listen to her. They don't give her time to finish her explanation.

Joan's workplace experience repeated this theme and, post-transition, she suddenly became aware of her loss of authority. She no longer "commanded the committee table" and was "talked over the top of". These responses are in line with studies confirming the disempowering effect of this technique (Connell, 2010, p. 48; Schilt and Connell, 2007, p. 607).

Kylie and Joan enjoyed a high rank on the masculinity-authority axis pre-transition and they talked candidly about the ways they dismissed women when they lived as men. Kylie admitted that it was, "Part of the sense of humour of guys to constantly deride women". Similarly, Joan remembers when living as a man, "trying to keep women down in meetings by being sarcastic and challenging them when they were trying to articulate". Furthermore, Joan was aware that she did this particularly in meetings involving subjects that questioned and challenged masculinity's authority.

> One of the women lecturers was presenting a paper on feminism and I was trying to be scathing and denigrating to her, and the woman who was talking about domestic violence and I was trying to stick up for [men] and put her down. (Joan, 69)

Joan's reflection points to a main function of gendered discrimination techniques—they are all designed to support and defend the hegemonic position of masculinity, its superiority, authority and right to privilege.

Participants talked of unemployment as a major issue for members of the transgender community. Many participants told of their struggles to find work, even when they had impressive qualifications and years of experience on their resumes. When presenting as a man, Marion had "never really been turned down for a job". However, post-transition, she struggled to have her excellent qualifications appreciated, and was advised by an IT recruiter: "It's hard placing a woman because most places don't want them, and you being transgender, you probably should forget it". This newfound experience came as a shock to Marion for she had been unaware of gendered employment discrimination and the privileged position held by men in the IT industry.

When participants were asked to discern if the discrimination they suffered was because they were considered transgender or cisgender women, Joan, Kylie, Marion, Rose and Julie replied that it was because they were seen as women. Joan, Kylie and Julie made the point that very few people in their work or social environment knew that they were transgender. Kylie explained, "In the early days in transition so much of the discrimination wasn't specifically based on the fact that I was transgender, there were times when people didn't realize that I was transgender." She went on to describe a job interview when she first relocated to Sydney. It was for a senior position in a marketing company. Kylie believes that the all-male interview committee discriminated against her because they saw her as a seemingly capable 27-year-old woman, and not a transgender woman. Julie answered the question by describing the difference in the discrimination she suffered when she did not pass as a cisgender woman compared to when she did pass.

> I honestly thought well this is what my life is going to be, constantly berated for being who I am [a transgender woman]. Then I started to pass [as a woman] . . . and I thought holy cow, I actually have more respect now. (Julie, 30)

On the other hand, Joan thought that there was a "level of discrimination whether it was as a transsexual or as a woman". The varied responses offered by participants highlight the difficulty in defining the source of the discrimination—whether directed at "woman" or "transgender woman". This blurring highlights the intricate gender ranking system, making the source of discrimination difficult to define, call out and challenge. Thus, most discrimination goes unchecked and the gender order and male privilege goes unchallenged.

Other participants offered their experiences and observations of discrimination specifically targeted to transgender women. Stephanie recalled when she transitioned, "The boss and fellow workers refused to talk to me". Kerry gave the example of the vice principal of the local primary school. After the vice principal transitioned, she lost her job and was transferred to a backroom in the education department. Similarly, Christine offered the example of a Michelin star chef in the hospitality industry. The chef had no problem securing a job until she transitioned and, even though she had the same qualifications, she "struggles to get a job". These stories are in line with findings that showed transgender women were more likely to suffer termination or discrimination and harassment in their workplace because of their transgender status (Connell, 2010; Schilt & Connell, 2007; Schilt & Wiswall, 2008, p. 16).

This section discussed participants' experiences of discriminatory practices as a means to differentiate between the multiple layers of the gender hierarchy and within gender categories. Discrimination is an effective way for the dominant group to manage subordinate group members' behaviour, limiting any opportunities to gain power and so challenge masculine authority, and masculinity's right to the spoils of rank and privilege. Often, intimidation underpins acts of discrimination and when discrimination fails, the threat of violence is used to enforce the will of the dominant group. The following chapter explores the association between hegemonic masculinity and the use of intimidation and violence to ensure that authority and privilege remain in the hands of the dominant group.

Chapter Four

4.1 Violence

Discrimination as discussed in the previous section is one of the means of reinforcing masculinity's authority and protecting its privilege. Other means are abuse, the threat of violence and acts of violence. The resultant pervasive sense of intimidation constrains the behaviour of subordinate group members and allows the dominant group to impose its will. The power of hegemony discussed in Section 1.3 means that both dominant and subordinate groups endorse this structure, hence subordinate group members consent to their own subordination. However, if compliance is denied and members of subordinate groups challenge the authority of masculinity, the dominant group will engage in acts of violence to enforce gender order (Connell, 1995, p. 77).

Hegemonic masculinity relies on the threat of violence, and acts of violence, as a "constituent element of gender hierarchy" (Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015, p. 1580). However, at the same time, it is consistent with domesticity and heterosexual attraction (Connell, 1987, p. 186). This means that hegemony usually receives the consent of the subordinate groups, but this consent is contingent upon the intimidating backdrop of the threat of violence. This violent background is necessary because the gender hierarchy is systematised inequality and involves such a "massive dispossession of social resources" (Connell, 1995, p. 83) that Connell finds it hard to imagine its sustainability without force. Therefore, there is a strong but complex interdependence between hegemonic masculinity and "patriarchal violence" (Bouffard, 2010; Connell, 1987, p. 184; Flood & Pease, 2009; Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015; Schwalbe, 2014).

Maintaining an atmosphere of intimidation through the threat of violence is a prerequisite of membership to the dominant group. This means that while

most men are not violent they still must "construct a masculine self" that is capable of emitting "an air of threat" (Schwalbe, 2014, p. 68). This stance implies that, if necessary, they can command the "soldiers, police, [and] bureaucratic functionaries" (p. 68) to exert the necessary control. One might counter Schwalbe's fear by drawing on the contemporary inclusion of women and homosexual men in the military. However, Schwalbe makes the point that, despite this inclusion, the patriarchal system "will be preserved with violence if politeness fails" (p. 71).

To ensure compliance among multiple masculinities, men police other men's performance in order to maintain the hyper-masculine ideal, secure masculinity's claim to authority and ensure the benefits and privileges most men enjoy (Connell, 1995; Schwalbe, 2014, p. 67). Demonstrating the way this policing operates, seven participants described the harsh and sometimes brutally violent attempts by their fathers, stepfathers, and in one case the mother, to "toughen" them up, to make them conform to the hyper-masculine ideal. Joan relayed a conversation she had with her dying mother. Aware that Joan was a sensitive child, Joan's mother told her, "I thought the only thing I could do for you was to help toughen you up and so I sent you to the toughest boarding school I could find." Christine suffered extreme physical violence at the hands of her stepfather. She recalled one assault that followed an incident at school where she had been bullied for being a "faggot and a poof". "I was over a chair and he just keep whipping me and whipping me and whipping me and then kicked me in the face as hard as he could." These participants' childhood experiences demonstrate not only the long-lasting impact of such brutalization but also the normalization of violence. Through experiencing such acts, boys learn about the controlling effect of violence, and evidence suggests that attitudes to violence may be transmitted intergenerationally (Flood & Pease, 2009, p. 131). Collins (2013) refers to this process as the "socialization of men into violence" (p. 71).

