

October 2018

Complicating Gender: Gender Inequality in Education and Employment

Skylar Davidson
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2



Part of the [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davidson, Skylar, "Complicating Gender: Gender Inequality in Education and Employment" (2018). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 1334.

<https://doi.org/10.7275/12415097> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/1334

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Complicating Gender: Gender Inequality in Education and Employment

A Dissertation Presented

by

SKYLAR DAVIDSON

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

September 2018

Sociology

© Copyright by Skylar Davidson 2018
All Rights Reserved

Complicating Gender: Gender Inequality in Education and Employment

A Dissertation Presented

by

SKYLAR DAVIDSON

Approved as to style and content by:

Michelle Budig, Chair

Joya Misra, Member

Lee Badgett, Member

Tony Paik, Department Head
Sociology

ABSTRACT

COMPLICATING GENDER: GENDER INEQUALITY IN EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

SEPTEMBER 2018

SKYLAR DAVIDSON, B.A., STOCKTON UNIVERSITY

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Michelle Budig

Sociologists have always acknowledged the complexity of gender, but despite acknowledging this complexity, much sociological research does not put this knowledge into practice; indeed, a great deal of research focuses on distinctions between men and women with regard to some other variable, reinforcing a narrow and binary understanding of gender. This tendency has two limitations: (1) it does not recognize the variability in men's and women's expression of masculinity and femininity; and (2) it does not recognize gender identities other than those of cisgender man and cisgender woman (i.e., transgender people). This study mitigates this limitation through telling a story in three sections about gender in educational settings and the workplace. I begin the process of disrupting binary social science through evaluating how understanding men's and women's masculinity and femininity can help us understand gender differences in choice of college major. In other words, I use additional ways of measuring gender in addition to the gender identities of men and women. I continue disrupting binary thinking through broadening measurement of gender identity to include transgender people (transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinary transgender people, who are those who identify as a gender other than man or woman). The second section evaluates how harassment and discrimination in educational settings, both K-12

and postsecondary, influence the educational attainment of transgender people. Finally, in the third section, I evaluate transgender people's experiences with discrimination at work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Cisgender Men and Women in Educational Settings.....	5
B. Transgender People in Educational Settings.....	8
C. Transgender People in Work Settings.....	13
II. CISGENDER MEN AND WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS.....	17
A. Abstract.....	17
B. Theory.....	18
1. Gender and Education.....	18
2. Race and Gender.....	27
C. Data and Analytical Plan.....	29
1. Data.....	29
2. Variables.....	30
3. Methods and Models.....	31
D. Results.....	32
1. Descriptive Findings.....	32
2. Multivariate Findings.....	33
E. Conclusion.....	36
F. Tables.....	42
III. TRANSGENDER PEOPLE IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS.....	46
A. Abstract.....	46
B. Theory.....	47
1. What is a Transgender Person?.....	47
2. Harassment and Discrimination.....	51
3. Different Transgender Groups.....	63
4. School-to-Prison Pipeline.....	66
5. Race and Gender.....	70
C. Data and Analytical Plan.....	76

1. Data.....	76
2. Variables.....	76
3. Methods and Models.....	79
D. Results.....	80
1. Descriptive Findings.....	80
2. Multivariate Findings.....	81
E. Conclusion.....	88
F. Tables.....	94
IV. TRANSGENDER PEOPLE IN WORK SETTINGS.....	101
A. Abstract.....	101
B. Theory.....	102
1. What is a Transgender Person?.....	102
2. Out at the Workplace.....	104
3. Race and Gender.....	112
4. Different Transgender Groups.....	118
C. Data and Analytical Plan.....	121
1. Data.....	121
2. Variables.....	122
3. Methods and Models.....	123
D. Results.....	124
1. Descriptive Findings.....	124
2. Multivariate Findings.....	126
E. Conclusion.....	131
F. Tables.....	137
V. CONCLUSION.....	142
A. Cisgender Men and Women in Educational Settings.....	143
B. Transgender People in Educational and Work Settings.....	145
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	154

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1. BSRI Questions (Add Health).....	42
2.2. Descriptive Statistics: Education (Add Health).....	43
2.3. OLS Regression: Bem Categories as IV and Percent Women in College Major as DV (Add Health).....	44
3.1. Demographic Information for the General U.S. Population, Nonbinaries, Transgender Men, and Transgender Women, 2008.....	94
3.2. Descriptive Statistics: Leaving School Due to Harassment and Incarceration (NTDS).....	95
3.3. Logistic Regression: Gender and Race as IV and Leaving School Due to Harassment as DV (NTDS).....	96
3.4. Logistic Regression: Gender and Race as IV and Graduation as DV (NTDS).....	98
3.5. Logistic Regression: Gender and Race as IV and Having Been Incarcerated as DV (NTDS).....	100
4.1. Descriptive Statistics: Race and Gender (NTDS).....	137
4.2. Descriptive Statistics: Labor Market Outcomes of Nonbinaries, Transgender Men, and Transgender Women (NTDS).....	138
4.3. Logistic Regression: Influence of Gender and Race on Employment Outcomes (Nonbinaries only; NTDS).....	139
4.4. Logistic Regression: Influence of Gender and Race on Employment Outcomes (Nonbinaries Only, with Interactions; NTDS).....	140
4.5. Logistic Regression: Influence of Gender and Race on Employment Outcomes (All Transgender Groups; NTDS).....	141