Early in their lives, boys learn these policing techniques. Bullying is widespread, oppressive, and "a central experience of entry into adolescent masculinity" (Collins, 2013, p. 71). Bullying's aim is to enforce compliance to hegemonic masculinity, to eliminate diversity and enforce sameness (Donaldson & Poynting, 2007, p. 92). So it was no surprise that all participants cited many

school experiences of being bullied for being effeminate, fat, short, quiet or physically weak. As a survival mechanism, three-quarters of the participants stressed the importance of being competent at sport or having the ability to fight, due to the high ranking of these two skills on the hierarchy. To demonstrate the point, Kylie said she learnt to become a "hyper-masculine person who can fight and defend [her]self". She felt that she had to "prove to everybody that [she was] worthy by measuring up to all these hyper-masculine archetypes". Similarly, Rose said she was never bullied at school because she "always played rugby union . . . and [I] was always good at it".

Another survival mechanism Rose developed was the cultivation of a strong sense of presence, a guard or "a front". She described a front as "being like cock roosters putting on their display". This front can also help the performer avoid bullying and may also assure a high ranking on the hierarchy by counteracting negatives like being slightly feminine or wearing glasses or being short. As a consequence of the effectiveness of this technique, Rose and Marion believe that many men learn to make their front a permanent fixture. These participants' observations are consistent with Goffman's work on the development of a front. For a front to be effective, it must be delivered in a manner that is continuous and consistent. Goffman named this delivery "dramatic realization" (1959, p. 30).

Joan, Elle and Marion believe that as a result of this front being continuous, "Men never let down their guard very much" (Marion, 40). By doing this, Elle believes that men learn to limit their emotional expression, and some to disconnect from their emotions entirely. Post-transition, she noticed "men are taught to disconnect from their emotions, actually to see them as weakness". For these men, it seemed that the expression of emotion was conflated with femininity and weakness and to be avoided. Similarly, Rose and Marion believe men think that if they talk about their emotions they may possibly disclose their vulnerability and put into question their rank on the hierarchy. Rose explained, "Men tend to avoid talking about their feelings and talking about things that could disclose their vulnerability." Joan referred to this emotional disconnection as "Jekyll and Hyde behaviour" and thought disconnection possibly leads to the "inarticulateness" of men. Joan said she watched her current male heterosexual partner struggling to

express his "emotional load". Therefore, it would seem that while the majority of participants benefited from the advantages of being men, they were, at the same time, fearful of expressing emotion and exposing themselves as vulnerable, thus risking their masculine hierarchy status (Schwalbe, 2014, p. 65). For these reasons, Schwalbe argued that the "social construction" of men involved the ability to shut down or limit the "human empathic response" (p. 105).

The shutting down of emotional expression for fear of being judged as feminine had Marion admit that she found it emotionally "restricting" when she lived as a man. "There's no real self-expression, other than say your footy . . . there is less emotion . . . men don't have conversations like women do." Further, Joan believes that unexpressed emotions build up in men and then "there is this belief somehow that you can express the emotion through some physical gesture". In turn, this disconnection from emotional expression and the inability to acknowledge an inner emotional world may lead to the "duality of the masculine condition" that Kylie believes is intrinsic to most men. Kylie based her insight on her pre-transition life as a man and the talks she has had with hundreds of men about this "tension between what is perceived to be masculine and what's perceived to be feminine". Schwalbe referred to this tension as the "manhood act" (2014, p. 55) and warned that to not perform correctly means risking being cast out of the dominant group and suffering the loss of the privilege of membership (p. 55).

Compounding the duality of the masculine condition, Joan reflected that in her experience, men saw themselves in the singular—it was one man against the world. It was a combative stand rather than one of co-operation. For example, Joan's heterosexual male partner remains defiant that he is "an isolated individual who has to act and defend himself constantly". Joan said that when men meet each other, they measure each other up to work out if they are higher or lower on the gender hierarchy. She names this behaviour the "pecking order of the thing", and her observation is in line with findings by Pratto and Stewart (2012). The authors argued that group identity was "less salient" to members of the dominant group and this made the members unaware of a sense of community and responsibility to fellow members, as well as the privilege of membership (Pratto & Stewart, 2012, p. 42). Therefore, individual responsibility for group

dominance, the inequality it produces and the need for it to be corrected is negated (p. 32).

In contrast, Joan thought that cisgender women usually considered themselves in the plural, as part of a community and not a hierarchy. Joan offered the situation of women meeting at a social function as evidence, describing how women exchanged gifts and compliments, keen to establish rapport rather than measure each other up. Marion described an incident at work where she felt isolated from her colleagues and unsupported by management. A woman she did not know saw her in tears in the washroom and spontaneously gave her a hug and comforting words. Marion added that a man would never have done that. It is clear that participants' experiences of a sense of community and communication is different pre- and post-transition, reflecting Pratto and Stewart's finding that group membership is "more salient" for subordinate groups (2012, p. 31). It would seem that when presenting as men, participants felt pressured to act in line with the ideal of hegemonic masculinity and this included a sense of isolation, of being in competition with other men.

The contestation inherent in the hierarchy of masculinities accounts for "most episodes of major violence" (Connell, 1995, p. 83) and often these transactions are a way for men to assert their masculinity in internal group struggles (p. 83). Such transactional violence is normalised and valorised as an expression of the camaraderie of men. For example, Joan described a bar scene where, "As a bloke you can have a fight with another bloke and then you go to the bar and have a few beers and laugh about it." As well, combativeness among men is normalised through mass culture, "from action movies to sport" (Connell, 1995, p. 257), and statistics quantify the strong connection between violence and masculinity. Men account for about 90 percent of homicides, assaults and prison inmates in the USA and Australia (p. 257), and Jewkes, Flood and Lang (2015) declared men's violence a "major public health problem" (p. 1580).

Supporting this data, the majority of participants described ways men normalize violence. For example, Kylie thought that for a lot of men,

[Violence] is quite normal. . . . You look at the kind of sports . . . men are attracted to watching . . . even the way our politics plays out in Australia. There is a cultural love of blood sport.

This connection between violence and masculinity is a keystone in the framework supporting masculinity's "successful claim to authority" (Connell, 1995, p. 77). This can be seen on the global stage. European/American masculinities are "deeply implicated in the world-wide violence through which European/American culture became dominant" (p. 186).

A prime example of the global dominance of a culture of violence is the military. The military represents the very definition of violent hegemonic masculinity in European/American culture. The military's main purpose is "violence on the largest possible scale" (Connell, 1995, p. 212). In this way, the military normalizes and to some extent glorifies violence. For example, Kylie's friends who, "Come from a military background have totally different expectations around violence and are far more accepting of it." Along the same line, Joan's violent father was a "war hero, so he killed people". However, Joan's descriptions of vicious physical acts perpetrated by her father occurred before and after the war, demonstrating how the military was used to normalize and in some way excuse murder and physical abuse for this extremely violent man.