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

For decades, sociologists have acknowledged the complexity of sex and gender and questioned the relationship between these categories (e.g., Ridgeway 2011; West and Zimmerman 1987). Most notably, sociologists identify a distinction between the biological category of sex and the socially constructed notion of gender that reflects norms regarding appropriate behavior for two binary sex categories (Ridgeway 2011). Categorization of biological sex has varied across time and place; this concept includes multiple factors, including chromosomes, genitalia, and hormone levels. Nowadays, it is common to assign sex at birth based on the appearance of the genitalia, though this assignment may not be in sync with chromosomes or with the hormones that develop at puberty (Fausto-Sterling 2000). Thus, in contrast to popular assumptions and stereotypes, neither biological sex nor gender is a binary category; each contains vast diversity, and the binary categories are socially constructed and culturally specific. Complexity arises at the biological level even before the sociocultural level, which is the most frequent topic of sociological research. At this sociocultural level, it is common to portray gender as a binary as well. People expect to be able to easily categorize someone as a man and a woman, expecting more nurturing traits from women and more agentic traits from men (Ridgeway 2011). As more research is done on transgender people, it has become apparent that they trouble binary notions of both sex and gender (West and Zimmerman 1987; Beemyn and Rankin 2011). Thus research on this population is useful not only for the practical purpose of advocating on behalf of this population but also for the theoretical purpose of furthering gender research more broadly.

Despite acknowledging the complexity of sex and gender, much sociological research does not put this knowledge into practice. Indeed, a great deal of research, including that which uses large samples to study education and employment outcomes, narrowly focuses on distinctions between cisgender men and cisgender women (i.e., people who are not transgender), reinforcing a narrow and binary understanding of gender. This tendency has two limitations: (1) it does not recognize the variability in men's and women's expression of masculinity and femininity; and (2) it does not recognize gender identities other than those of man and woman.

Beyond the attribution and expression of sex and gender at the individual level, social institutions also are structured by and shape the expression of sex and gender. As such, it is illuminating to study gender inequality within educational and employment contexts because of how these contexts can both shift and reproduce gender differences. There are multiple reasons why it is theoretically useful to research how gender influences field of study. First, college is a useful arena to study gendered processes because it is a space where people have the opportunity to interact with diverse people from different backgrounds, as well as a space where people have the opportunity to challenge mainstream ideas (Campbell and Horowitz 2016). Thus, it can be a significant institution in structuring people's gender beliefs. Furthermore, since educational experiences influence people's workplace outcomes, including income (Blau and Kahn 2007), higher education is an important institution to study gendered processes that ultimately influence long-term economic well-being. In order to obtain information on how inequality is perpetuated, social scientists must investigate any instance in which people belonging to a particular category (e.g., whites, men) have an advantage over interactional resources relevant in a particular context (such as education, authority, or

tenure) (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). In addition, it is important to investigate instances of gender segregation or inequality in major life activities because these activities can have feedback effects; gender differentiation can reinforce gender stereotypes that lead young boys and girls to envision a narrow range of life options for themselves (Charles and Bradley 2009).

Gender inequality is not only an academic theoretical debate. Misinformation and bias toward transgender people are pervasive in the United States and around the world, leading to poor outcomes in people's well-being. Some Americans, including but not limited to religious fundamentalists, believe that transgender people are “confused” and that transgender identities are invalid. In 32 U.S. states, employers may fire someone simply for being transgender. Transgender people are four times more likely than cisgender people to be in poverty and over 20 times more likely to commit suicide than cisgender people (Grant et al. 2011). One-fifth of transgender people have been homeless, and about half of homeless transgender people report receiving harassment upon attempting to access the services of a homeless shelter (Grant et al. 2011). Because many spaces in everyday life, such as bathrooms and locker rooms, are gendered, transgender people encounter numerous opportunities for bias incidents. About a third of transgender people experience physical violence due to being transgender (Winter et al. 2016).

In late 2017, Trump ordered the U.S. military to no longer allow transgender service members. This government-mandated policy affects more than just the thousands of transgender people who are directly affected—it perpetuates fear and misinformation about transgender people beyond the military setting. This fear and misinformation has repercussions for transgender people in all facets of life. Even the process of transition is difficult for many transgender people. When transgender people need to access transition-

related medical care, such as hormones and surgeries, they may be refused care or need to educate medical providers about transgender care. Due to the numerous spaces in which transgender people face differential treatment, they experience minority stress, leading to negative mental and physical health consequences (Winter et al. 2016).

In summary, therefore, transgender people's lived experience is that of a population that is denied basic rights (Winter et al. 2016). Transgender people experience discrimination; their identities are not always legally recognized; their opportunities for meaningful work are limited; and they fear for their safety (Winter et al. 2016). The stigma surrounding being transgender is a primary factor underlying the diverse negative outcomes faced by this population. People who hold negative beliefs about transgender people are inclined to harass and discriminate, leading these prejudiced beliefs to become part of the social, economic, and legal structure (Winter et al. 2016). Because many people's level of awareness of transgender people is low, it is important to produce more knowledge about this population so as to combat stigma (Winter et al. 2016), as this dissertation will do.