Masculinities are diverse, complex, contradictory, multi-layered and multi-dimensional; therefore, masculinity does not have a direct singular link to violence (Connell, 1995, p. 258). Social tensions, historical context and, indeed, personal histories need to be considered when studying the connection between masculinities and violence. An intriguing example of the complexity of this issue was evidenced when Joan's violent father turned into "a sweet old man". Describing her reaction to her father's transformation in his old age Joan paused and, after a long silence, admitted that his reform came too late. For her, the years of domestic violence made violence seem "normative unless it was extreme".

Particularly pertinent to this project, the connection of violence and masculinity is founded in the connection with gender and the social values and gender expression deemed appropriate for men and women (Jewkes, Flood, & Land, 2015, p. 1581). Violence defends the patriarchal system by policing people

who display non-confirming gender behaviour (Jauk, 2013, p. 807; Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing, & Malouf, 2008; Witten & Eyler, 1999). Therefore, all gender policing acts are ritualised expressions of western society's relations with power, "the dominant and the weaker, the powerful and the powerless, the active and the passive . . . the masculine and the feminine" (Kaufman, 1987, p. 1). For example, gay bashers consider themselves to be defenders of society's gender norms, and men who perpetrate domestic violence, "feel they are exercising a right, maintaining good order in the family and punishing their wives' delinquency" (Connell, 1995, p. 213).

Transgender women, a source of confusion to the patriarchal social order, suffer not only because they embrace femininity but also because they are seen to have rejected hegemonic masculinity. Transgender women are considered not to be real women and to be failed men and, therefore, an affront to the gender binary and the gender order. This makes them prime targets for violent gender policing. As evidence, the largest study of homophobic and transphobic abuse conducted in the state of Queensland, Australia, in 2010, found that transgender women experienced markedly more violence, abuse and sexual assault than all other subordinate groups (Berman & Robinson, 2010, p. 44). Ninety-two percent of transgender women survey respondents suffered verbal abuse, 62 percent suffered threats of violence and 46 percent suffered physical assault, versus 69 percent, 29 percent and 15 percent, respectively, for the same offences perpetrated on cisgender women (p. 43).

Most women live with a general sense of intimidation. Intimidation is an effective mechanism to encourage dependence and compliance and ranges across a wide spectrum, "from wolf whistling in the street, to office harassment, to rape and domestic assault, to murder by a woman's patriarchal 'owner'" (Connell, 1995, p. 83). And, while most men do not attack women, those men who do usually feel justified. Defining masculinity as dominant and tough, they consider themselves defenders of patriarchy and entitled to hegemonic masculinity's spoils of power and privilege (Bouffard, 2010; Connell, 1995; Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015, p. 26).

Participants commented on this pervading sense of intimidation post-transition. They reported suddenly, and sometimes shockingly, becoming concerned about their personal safety. Marion recalled parking her car at night and, when she returned, being aware of a man close by. She was surprised to realize that she "wasn't as confident as I would have previously been". Similarly, Elle explained that because of her personal history of being bullied she has always been "cautious about [her] safety". However, in terms of being a woman, she says she, "Definitely feels [her] safety is a lot more compromised, in the night or by myself." And, while all gender violence is "patterned by patriarchal structures" (Jauk, 2013, p. 821), Elle noticed that the threat she senses post-transition feels "more systematic somehow". This observation is intriguing and may be explained by the long history of subordination of women, allowing intimidation practices to be honed and systematised within the clear, normalised and institutionalised delineation of male supremacy and female subordination.

Interestingly, Connell considered the evidence of gendered violence as indicators of "crisis tendencies in the modern gender order" (Connell, 1995, p. 84). She reasoned that a "thoroughly legitimate hierarchy would have less need to intimidate" (p. 84) and certainly not to this degree. The necessity for intimidation and violence to protect male privilege reveals the extent of the unfair advantage enjoyed by many but not all men at the expense of all women. Over the past three decades, these advantages have grown and the wealth concentrated in fewer peoples' hands. The ten wealthiest people in the world, all men, hold 612.5 billion US dollars (Forbes, 2017). Connell (1995) argued that this increased concentration of power, authority and privilege must be accompanied by an "intensification of crisis tendencies in the gender order" (p. 201). This intensification has implications for both the allocation of authority and privilege within multiple masculinities, the subordination of women, and the intimidation and violence required to subdue any, seemingly inevitable, challenge to the gender order, hegemonic masculinity and male privilege.

Chapter Five

5.1 Conclusion

This final chapter draws together key findings and discusses their implications when mapped on to the project's theoretical framework, that is, Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity. There are five key findings:

1. All participants evidenced hegemonic masculinity, and that it relies on the enforcement, normalization and institutionalization of a gender-based hierarchy. This hierarchy involves a complex and often contradictory ranking order.

2. Participants' experience of and attitude to male privilege depended on the pre-transition rank of participants on this complex hierarchy of multiple masculinities.

3. Participants who had privilege when they lived as men were largely unaware of the advantage at that time. However, on transition, they became acutely aware of the loss of privilege. Participants who had little or no privilege when they lived as men did not report a loss of privilege on transition.

4. Participants who had privilege when they lived as men and lost it on transition still carried their privileged world-view into their lives as transgender women.

5. All participants, post-transition, reported a newfound fear for their personal safety. This was particularly so for participants who had enjoyed privilege when they lived as men

As this study proceeded, further issues became visible and the difference in participants' responses to the questions on privilege became more apparent. It would appear that the uneven allocation of authority and privilege affects the way transgender women understand male privilege and entitlement, both pre- and post-transition. Those who enjoyed authority and privilege when they lived as men were aghast at its abrupt loss when they transitioned, and many were shocked at the sudden visibility of the advantages and protections granted by the allocation of this "invisible knapsack" (McIntosh, 1998, p. 30). Furthermore, three participants talked with shame about the ways they had abused this privilege and discriminated against other men and all women when they lived as men.

Participants who reported the sudden realization of the loss of privilege on transition said they had previously accepted their superior status and privilege as normal, and neither understood nor could identify or feel sympathy with the disadvantages women suffered. Participants' lack of awareness of the privilege they had enjoyed and lack of empathy for members of subordinate groups demonstrates how the gender order and hierarchy are normalised and institutionalised within society and the workplace. Such normalization renders the privilege experienced by most men invisible (Kimmel, 2002, p. 1). However, for these participants, the transition experience turned the spotlight on the shadowy structure of the gender hierarchy, the gender order and male privilege, bringing them all centre stage. Ironically, while these participants reported feeling empowered by their newfound self-awareness, they simultaneously expressed frustration at their inability to share these insights with men. Having given up their high rank status on the hierarchy following transition, they were now denied authority and the right to be heard.