Gender is not the only basis for inequality and discrimination, since different bases of inequality can overlap and compound one another. My dissertation is intersectional, for gender and race are greatly intertwined in educational and employment settings. "Intersectionality" refers to mutually constitutive relationships between identities. This means that relationships between categories such as gender, race, and class create new meanings; categories do not function independently of one another, with clear and simplified effects (Browne and Misra 2003; Warner 2008). Though all categories influence people's outcomes, it is impossible to include every aspect of

someone's identity in a study (Brown 2012; Warner 2008); thus this dissertation will focus on race in addition to gender due to its salience in the modern United States.

Mainstream concepts of masculinity and femininity are white-centric (Branch 2011, Pascoe 2005). For example, black women have historically not had the access to a more middle- or upper-class type of femininity as white women have, because they have been forced or encouraged into dirty, difficult work (Branch 2011), and white and black boys are held to different standards of masculine behavior in K-12, with black boys being “othered” and exempted from dominant white conceptions of masculinity (Pascoe 2005). Similarly, there is much evidence that transgender people of color experience more harassment and discrimination than white transgender people (Grant et al. 2011; Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). Thus my dissertation will touch upon how race is a part of gender inequality in educational and employment contexts.

My dissertation will mitigate both limitations specified above: both the fact that much sociological research does not recognize the variability in men's and women's expression of masculinity and femininity and the fact that much sociological research does not recognize additional gender identities other than those of man and woman. Specifically, I will fill these gaps in the literature with regard to educational and employment contexts, and detail my contributions below.

A. Cisgender Men and Women in Educational Settings

In my first empirical chapter, I use data from Add Health to investigate how gender identity and gendered traits are related to the gender composition of one's college major. Add Health is a longitudinal survey beginning with a nationally representative sample of adolescents in 1994-1995 and following them into adulthood. This survey data allows me to examine how individual-level traits characterizing masculinity, femininity,

androgyny, and undifferentiated in higher education are associated with differences in men's and women's choice of college major. In other words, this section begins the process of disrupting binary thinking through using a four-dimensional measure of gender (masculinity, femininity, androgyny, and undifferentiated) in addition to the dichotomous gender identities of men and women. Even though Add Health focuses on health, there is substantial content on education in this survey because of the age of the participants, and the BSRI is available in one wave.

This study on cisgender men and women in educational settings theorizes on what gender is and how to measure it. (This survey only permits respondents to label themselves as a man or woman, so it does not allow researchers to identify who, if anyone, is transgender. Only approximately 0.3% of the population is transgender [Gates 2011], so the number of transgender people in this dataset is likely to be too small to cause noticeable error.) At one time, masculinity and femininity were commonly conceptualized as opposite ends of one dimension; however, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was influential in changing this viewpoint, and this scale continues in use today (Bem 1974). In contrast to a one-dimensional conception of gender, the BSRI is two-dimensional, meaning that it treats masculinity and femininity as separate characteristics instead of as opposing characteristics. As a result, it places people into one of four gender categories (masculine, feminine, androgynous [both masculine and feminine], or undifferentiated [neither masculine nor feminine]). The BSRI complicates gender; anyone of any gender identity can express any of these four categories. In other words, people may or may not express the gendered traits stereotypically associated with their gender identity.

Academic fields of study constitute one space that has experienced both changes in gender composition and devaluation of fields of study associated with women. Overall, the proportions of women and men have been changing in higher education; women now make up a higher percentage of college students than men (Charles and Bradley 2009). Simple changes in overall representation obscure other aspects of gender inequality, however; gender egalitarianism contributes more to integration in different levels of education than to integration in different fields (Charles and Bradley 2002). There has been some integration of men and women in college majors over time; however, much of this integration has been accounted for by women moving out of traditionally feminine fields rather than men moving into traditionally feminine fields (England and Li 2006). Women have become less interested in pursuing fields highly dominated by women, particularly English and education, and moved into more men-dominated fields, particularly business (England and Li 2006). Men have not increasingly pursued traditionally women-dominated fields, in part due to the less lucrative women-dominated occupations that are connected to the women-dominated fields of study. This state of affairs can be explained by the devaluation perspective; fields that become associated with women become culturally and economically devalued, meaning that women's subsequent careers and earnings benefit more than men's when they enter majors nontraditional for their gender (England and Li 2006). People tend to belong to fields in which they feel they fit in; for example, those who express more masculinity tend to belong to men-dominated fields (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2013), while those who express more femininity are more likely to belong to women-dominated fields (McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray 2010). This section uses data from Add Health to analyze gender expression (masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated) as the

independent variable and percentage women in the college major as the dependent variable.