On the other hand, four participants who said they did not have a noticeable degree of privilege when they lived as men did not report missing privilege when living as women. Interestingly, they also did not appear to acknowledge or become distressed about discrimination inflicted on cisgender women, or at least not to the same degree as the participants referred to in the previous paragraphs. It would seem that these transgender women's world-view is also influenced by their pre-transition lowly rank on the hierarchy and subsequent denial of a degree of authority and privilege. The denial of authority and privilege to some men is a complex and often contradictory calculation and, in the case of three of these four participants, the intersection of their culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds with the hierarchy moved them down. These three participants insisted that their experience of race discrimination was more noticeable than gender discrimination. Their responses highlighted the normalization of gender discrimination, making it less visible compared to overt racism. The fourth participant who denied having any degree of privilege when living as a man, Kerry, is Caucasian, and her response prompted consideration of the intersection of class with the gender hierarchy. While Kerry has a secure white-collar job, her description of her family of origin suggested a working-class,

blue-collar background. In Kerry's instance it appears that her family of origin's socio-economic class together with her diminutive stature and lack of sporting or physical prowess denied her a noticeable degree of authority and privilege pre-transition.

Connell's claim that authority and privilege are distributed unevenly (1995, p. 248) was evidenced not only in participants' reactions to their sudden denial of the authority and privilege they had previously and unknowingly enjoyed, but also in their attitudes to women's compliance. Those participants who had grown up accustomed to male privilege, when denied authority and privilege post-transition, continue to see the world through the lens of privilege and authority. This world-view makes it difficult for them to appreciate and empathize with the socialization of women to their low rank on the gender hierarchy. Hence, these transgender women found it difficult to comprehend why women comply with their own subordination and became frustrated when observing such compliance.

The differences in responses from participants who enjoyed privilege pre-transition and those who did not, clearly evidence Connell's statement that authority and privilege are unevenly distributed among multiple masculinities. According to Connell, this uneven distribution is calculated according to the intersection of the main power axis with the second diffuse axis, creating a web of "hierarchies of authority and centrality within major gender categories" (1987, p. 109). Hearn (2004) described this web as elusive, for its complexity made it impossible to reduce gendered social structures to a "set of fixed positions and practices" (p. 60).

This study builds on Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity and the complex and elusive web of hierarchies of masculinities to argue that the complexity of the ranking system, the multitudes of masculinities and the indefinability of the structures are its invisible strength. These structures interlock into opaque and seemingly impenetrable scaffolding that supports hegemonic masculinity and the gender hierarchy. This project opens a window into future research by proposing that the discourse on male privilege and gender inequality may benefit from further research centred on the "social construction of the

systems of differentiations of men and men's practices" (Hearn, 2004, p. 60). This is not a call for more research into multiple masculinities, a step cautioned by Schwalbe (2014, p. 30) or for further study into the relationships between multiple masculinities and femininities as explored by Schippers (2007, p. 101), but rather for further exploration into the systems of differentiation. In other words, it is a call for further research to unpick the systems of allocation of authority and privilege to some men in such a way as to render the advantage invisible. If as Connell claims, hegemonic masculinity is "always contestable" (1995, p. 76) then it would seem strategic to further explore the social construction of the systems of differentiation and, in this way, help to define, unlock and challenge the complex web of scaffolding that protects and supports hegemonic masculinity.

To date, research has concentrated on the discrimination and disadvantages suffered by transgender people and particularly transgender women (Connell, 2010; Jauk, 2013; Schilt & Connell, 2007; Schilt & Wiswall, 2008). Research has also explored the "pressing need" (Wilson, 2002, p. 426) for transgender people to confine themselves to one of two gender options according to the rigid gender binary, thus limiting their capacity to challenge or deconstruct gender boundaries (Levitt & Ippolito, 2013; Schilt & Connell, 2007; Schilt & Westbrook, 2009; Wilson, 2002). While respecting the contribution these findings offer the discourse on gender inequality and acknowledging the on-going debate about the willingness or ability of transgender people to disrupt the gender order, this project focuses on the contribution the unique perspective, reflections and insights transgender women offer the discourse on gender inequality.

I intend to further this exploration of male privilege and entitlement through a doctoral study. Such future research will increase the transgender women sample size and diversity, and explore and compare male privilege and entitlement from the perspective of transgender men who lived as women without male privilege before transitioning. By increasing the sample size and diversity and including both transgender women and transgender men, the doctoral study will extend the reach of the aim of this thesis.

Concluding Statement

This project employed the unique perspective of individuals who have lived "on both sides of the gender curtain" (Marion, 40) to spotlight both the normalised and institutionalised structures that support gender inequality and the mechanisms used to enforce hegemonic masculinity's valuing of masculinity over femininity, thus endorsing male privilege. This study argues that it is the fact that these structures and mechanisms of enforcement are often masked and hidden, together with the convoluted calculation for the allocation and denial of authority and privilege that reinforces the system of inequality. Transgender women's lived experience exposes both the hidden structures and the complex system of allocation and denial of authority and privilege. Their responses have turned a spotlight on the "wizard behind the gender curtain" (Marion, 40), unmasking his elusive character and revealing his illusionary tricks.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organisations. *Gender and Society*, 4 (2), 139–158. Sage Social Science Collections. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from gas.sagepub.com.

Anderson, S., Ertac, S., Gneezy, U., List, J. A., & Maximiano, S. (2013). Gender, competitiveness, and socialization at a young age: Evidence from a matrilineal and a patriarchal society. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95 (4), 1438–1443. Retrieved 6 March 2017 from DOI: 10.1162/REST_a_00312.

Baker, J. (2008). The ideology of choice: Overstating progress and hiding injustice in the lives of young women, findings from a study in North Queensland, Australia. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 31, 53–64. Retrieved 20 September 2016 from www.elsevier.com/locate/wsif.

Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world. *Men and Masculinities*, XX (X), 1–18. Retrieved 17 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184X08315102.

Beasley, C. (2012). Problematizing contemporary men/masculinities theorizing: The contribution of Raewyn Connell and the conceptual-terminological tensions today. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63 (4), 747–765. Retrieved 16 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2012.01435.x.

Beasley, C. (2013). Mind the gap? Masculinity studies and contemporary gender/sexuality thinking. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 28 (75), 108–124. Retrieved 20 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1080/0816469.2013.761949.

Beasley, C. (2015). Caution! Hazards ahead: Considering the potential gap between feminist thinking and men/masculinities theory and practice. *Journal of Sociology*, 51 (3), 566–581. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/1440783314553317.

Beck, K., & Speckhard, A. (2013, Kindle edition). *Warrior Princess: A U.S. Navy SEAL's Journey to Coming out Transgender.* Retrieved www.amazon.com.

Bongiorno, F. (2012). *The Sex Lives of Australians*. Collingwood, Melbourne: Black Inc.

Boothman, D. (2008). The sources for Gramsci's concept of hegemony: Rethinking Marxism. *A Journal of Economics, Culture and Society*, 20 (20). Retrieved 10 March 2017 from DOI: 10.1080/0893590801916942.

Bouffard, L. A. (2010). Exploring the utility of entitlement in understanding sexual aggression. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38 (5), 870–879. Retrieved 20 January, 2017 from DOI: org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.06.002.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101. Retrieved 5 November 2016 from DOI: 10.1191/1478088706pq063oa.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology,* 2 (4). Retrieved 22 July 2016 from DOI: 10.1037/13620-004.