Overall, the results of this section provide support for Bem's (1974, 1977) theory. In this study, women and men can express any combination of gendered traits, regardless of whether those traits are traditionally associated with masculinity or femininity. Gender distinctions separate active, task-oriented behavior and nurturing, people-oriented behavior (Bem 1974); I find that these traits operate differently for men and women. Consistent with my predictions, men with greater levels of feminine traits are more likely to be in women-dominated majors. Surprisingly, however, women who are not feminine belong in majors that are more women-dominated, relative to other women. It is unclear why this is so, because college major and the BSRI were measured during the same wave of this survey. Perhaps token women in male-dominated majors have a heightened awareness and expression of their feminine traits in a masculinized academic field. My research thus shows that the relationship between gender and field of study is more complex than it seems on the surface. Men who express the devalued characteristic of femininity are likely to fit into a women-dominated major, but men who can express masculinity, and move into a major that is less women-dominated, are likely to do so. But women are criticized for taking on traits that conflict with their subordinate status (Ridgeway 2011), so women who do not have feminine traits may take on majors with a higher percentage of women to fit in better and avoid censure.

B. Transgender People in Educational Settings

Transgender people are those whose gender identity (their sense of their own sex and/or gender expression) differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. People may consider themselves transgender because of their feelings about their biological sex,

because of their feelings about gender roles, or both. Many factors contribute to bias against transgender people in education. Schools understand little of the needs of transgender students and are thus unequipped to support them (McKinney 2005; Sausa 2002). A major example is the fact that teachers frequently hesitate to step in when students are being bullied or when students express prejudiced viewpoints. Sometimes teachers themselves perpetuate inequality, placing more surveillance on students who violate gender norms and punishing them more harshly than students who do conform to gender norms for disciplinary infractions. Many transgender people are refused bathroom access or verbally or physically attacked in bathrooms (Herman 2013; Nadal et al. 2012), and as a result of these problems, some transgender people miss classes or drop out of schools because they cannot find a solution (Herman 2013). Existing research suggests that that transgender women have the worst outcomes of all transgender groups because they are stereotyped as sexual deviants and predators (Nadal et al. 2012). This is because cisgender men are assumed to be aggressive, and this stereotype maps on to transgender women because some people believe they are truly men even if they transition, because they were born biologically male. This stereotype is especially true in women's spaces, where people tend to fear the presence of someone who is or was assigned biologically male (Westbrook and Schilt 2013).

In this section and the next, I use data from the National Transgender Discrimination Survey to evaluate how harassment and discrimination in educational settings, both K-12 and postsecondary, influence the educational attainment of transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinary transgender people. “Nonbinary transgender people” is an umbrella term referring to those whose gender identity is something other than man or woman; I will call them “nonbinaries” throughout this

document. A comparison of these three groups to cisgender people is not possible due to data limitations, namely that cisgender men and women were not surveyed by the NTDS. Unfortunately, major randomly sampled surveys do not provide the opportunity for people to identify with nonbinary genders, and few even provide the opportunity to identify as transgender at all. While the NTDS offers a large sample of gender minorities, this dataset contains no cisgender people. In contrast to much prior research on transgender people, which tended to be based on small samples, often from clinical settings (Kuper, Nussbaum, and Mustanski 2012), the NTDS was designed to be large and as representative as possible of the transgender and gender nonconforming population of the United States. Though it has some representational bias, underrepresenting racial and ethnic minorities and people with lower educational attainment (Harris 2015), it does represent a demographically diverse population, including variation along the lines of race, education, and age.

In order to study how bias influences transgender people's school outcomes, I take account of various factors. I investigate educational attainment through the dependent variables of graduation from high school and graduation from college. I also look into other factors relevant to transgender people's school experiences: whether they leave school to harassment, and whether they have been incarcerated during their lives. Incarceration allows me to study how transgender people are part of the school-to-prison pipeline. Logistic regression allows me to investigate transgender people's outcomes in terms of both their gender identity (transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries) and their race. Collectively, the results from this section demonstrate that there is a progression from a hostile educational climate for transgender people to

negative future outcomes, including lower educational attainment and incarceration, which will have repercussions throughout people's lives.

This section also theorizes about intersectionality. I focus on race and gender, which are not only identities but also entire systems of inequality. All people hold multiple statuses at once (e.g., everyone has a racial identity, gender identity, social class, etc., which come together to construct a unique person) (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). This influences how social scientists interpret intersectionality: identity categories are culturally distinct and intersect in social relations (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). Thus race is an essential part of the concepts of masculinity and femininity: mainstream views on these concepts are white-centric (e.g. Branch 2011, Pascoe 2005). As Branch (2011) explained, the racialization of gender identity is built into the structure of society and influences all social interaction. While people have the agency to construct their racial and gender identities, their behavior is simultaneously constrained by social expectations surrounding gender and race.

The results from this section display distinctions on the bases of gender identity and race. Though all transgender people are vulnerable in school settings, some racial groups are more vulnerable than others. When looking at graduation rates, black and Latino transgender people are less likely to graduate than white transgender people, and Latino transgender people are more likely to leave school due to harassment than white transgender people. There was no statistically significant difference between the outcomes of whites and Asians. This is consistent with research indicating that blacks and Latinos tend to experience the most bias in schools relative to whites (Mitchum and Moodie-Mills 2014). LGBT people of color experience marginalization from multiple sectors of society: they have less social support from families and communities for their

school performance, and school officials typically have limited knowledge of working with multiply marginalized populations and attending to their complex needs (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016).