Brickell, C. (2006). The sociological construction of gender and sexuality. *The Sociological Review*, 54 (1), 87–113. Retrieved 20 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1367-954x.2006.00603.x.

Bridges, T. (2014). What research about transgender people can teach us about gender and inequality. *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved 20 November 2016 from www.huffingtonpost.com.

Brooks, A. (2007). Feminist standpoint epistemology: Building knowledge and empowerment through women's lived experience. *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 15 May 2016 from DOI: dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412984270.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University.

Brynn Jones, K. (2014). Trans-exclusionary radical feminism: What exactly is it, and why does it hurt? *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from www.huffingtonpost.com.

Budgeon, S. (2013). The dynamics of gender hegemony: Femininities, masculinities and social change. *Sociology*, 48 (2), 317–334. Retrieved 9 October 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/0038038513490358.

Burns, C. (2012). The gay and transgender wage gap: Many workers receive less pay due to sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination. *Center for American Progress.* Retrieved 20 January 2017 from www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/04/1gbt_wage_gap.html.

Burns, C. & Chem, M. (2012). Multiple identities of transgender individuals: Incorporating a framework of intersectionality to gender crossing. In R. Josselson & M. Harway (Eds.), *Navigating Multiple Identities.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Burr, V. (2015). *Social Constructionism* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Milton Park, UK: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Callahan, K. (2014, March). Trans women, male privilege, socialisation, and feminism. *ROYGBIV*. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from www.roygbiv.jezebel.com.

Cant, B., & Taket, A. (2008). Editorial introduction: Special section on methodology and LGBT people. *Social Research Online*, 13 (1). Retrieved 10 February 2017 from DOI: 10.5153/sro.1688.

Carlson, S. T. (2010). Transgender subjectivity and the logic of sexual difference. *Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 21 (2). Retrieved 5 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1215/10407391-2010-005.

Carrigan, T, Connell, R. W. & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity, *Theory & Society*, 14 (5): 551–604. Retrieved 25 November 2016 from DOI: 10.1007/BF00160017.

Case, K. A., Iuzzini, J., & Hopkins, M. (2012). Systems of privilege: Intersections, awareness, and applications. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68 (1), 1–10. Retrieved 6 March 2017 from DOI: 1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01732.x.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Cheng, C. (2008). Marginalised masculinities and hegemonic masculinity: An Introduction. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 7 (3), 295–315. Retrieved 10 February 2017 from www.journals.sagepub.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au

Christensen, A., & Qvotrup Jensen, S. (2014). Combining hegemonic masculinity and intersectionality. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 9 (1), 60–75. Retrieved 26 July 2016 from DOI: 10. 1080/18902138.2014.892289.

Connell, C. (2010). Doing, undoing or redoing gender? Learning from the workplace. Experiences of transpeople. *Gender & Society*, 24 (1). Retrieved 5 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0891243209356429.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power, Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (digital, 2003). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities* (2nd ed., 2005) Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (2010). Two cans of paint: A transsexual life story, with reflections on gender change and history. *Sexualities*, 13 (1), 3–19. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/1363460709352723.

Connell, R. W. (2012). Transsexual women and feminist thought: Toward new understandings and new politics. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 37 (4), 857–881. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1086/664478.

Connell, R. W. (2013). Feminism's challenge to biological essentialism. Raewyn Connell's web site. Retrieved on 10 February 2017 from www.raewynconnell.net.

Connell, R. W. (2014). Margin becoming centre: For a world-centred rethinking of masculinities. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 9 (4), 217–231. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1080/18902138.2014.934078.

Connell, R. W. (2014). The sociology of gender in southern perspective. *Current Sociology Monograph*, 62 (4), 550–567. Retrieved 20 July 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0011392114524510.

Connell, R. W., Dowsett, G. W., & Kessler, S. (1981). Class and gender dynamics in a ruling class school. *Interchange*, 12 (102). Retrieved 15 September 2016 from DOI: 10.1007/BFO01192110.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19 (6), 829–859. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/0891243205278639.

Cose, E. (1995). *A Man's World: How Real Is Male Privilege—and How High Is Its Price?* New York: Harper Collins.

Coston, B. M., & Kimmel, M. (2012). Seeing privilege where it isn't: Marginalised masculinities and the intersectionality of privilege, *Social Issues*, 68 (1), 97–111. Retrieved 10 January, 2017 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01738.x

Cox, L., (2016). In transition. *The Big Issue*, 512, 14–17. International Network of Street Papers.

Crouch, M., & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social Science Information*, 45 (4), 483–499. Retrieved 10 February 2017 from DOI: 10.1177/0539018406069584.

Cummings, K. (2007). Katherine's diary: The story of a transsexual: A transgender journey from first awareness to self-determination and beyond. Tascott, NSW: Beaujon.

David, E.J.R. (Ed.) (2014). *Internalised Oppression. The Psychology of Marginalised Groups*. New York: Springer.

Davidson, L., & Gordon, L. K. (1979). *The Sociology of Gender*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Davies, B. & Davies, C. (2007). Having and being had by "experiences" in the social sciences after the discursive/poststructuralist turn. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13 (8), 1139–1159. Retrieved 10 February 2017 from DOI: 10.1177/1077800407308228.

De Lamater, J. D., & Hyde, J. S. (1998). Essentialism vs. social constructionism in the study of human sexuality, *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35 (1), 10–18. Retrieved 21 January 2017 from DOI: 10.1080/00224499809551913.

Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society*, 30, 337–361. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from www.springer.com.

Deutsch, F. M. (2007). Undoing gender. *Gender & Society*, 21 (1), 106–127. Retrieved 6 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0891243206293577.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22, 643–657. Retrieved 10 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1007/BF00993540.

Donaldson, M., & Poynting, S. (2004). The time of their lives: Time, work and leisure in the daily lives of ruling-class men. In *The Power, Privilege and Politics of the New Ruling Class* (pp. 127–153). Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.

Donaldson, M. & Poynting, S. (2007). *Ruling Class Men: Money, Sex, Power*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Donovan, B. (1998). Political consequences of private authority: Promise keepers and the transformation of hegemonic masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 27 (6), 817–843. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1023/A:1006909132442.

Ducat, S. J. (2004). *The Wimp Factor: Gender Gaps, Holy Wars, and the Politics of Anxious Masculinity*. Portland, Oregon: Beacon.

Duncanson, C. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity and the possibility of change in gender relations. *Men and Masculinities*, 18 (2), 231–248. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184X15584912.

Emery, J. (2009). *The Real Possibility of Joy, A Personal Journey from Man to Woman*. Millers Point, Australia: Murdoch Books.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000 kindle version). *Sexing the Body: Gender, Politics, and the Construction of Sexuality*. Retrieved from www.amazon.com.

Fee, A. (2009). *Transgender identities: Within and beyond the constraints of heteronormativity* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Edinburgh. Retrieved 20 January 2017 from www.atria.ni.

Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2006). Changing men: Best practice in sexual violence education. *Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal*, 8, Retrieved 6 March 2017 from www.search-informit-com-au.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au.

Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse* 10 (2), 125–142. Retrieved 6 March 2017 from DOI: 10.1177/1524838009334131.