When comparing on the basis of gender identity, only female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender men have better outcomes than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries; transgender women have worse. Compared to female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, all the statistically significant coefficients other than one indicate that male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender women have worse outcomes. Results pointing to high penalties for transgender women and male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are consistent with theory pointing to how transgender people who are or have been biologically male are targets of fear and disgust (Westbrook and Schilt 2013). Compared to male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, those who are female-assigned-at-birth are less likely to leave school due to harassment and more likely to graduate from high school and college. Transgender men are more likely to graduate from high school than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries. The findings regarding transgender men and female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries suggest that people are more tolerant of gender variance in a person who is or was assigned female. There were no statistically significant differences between transgender men and female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, suggesting that these groups tend to have similar trajectories. Finally, this section has determined that transgender people who leave school due to harassment are more likely to enter the school-to-prison pipeline. In other words, there is a sequence of negative events in the lives of some transgender people. This analysis sets the stage for Section 3, Transgender People in Work Settings, through providing a framework for understanding how discriminatory educational experiences can negatively influence people's life course.

C. Transgender People in Work Settings

The study of transgender people in work settings theorizes about a variety of factors that work against transgender people in the workplace. For example, because it is difficult to get identity documents to reflect one's gender identity, conflicts between documents are common, and these conflicts, or conflicts between documents and one's appearance, can be an avenue for bias (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). If people are outed in the workplace, prejudiced gossip can spread (Herman 2013). Gender-specific dress codes can require someone to dress in a manner inconsistent with their identity and lead to job loss if someone does not comply (Levi 2007). In other words, people may be forced to dress according to the gender on their legal documentation, even if that is not their gender identity, or be punished or fired (Levi 2007). Not all workplaces have policies acknowledging and protecting transgender people, and when these do exist, they may elicit confusion and negative reactions. Employer bias is also part of transgender employment inequality; many employers prefer for the most visible employees to be those who are similar to them and who do not disrupt existing social norms (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005), leaving out transgender people and people of color.

The analysis of transgender people in the workplace also uses the NTDS. In order to investigate how being out as transgender can lead to negative employment outcomes due to bias, I use logistic regression to compare within nonbinaries and among transgender groups on several employment variables. These variables are: whether the respondent is currently unemployed; and whether as a result of anti-transgender bias the respondent has been underemployed, lost a job, been denied a promotion, or been removed from direct contact with clients, customers, or patients. This section suggests that being out at the workplace as nonbinary is sometimes associated with negative

outcomes. Controlling for age, nonbinaries who are out at the workplace are less likely to be unemployed but more likely to have been denied a promotion, suggesting that some employers discriminate against nonbinaries in access to authority even if they are willing to hire them. Furthermore, the experiences of nonbinaries who are out at the workplace differ based on sex assigned at birth. Outness does not increase the odds of unemployment for nonbinaries assigned male at birth, but it is associated with substantially lower unemployment among those who were assigned female at birth. In contrast, outness does not increase the odds of underemployment, job loss, denial of promotion, or removal from contact with clients, customers, or patients for nonbinaries assigned male at birth but is associated with higher levels of those four negative employment outcomes for nonbinaries assigned female at birth. These interactions suggest that employers are inclined to police what they perceive as a rejection of femininity in a person assigned female at birth who is out as nonbinary among people currently in their employment. However, discrimination is not the only possible explanation for why employment outcomes differ between nonbinaries who are male-assigned-at-birth and those who are female-assigned-at-birth. It is possible that other life experiences or human capital factors contribute to differences in outcomes.

The racial biases that are prevalent among cisgender people in the workplace are replicated among transgender people. Black transgender people are more likely to be unemployed, to have lost a job, and to have been removed from direct contact with customers, clients, or patients than whites. Transgender people of mixed race are more likely to be underemployed, to have lost a job, to have been denied a promotion, and to have been removed from direct contact with customers, clients, or patients than whites. These results suggest that people of color are stereotyped as threatening, angry, or violent

(Schilt 2010). This is because the actions of people of color are more heavily policed than the actions of whites (Wernick et al. 2014). Because employers' perceptions of soft skills are subjective, these perceptions are vulnerable to racial bias (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Employers tend to assume that whites have superior soft skills, and implicit racial bias influences how they view people of color. Blacks tend to be viewed as particularly unfriendly and intimidating (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005).

Finally, when the three different transgender groups (transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries) are compared, there is evidence that some outcomes are worse for transgender women. Specifically, transgender women are more likely to have lost a job and to have been removed from direct contact with clients, customers, or patients compared to nonbinaries. There are no statistically significant differences between the outcomes of transgender men and nonbinaries, suggesting again that being a woman leads to the most negative outcomes. The fact that transgender women are likely to lose a job due to bias suggests that their transitions place them in a gender system in which women, and their work, are devalued (Schilt and Connell 2007). Furthermore, this result corroborates prior research on transgender women's experiences, such as the fact that transgender women are frequently the target of fear and disgust (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012; Westbrook and Schilt 2013).

In summary, my dissertation seeks to add to sociological research on gender in educational and work contexts through complicating gender. I build upon the wealth of existing research that focuses on cisgender men and women to (1) acknowledge variability in cisgender men's and women's gender expression and (2) acknowledge transgender identities. I use college as a setting to investigate how gender expression influences choice of college major, thus contributing to this literature through evaluating

how both gender identity and expression contribute to differences in major choice. In addition, I uncover the results of anti-transgender bias in both education and work, acknowledging how this bias can differ based on gender identity and race. My dissertation finds that complicating gender is a useful task for helping modern social scientists understand gender inequality in these two settings.

It is important for social scientists to do research on distinctions between men and women. This is consistent with Ridgeway's (2011) concept of sex/gender as a primary classification system—something generally easily visible that people use to simplify their understanding of social life. However, prior research on gendered expectations has demonstrated that they are socially constructed and can vary widely across time and place. Furthermore, at times, sex and gender do not line up, as in the case of transgender people. When looking at educational and employment settings, both gender variation within sex assigned at birth (i.e., differences in gender expression among cisgender people) and variations in sex assigned at birth within gender identity categories (i.e., transgender people) are important. Thus, this dissertation furthers social science through using different and comprehensive measurements to complicate gender.

CHAPTER 2

CISGENDER MEN AND WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

A. Abstract

Despite the growing parity in educational attainment for women and men, there are persistent differences in the gender composition of academic majors (Charles and Bradley 2009; England 2010; England and Li 2006). Gendered traits, held in different combinations by both men and women, may be related to their choices of college major. However, most sociological research on the educational trajectories of men and women makes distinctions purely based on gender identity, which does not acknowledge variability in gender expression within a gender identity. This chapter mitigates this limitation through identifying how men's and women's masculinity and femininity are associated with the gender balance of the major they choose. This study uses data from Add Health, a national, randomly sampled longitudinal study. This dataset contains the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), which places people into one of four gender categories (masculine, feminine, androgynous [both masculine and feminine], or undifferentiated [neither masculine nor feminine]). The BSRI complicates the two-category measure of gender; anyone of any gender identity can express any of these four categories. Using OLS regression, this study finds that gendered traits and major choice operate differently for men and women. Men who are feminine tend to have majors that fit their gender expression; however, women who are not feminine tend to have majors that are more women-dominated, possibly in order to minimize their masculinity. My research thus shows that the relationship between gender and field of study is more complex than it seems on the surface. Men who express the devalued characteristic of femininity are likely to fit into a women-dominated major, but men who can express masculinity, and

move into a major that is less women-dominated, are likely to do so. But women are criticized for taking on traits that conflict with their subordinate status, so women who do not have feminine traits may take on majors with a higher percentage of women to fit in better and avoid censure. Alternately, it is possible that women expressing the agentic traits commonly associated with masculinity may choose women-dominated majors so as to achieve leadership positions over those people in the field who express less of these traits.

B. Theory

1. Gender and Education

There are differences between men and women in representation in higher education, as well as in particular fields, which have implications for earnings (Charles and Bradley 2009; England and Li 2006). Gender differences in field of study are associated with both people's gender identity (England and Li 2006) and people's masculine or feminine traits. For example, people who express more stereotypically masculine traits are more likely to be in men-dominated fields (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2013). Similarly, McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray (2010), in their study of attrition rates in nursing education, explored the degree to which perceived gender identity fit with field composition influences college success. They investigated both gender identity and masculinity and femininity in this study. They determined that women are more likely to complete a nursing degree than men and that people (regardless of gender) who think nursing, a women-dominated field, is most appropriate for women are more likely to complete a nursing degree than those who think it is appropriate for everyone (McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray 2010). In both of these studies, masculinity and femininity were measured at the same time as the field someone is in; thus causality

cannot be determined. In McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray's (2010) study, however, attrition rates were measured after measuring gender and field, suggesting that fit within a major influences success.

Numerous factors intersect with gender. Women students from a lower socioeconomic status are less likely than those from a higher socioeconomic status to be in women-dominated majors (Ma 2009). Women-dominated majors tend to lead to less lucrative careers, and women students from a lower socioeconomic status who have the opportunity to attend college tend to use this opportunity to train for higher-paying jobs; in contrast, those from a higher socioeconomic status think of college as a natural step in their educational careers and use it as an opportunity to receive qualifications for a job they perceive to have altruistic rewards (Ma 2009). In contrast, men of all socioeconomic statuses are inclined to aspire to lucrative careers (Goyette and Mullen 2006; Ma 2009). Differences between men and women in field of study are related to differences between men and women in workplace outcomes; a large proportion of the wage gap between men and women is accounted for by gender segregation in industry and occupation—though other factors, such as discrimination and segregation by firm, also play a role (Blau and Kahn 2007). Women's experiences in educational and employment settings can be understood by looking at how the feminist revolution has operated (England 2010). The feminist message that women should have equal access to jobs and education was well received, because it resonated with liberal individualism (England 2010). However, the feminist message that challenged the devaluation of work that was traditionally associated with women was less popular (England 2010). As a result, men have not moved into traditionally women-dominated fields (England 2010; England and Li 2006).