Forum, The (2017). The world's billionaires. Retrieved from www.forbes.com/billionaires/list/#/version:static

Garfinkel, H. ([1967] 2006). Passing and the managed achievement of sex status in an "intersexed" person. In S. Stryker and S. Whittle (Eds.), *Transgender Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Gartler, H. A. (2015). *Examining the relationship between internalised misogyny, self-objectification and self-efficacy among cisgender and transgender women* (Doctoral dissertation). UMI number 3704112. Ann Arbor: Proquest.

Giddens, A. (2001). *What Is Sociology?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, vol. 174. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1986, reissue ed.). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity.* New York: Touchstone.

Goldberg, M. (2014, August). What is a Woman? The dispute between radical feminism and transgenderism. *American Chronicles.* Retrieved 16 August 2015 from www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/08/04.

Gonick, M. (2006). Between "girl" power and "reviving Ophelia": Constituting the neoliberal girl subject. *NWSA Journal*, 18 (2), 1–23. Indiana: John Hopkins. Retrieved 31 January 2017 from DOI: 10.1353/nwsa.2006.0031.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Trans. and Ed.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gunter, J. (2016). The secret life of a transgender airman. *BBC News Magazine.* Retrieved 17 June 2016 from www.bbc.com/news/magazine.

Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory,* 5 (1), 49–72. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/1464700104040813.

Hearn, J. (2014). Men, masculinities and the material (-) discursive. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 9 (1), 5–17. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1080/18902138.2014.892281.

Hendry, P. M. (2007). The future of narrative. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13 (4), 487–498. Retrieved 10 February 2017 from DOI: 10.1177/1077800406297673.

Herman, B. (2015). TERF wars: "Radical feminists" are going after transgender activists, but why? *International Business Times*. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from www.IBTimes.com/media-culture.

Heyes, C. J. (2003). Feminist solidarity after queer theory: The case of transgender. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28 (4), 1093–1120. Retrieved 30 September 2015 from DOI: 10.1086/343132.

Hines, S. (2006). What's the difference? Bringing particularity to queer studies of transgender. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 15 (1), 49–66. Retrieved 20 September 2015 from DOI: 10.1080/09589230500486918.

Holdom, A. (2013, June). If the RAF can accept my gender transition, why can't the media? *The Guardian*. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from www.theguardian.com.

Hyde, Z., Doherty, M., Matt Tilley, P. J., McCaul, K. A., Rooney, R., & Jancey, J. (2014). *The First Australian National Trans Mental Health Study*, Curtin University. Retrieved May 2016 from www.transoz.org.

Jauk, D. (2013). Gender violence revisited: Lessons from violent victimisation of transgender identified individuals. *Sexualities* 16 (7), 807–825. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/1363460713497215.

Jericho, J. (2015). *Hegemonic masculinity in the Australian defence force—The exclusion of women from combat service as state policy, 1973–2013* (Doctoral dissertation). Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Sydney University.

Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequalities in gender relations: A conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet*, 385 (9977), 1580–1589.

Johnson, K. (2012). Transgender, transsexualism, and the queering of gender identities: Debates for feminist research. In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis* (pp. 606–626). *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 16 August 2016 from DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483384740.

Johnson, T., & Ottemo, A. (2015). Ruptures in hegemonic masculinity: The dialectic between ideology and utopia. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 24 (2), 192–206. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: org/10.1080/09589236.2013.812514.

Kaufman, M. (1987). *The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men's Violence. Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel, M. (2000). *The Gendered Society* (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel, M., (2002). Toward a pedagogy of the oppressor. *Tikkun Magazine*, Nov/Dec. Retrieved 16 October 2016 from www.tikkun.org/magazine/index.cfm/action/tikkun/issue/tik0211/article/02113c.html.

Kimmel, M. (2003). Globalization and its mal(e) contents: The gendered moral and political economy of terrorism. *International Sociology*, 18 (3): 603–620. Retrieved 25 November 2016 from DOI: org/10.1177/02685809030183008.

Kimmel, M. (2015a). *Angry White Men.* New York: Avalon.

Kimmel, M. (2015b, September). Why gender equality is good for everyone—Men included. TED talk. Retrieved 13 January 2017 from www.ted.com.

Kimmel, M. (2016). Privilege is invisible to those who have it. Interview with Fiona Smith, *The Guardian*, 8 June. Retrieved 16 October 2016 from www.theguardian.com.

Lazar. M. M. (2014). Recuperating feminism, reclaiming femininity: Hybrid postfeminist I-dentity in consumer advertisements. *Gender and Language*, 8 (2), 205–224. Retrieved 11 December 2016 from www.web.b.ebscohost.com.

Leckenby, D. (2007). Feminist empiricism: Challenging gender bias and "setting the record straight. *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 15 May 2016 from DOI: dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412984270.

Lenning, E., & Buist, C. (2013). Social, psychological and economic challenges faced by transgender individuals and their significant others: Gaining insight through personal narratives. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 15 (1), 44–57. Retrieved 5 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1080/13691058.2012.738431.

Leonard, W., Pitts, M., Mitchell, A., Lyons, A., Smith, A., Patel, S., Couch, M., & Barrett, A. (2012). Private lives 2 report. Second national survey of the health and well being of GLBT Australians. Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society. La Trobe University. Retrieved 20 December, 2016 from www.glhv.org.au.

Levitt, H. M., & Ippolito, M. R. (2014). Being transgender: Navigating minority stressors and developing authentic self-preservation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38 (1), 46–64. Retrieved 5 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0361684313501644.

Lina Leavy, P. (2007). Feminist postmodernism and poststructuralism. *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 15 May 2016 from DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412984270.

Lombardi, E. L., Wilchins, R. A., Priesing, D. Esq., & Malouf, D. (2002). Gender violence. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42 (1), 89–101. Retrieved 2 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1300/j082v42n01_05.

Lorber, J. (2012). The social construction of gender. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, C. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zuniga (Eds.), *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice* (pp. 321–326). New York: Routledge.

Marinucci, M. (2012). *Feminism Is Queer: The Intimate Connection between Queer and Feminist Theory.* London: Zed Books.

Martin, P. Y. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Connell's masculinities. *Gender and Society*, 12 (4), 472–474. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from www.jstor.org/stable/190180.

Mason, M. (1990). Internalised oppression. In *Disability Equality in Education*. Reiser, R. and Mason, M. (eds). London: ILEA.

McCormack, C. (2004). Storying stories: A narrative approach to in-depth interview conversations. *International Journal of Social Research*, 7 (3), 219–236. Retrieved 10 February 2017 from DOI: 10.10.80/13645570210166382.

McGregor, C. (2014, February 24). Call me Cate. *Australian Story*, ABC. Transcript retrieved 20 August 2015 from www.abc.net.au/austory/content/2012/s3951204.

McIntosh, P. (1992). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In A. M. Filor (Ed.), *Multiculturalism*. New York State Council of Educational Associations, New York: New York State United Teachers. Retrieved 10 January, 2017 from www.eric.ed.gov.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2004). *Flesh & Blood: Adolescent Gender Diversity and Violence.* Langhma, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Messerschmidt , J.W. (2008). And now, the rest of the story . . . Commentary on Christine Beasley's "Rethinking Hegemonic Masculinity in a Globalising World." *Men and Masculinities*, 11 (1), 104–108. Retrieved 17 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184X08315103.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2012). Engendering gendered knowledge: Assessing the academic appropriation of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 15 (1), 1–21. Retrieved 17 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184X11428384.

Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1995). *In-depth Interviewing* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Longman.

Moller, M. (2007). Exploiting patterns: A critique of hegemonic masculinity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 16 (3), 263–276. Retrieved 27 July 2016 from DOI: 10.1080/09589230701562970.

Morris, J. (2002). *Conundrum (European Road Maps).* New York: New York Review of Books.

Muhr, S., & Sullivan, K. R. (2013). "None so queer as folk": Gendered expectations and transgressive bodies in leadership. *Leadership* 9 (3), 416–435. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/1742715013485857.

Muhr, S., Sullivan, K. R., & Rich, C. (2016). Situated transgressiveness: Exploring one transwoman's lived experiences across three situated contexts. *Gender, Work & Organisation*, 23 (1), 52–70. Retrieved 5 December 2016 from DOI: 10.111/gwao.12093.

National Center for Transgender Equality (2014). Transgender terminology. Washington, DC. Retrieved 11 December 2016 from www.nctequality.org.

Nielsen, H. B. (2004). Noisy girls: New subjectivities and older gender discourses. *Young*, 12 (9), 9–30. Retrieved 20 September 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/11003308804039.

Oxford Dictionary. Retrieved 11 December 2016 from www.en.oxforddictionaries.com.

Pesta, A. (2015, April). Chelsea Manning shares her transition to living as a woman—Behind bars. *Cosmopolitan*. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from www.cosmopolitan.com.

Peterson, A. (2003). Research on men and masculinities: Some implications of recent theory for future work. *Men and Masculinities*, 6 (1), 54–69. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184X02250843.

Plummer, K. ([1995] 2004). *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*. London: Routledge.

Plummer, K. (2001a). Sighting a diversity of life stories: From resource to topic. *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 21 June 2016 from DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208888.

Plummer, K. (2001b). *Documents of Life 2. An Invitation to a Critical Humanism*. London: Sage.

Pratto, F., & Stewart, A. L. (2012). Group dominance and the half-blindness of privilege. *Social Issues*, 68 (1), 28–45. Retrieved 10 January, 2017 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01734.x.

Reicherzer, S., & Comstock, D. L. (2010). A transgender's qualitative journey: Deconstructing gender-based social opprobrium. *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 21 June 2016 from DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452272078.

Rich, E. (2005). Young women, feminist identities and neoliberalism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 28, 495–508. Retrieved 20 September 2016 from www.elsevier.com/locate/wsif.

Risman, B. (2004, August). Gender as a social construction: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society*, 18. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0891243204265349.

Risman, B. (2009). From doing to undoing: Gender as we know it. *Gender & Society*, 23 (1), 81–84. Retrieved 6 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0891243208326874.

Rose, J. (2016). Who do you think you are? *London Review of Books*, 38 (9), 3–13. Retrieved May 2016 from www.lrb.co.uk.

Rubin, H. (Ed.) (2003). *Self-Made Men: Identity and Embodiment among Transsexual Men*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data (2nd ed.). *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 4 April 2015 from DOI: http://dx.doi.org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.4135/9781452226651.

Saltzman Chafetz, J. (Ed.) (2006). *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*. Houston: Springer.

Schilt, K., & Connell, C. (2007). Do workplace gender transitions make gender trouble? *Gender, Work and Organisation*, 14 (6), 596–618. Retrieved 10 September 2015 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00373.x.

Schilt, K., & Wiswall, M. (2008). Before and after: Gender transitions, human capital, and workplace experiences. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy*, 8 (1), 1–26. Retrieved 15 January 2017 from doi-org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.2202/1935-1682.1862.

Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing gender, doing heteronormativity. "Gender normals," transgender people, and the social maintenance of heterosexuality. *Gender and Society*, 23 (4), 440–464. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/0891243209340034.

Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory of Sociology*, 36, 85–102. Retrieved 16 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1007/s11186-007-9022-4.

Schrock, D. (2005). Transsexuals' embodiment of womanhood. *Gender and Society*, 19 (3), 317–335. Retrieved 6 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/089124204273496.

Schwalbe, M. (2014). *Manhood Acts, Gender and the Practices of Domination*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Schwalbe, M., Godwin, S., Holden, D., Schrock, D., Thompson, S., & Wolkomir, M. (2000). Generic processes in the reproduction of inequality: An interactionist analysis. *Social Forces*, 79 (2), 419–452. Retrieved 20 December 2015 from DOI: -org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1093/sf/79.2.419.

Serano, J. (2016). *The Whipping Girl. A Transsexual Women on Sexism and the Scapegoating of Femininity*. Berkeley: Seal.

Sherman, A. M., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2014). "Boys can be anything": Effect of Barbie play on girls' career cognitions. *Sex Roles*, 70 (5), 195–208. Retrieved 6 March 2017 from DOI: 10.1007/s11199-014-0347-y.

Sherwood, J. H. (2004). *Talk about country clubs: Ideology and the reproduction of privilege* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved 10 January, 2017 from www.lib,ncsu.edu/resolver/1840.16/3016.

Shrock, D., and Schwalbe, M. (2009). Men, masculinities and manhood acts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 277–295. Retrieved 10 March 2017 from DOI: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115933.

Silverman, D. (Ed.) (2016). *Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Stone, S. (1991). In J. Epstein & K. Straub (Eds.), *The Empire Strikes Back: A Post-Transsexual Manifesto, Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity* (pp. 280–304). New York: Routledge

Stryker, S., & Aizura, A. Z. (Ed.) (2013). *The Transgender Studies Reader 2*. New York: Routledge.

Talbot, K. & Quale, M. (2010). The perils of being a nice guy: Contextual variation in five young women's constructions of acceptable hegemonic and alternative masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, 13 (2), 255–278. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184X09350408.

Tani, M. (2015, February). Kristin Beck, transgender former Navy Seal, to run against Steny Hoyer. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from www.huffingtonpost.com.

Teich, N. (2012). *Transgender 101: A Simple Guide to a Complex Issue*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Thanem, T., & Wallenberg, L. (2016). Just doing gender? Transvestism and the power of undoing gender in everyday life and work. *Organisation*, 23 (2), 250–271. Retrieved 4 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/135050841454759.

Thomas, D. R., & Hodges, I. D. (2010). Designing and managing your research project: Core skills for social and health research. *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 4 April 2015 from http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446289044.n7.

Touraine, A. (1989). Is sociology still the study of society? *Sage Research Methods*. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from www.sagepub.com.

Vidal-Ortiz, S. (2008). Transgender and transsexual studies: Sociology's influence and future steps. *Sociology Compass*s, 2 (2), 433–450. Retrieved 6 December 2016 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00086.x.

Wahlquist, C. (2016, April). Germaine Greer on Q & A. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 28 February 2017 from www.theguardian.com.

Walby, S. (1989). Theorising patriarchy. *Sociology*, 23 (2), 213–234. Retrieved 28 August 2016 from www. Soc.sagepub.com.