People may feel drawn to environments in which they are the numerically dominant group, because “tokens,” or numeric minorities, can experience negative outcomes (Kanter 1977). Tokens are easily visible; their behavior is held up as a standard for their entire group; their status as a token tends to overshadow their work; and when their work is exceptionally good, dominants can feel threatened (Kanter 1977). Women in men-dominated workplaces may be placed into a stereotypical women's role, including a mother figure, a sex object, a childlike person, or a radical feminist (Kanter 1977). Tokens may find it easier to act conservatively and accept their stereotyped role than to challenge gender bias (Kanter 1977). Women may be assumed to have lower-status roles, while men ride a “glass escalator” to faster promotion (Williams 1992).

Socioeconomic status differences or the lack thereof vary by race; for example, racial minority students of different socioeconomic statuses are equally likely to aspire to be doctors (Ma 2009). This concurs with the fact that men's roles have not changed to the same extent that women's have (Konrad and Harris 2002), as well as the fact that black people have historically downplayed or been excluded from white-centric gender roles as they have engaged in the labor market for financial survival (Branch 2011; Konrad and Harris 2002). However, because people of color are disproportionately of lower socioeconomic status than whites (and thus tend to have access to worse K-12 education), they may be more likely to switch out of lucrative, men-dominated STEM fields due to a perceived lack of academic preparedness (Ma 2009). Similarly, Lareau (2003) described how social class has the strongest influence on young people's outcomes as they grow up, because families from working-class and middle-class backgrounds, regardless of race, offer different opportunities to children with regard to training for education and work.

Gender bias in educational spaces appears even at the most subtle levels. McGeown et al. (2012) studied both sex and gender (defined as masculinity and femininity) to see how they influenced reading skill and motivation for children. McGeown et al. (2012) found that although there were no sex differences in reading skill, intrinsic motivation for reading was more influenced by masculinity or femininity than sex, with more feminine people having more motivation (though the children did tend to express the gender associated with their sex). School itself may also be gendered. Heyder and Kessels (2013) built upon research on math-male and language-female stereotypes to evaluate gender stereotypes associated with school itself. They determined that students did associate school more strongly with female than male and that this had effects on boys' performance; the more they associated school with femininity, the lower their language scores were (though there was no influence on their math scores). Thus grades may be related to masculinity and femininity.

Masculinity and femininity are broad concepts that vary widely across time, region, and race. There are also simpler and more targeted methods of complicating gender that can be used to study higher education outcomes. One is measuring gender beliefs. Having more education is associated with more egalitarian gender beliefs (Campbell and Horowitz 2016), but it is unclear whether this is the result of exposure or self-selection (Bolzendahl and Meyers 2004). Both boys and girls who hold more egalitarian beliefs are more likely to desire a college degree (Davis and Greenstein 2009). Theories explaining how exposure to the college environment can influence gender egalitarianism point to college as a space where people learn about different cultures and ideas and a space where diverse people can congregate to develop alternative ideologies (Campbell and Horowitz 2016). Students' levels of gender traditionalism decline as they

progress through college; thus educational attainment and gender egalitarianism may be positively associated (Bryant 2003).

Most people label their gender identity as cisgender man or cisgender woman, and for many people, this label corresponds to the sex they were assigned at birth. People of any gender identity can express (or not express) gendered traits (those traditionally associated with masculinity or femininity). Decades ago, it was common for social scientists to portray masculinity and femininity as opposite ends of one dimension (Bem 1974). However, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was influential in changing this viewpoint, and this scale continues in use today. The BSRI places people into one of the four gender categories (masculine, feminine, androgynous [both masculine and feminine], or undifferentiated [neither masculine nor feminine]) according to a self-report. Anyone of any gender identity can express masculinity, femininity, both, or neither; in other words, people may or may not express the gendered traits stereotypically associated with their gender identity. Bem theorized that it is most useful socially to be androgynous so that one can draw upon a vast variety of positive traits, rather than only those stereotypically associated with one's own gender identity (Bem 1974). In other words, the BSRI serves to complicate the notion of gender. It intersects with gender identity to allow social scientists to further distinguish among men and among women instead of treating those categories as homogeneous groups. This is important, because it enables social scientists to approach the question of how educational spaces are gendered—the detailed notions of gender in the BSRI approach questions of traditionalism versus liberalism and, thus, of gendered “fit.”