Waling, A. (2016). "We are so pumped full of shit by the media": Masculinity, magazines, and the lack of self-identification. *Men and Masculinities*, Sage Journals, 1–26. Retrieved February 10, 2017 from DOI: 10.1177/1097184x16652654.

Wedgwood, N. (2009). Connell's theory of masculinity—Its origins and influences on the study of gender. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 18 (4), 329–339. Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1080/09589230903260001.

Weekes, K. (Ed.) (2009). *Privilege and Prejudice: Twenty Years with the Invisible Knapsack.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism and Psychology*, 9 (3), 335–356. Retrieved 10 August 2016 from DOI: 10.1177/0959353599009003012.

Wharton, A. S. (2012). *The Sociology of Gender. An Introduction to Theory and Research* (2nd ed.). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wilchins, R. (2004). *Queer Theory, Gender Theory*. New York: Magnus Books.

Wilson, M. (2002). I am the prince of pain, for I am a princess in the brian: Liminal transgender identities, narratives and the elimination of ambiguities. *Sexualities*, 5 (4), 425–448. Retrieved on 21 January 2017 from DOI: 10.1177/1363460702005004003.

Witten, T. M., & Eyler, E. (1999). Hate crimes and violence against the transgendered. *Peace Review*, 11 (3), 461–468. Retrieved 6 March 2017 from DOI: org/10.1080/10402659908426291.

Woodley, N. (2011, March 23). Anti-carbon tax rally attacks get personnel. *ABC Radio National Mark Colvin, PM.* Retrieved from www.abc.net.au/pm/content/2011/s3171851.htm.

Workplace Gender Equality, Australian Government (2015). Progress made on board diversity says AICD. Retrieved from www.wgea.gov.au/wgea-newsroom2/progress-made-board-diversity-says-aicd.

World Economic Forum (2015). Retrieved from www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/…/which-countries-have-had-a-female-leader.

Wylie, A. (2012). The feminism question in science: What does it mean to "do social science as a feminist"? In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis* (pp. 544–556). Retrieved 16 August 2015 from DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483384740.

Yost, M. (2014). Transfeminist psychology. *Feminism and Psychology*, 24 (2), 145–156. Retrieved 20 August 2015 from DOI: 10.1177/0959353514529392.

Appendices

Appendix I

Ethics Approval

Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

Research Office

Research Hub, Building C5C East

Macquarie University

NSW 2109 Australia

T: +61 (2) 9850 4459

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/

ABN 90 952 801 237 CRICOS Provider No 00002J

6 June 2016

Dear Associate Professor Reynolds **Reference No:** 5201600273

Title: *Transwomen's experience, pre- and post-transitioning, of male privilege, entitlement and power*

Thank you for submitting the above application for ethical and scientific review. Your application was considered by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC (Human Sciences & Humanities)).

I am pleased to advise that ethical and scientific approval has been granted for this project to be conducted by:

Macquarie University. This research meets the requirements set out in the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (2007 – Updated May 2015) (the *National Statement*). **Standard Conditions of Approval:**

1. Continuing compliance with the requirements of the *National Statement,* which is available at the following website:

http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/book/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research

2. This approval is valid for five (5) years, subject to the submission of annual reports. Please submit your reports on the anniversary of the approval for this protocol.

3. All adverse events, including events which might affect the continued ethical and scientific acceptability of the project, must be reported to the HREC within 72 hours.

4. Proposed changes to the protocol and associated documents must be submitted to the Committee for approval before implementation.

It is the responsibility of the Chief investigator to retain a copy of all documentation related to this project and to forward a copy of this approval letter to all personnel listed on the project.

Should you have any queries regarding your project, please contact the Ethics Secretariat on 9850 4194 or by email ethics.secretariat@mq.edu.au

The HREC (Human Sciences and Humanities) Terms of Reference and Standard Operating Procedures are available from the Research Office website at:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human _research_ethics

The HREC (Human Sciences and Humanities) wishes you every success in your research. Yours sincerely

Dr Karolyn White

Director, Research Ethics & Integrity, Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee (Human Sciences and Humanities)

This HREC is constituted and operates in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council's (NHMRC) *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (2007) and the *CPMP/ICH Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice*.

Details of this approval are as follows: Approval Date: 3 June 2016

The following documentation has been reviewed and approved by the HREC (Human Sciences & Humanities):

Documents reviewed

Response addressing the issues raised by the HREC

Version no.

Date

Received 01/06/2016

Macquarie University Ethics Application Form

Revised version received 01/06/2016

Participant Information and Consent Form   1   01/06/2016

Interview Questions

1

01/06/2016

*If the document has no version date listed one will be created for you. Please ensure the footer of these documents are updated to include this version date to ensure ongoing version control.

Appendix II

Interview Questions

Before we start, could you please tell me a little about yourself?

What age bracket are you in, 20–30, 30–40, 40–50, 50–60, 60–70?

How many years has it been since you transitioned?

If you are working, in what area or industry do you work?

Has your work situation changed since transitioning?

1. May I ask you to describe any experiences of expressions of privilege
   and entitlement since you have transitioned? You may have witnessed
   this behaviour or experienced it either as the recipient or perpetrator.

2. If you feel comfortable doing this, could you please describe any
   experiences of expressions of privilege and entitlement before you
   transitioned? You may have witnessed this behaviour or experienced
   it either as the recipient or perpetrator.

3. Reflecting on these experiences, in two completely different times in
   your life, do they have a different quality or feel and could you talk to
   me about these differences?

4. If you feel ok doing this, please describe aggressive or abusive
   behaviour as you have experienced it since transitioning? Who
   was/were the perpetrator(s)?

5. And could I ask you to tell me about your experiences of this
   behaviour before transitioning? Who was/were the perpetrator(s)?

6. Comparing these experiences, could you talk to me about which was more intense for you and why?

7. Staying with this comparison, could I ask you to give me more of an understanding of the effect this abuse had on you at the time?

8. Do you think that there is a certain type of person who acts in an aggressive or abusive way? Could you describe them?

9. Why do you think some people act in this way?

10. While I am interested in the experiences of trans women, as a counterpoint, could you tell me if you are aware of aggressive, abusive or discriminatory behaviour dealt to cisgender women? Who was/were the perpetrator(s)?

11. Could I ask you to tell me about any differences in the way trans women versus cisgender women experienced this behaviour? Why do you think this was so?

12. Could you please talk to me about your thoughts on feminism? Do you identify with it?

13. And what do you think about equal pay, equal opportunity and affirmative action programs?

14. Thinking about discrimination in the workplace, as a trans woman, do you think you suffer more or less discrimination than a cisgender woman?

15. Having once been recognised by society as a man, and having transitioned to a trans woman, do you think you have a particular perspective on privilege, entitlement, discrimination and abusive behaviour? Could you describe it?

16. Has your attitude to this behaviour changed over the years? Could you describe the change?

17. Thank you for your time and thoughtful response to these questions. The experiences and thoughts you have shared in this interview will add to the discourse on privilege and entitlement, and aggressive, abusive and discriminatory behaviour. And as we close this interview, would you like to share further reflections and insights not prompted by my questions?