Terminology for masculinity and femininity varies; the traits stereotypically associated with men and women can be separated into the concepts of “agency versus

communion” or “instrumental versus expressive” (Ridgeway 2011). Such concepts purport to make a distinction between active, task-oriented behavior and nurturing, people-oriented behavior (Bem 1974). These terms become gendered due to the assumption that they are most appropriate for either men or women, and the assumption that masculinity and femininity are bipolar ends of one continuum (Bem 1974). In any case, however, these concepts always have gendered effects; they are not only descriptive but also prescriptive, so they allow space for perceived deviations to be punished (Ridgeway 2011). In a study of the BSRI, Hoffman and Borders (2001) found that about half of the traits labeled masculine (e.g., respondent defends their own beliefs, respondent is willing to take a stand) were judged to be neutral about 25 years after the BSRI was invented. Only one trait labeled feminine (loyal) was judged to be neutral at that time. Similarly, Auster and Ohm (2000) found that most BSRI traits labeled feminine are still considered feminine, while only about half of the traits labeled masculine are still considered masculine. Both men and women, however, describe the ideal traits for themselves to have as a blend of masculine and feminine traits; 13 of the top 15 for both men and women were the same, including the masculine traits ambitious and independent and the feminine traits loyal and understanding (Auster and Ohm 2000). In a meta-analysis, Twenge (1997) determined that women's masculinity scores have been increasing over time; thus the difference between men and women in what is labeled “masculinity” has been in decline. This suggests that stereotypically masculine traits have been valued more than stereotypically feminine traits; stereotypically masculine traits are now more of a general behavioral standard (for everyone) rather than specific to men. Over time, women's behavior in general became more like that of men (the group valued more highly); the reverse did not occur. Furthermore, this shift reflects increases of

women in the labor force since the BSRI was invented; as more women took on career-oriented trajectories, they also took on more instrumental traits (Twenge 1997). The fact that women's femininity scores have declined over time, though their masculinity scores have been stable, also suggests that traits stereotypically associated with women are devalued (Donnelly and Twenge 2017).

People's experiences with higher education and gender egalitarianism are related to their backgrounds. Some people who are more likely to attend college are also more likely to identify as liberal even before attending college; part of the relationship between education and egalitarianism is accounted for by family influences that encourage people to both attend college and have liberal beliefs (Campbell and Horowitz 2016). Levels of gender egalitarianism may have long-reaching effects; Judge and Livingston (2008) determined that men who subscribe to more traditional gender beliefs have higher wages than those who do not, while the opposite is true for women. Occupational segregation can play a role in this inequality; men and women tend to work in gender-segregated jobs, and some gender-segregated lower-complexity jobs, such as factory work, become hyper-gendered (Judge and Livingston 2008:1008).

Because gender is a primary classification scheme (Ridgeway 2011), it is salient in all areas of life, including the educational arena. Thus judgments of fit in educational spaces are based on gender. Women's and men's masculinity scores have been converging over time (Auster and Ohm 2000; Twenge 1997), and college is a space where people can feel free to express their individuality, which may encompass transgressing gender norms (Charles and Bradley 2009). Despite these changes, people still understand that they are held accountable to gendered expectations and may act accordingly to avoid censure (Charles and Bradley 2009). People are conscious of gender norms not only in gender-

specific spaces, such as the above examples, but also in gender-integrated spaces (Ridgeway 2011). This is demonstrated, for example, when women are discriminated against when attempting to rise to higher positions in a work hierarchy; this discrimination is often based on the fact that they violate stereotypical assumptions about women's niceness and deference through projecting authority (Ridgeway 2011:115).

Overall, more masculine women and men are more likely to be in men-dominated fields, while feminine women are likely to be in women-dominated fields. In other words, gender expression is more closely related to women's outcomes more than it is to men's outcomes. Theoretically, this tells us that masculinity is the “default,” while femininity is “other”: femininity sequesters women into lower-paying, women-dominated positions, while masculinity gives people access to a wider range of options. Looking briefly at transgender women further explains this segregation. When transgender women transition, some report that people's standards for their occupational performance drop. As Lana, a transgender woman, reports:

“The only thing I remember [my business partner] saying in the entire three days was, ‘How can you expect to run a company when all you’re going to be thinking about is nail polish?’” (Schilt and Connell 2007:606)

Lana previously owned a business with three men, and when she transitioned to female, the homosocial bonds were disrupted and she was forced out of the partnership. This event is based on the business partners' assumptions that women are incapable of being serious about business. Lana's transition did not disrupt gender bias or gendered expectations; instead, she was absorbed into a system that devalues women and femininity (Schilt and Connell 2007).

Prior research has determined that people who belong to a field that corresponds to their own gender identity or gender beliefs tend to progress in that field instead of dropping out and choosing another field (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2013; McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray 2010). For example, more masculine people are more likely to both enter more men-dominated fields of study and enter more men-dominated occupations afterward, indicating that people who perceive their educational experiences to fit them tend to progress in a related career (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2013). Similarly, the more feminine women in McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray's (2010) study were more likely to complete a nursing degree.

Prior research that has addressed gendered “fit” and field suggests that people tend to belong in fields in which they feel they do fit in, but this research has tended to have a limited scope, such as focusing on one field or one gender identity. Based on this prior research, I hypothesize that women and men will have college majors in which they feel as if they fit into the major, as follows. This hypothesis contributes toward the literature because I will test it using a more varied sample, which incorporates multiple fields and both men and women. *Hypothesis 1-1: Gendered Traits and Majors Congruence:*

Observed combinations of gender identity and gendered traits should correlate with the gender composition of college major in the following ways:

A. Women with higher scores on feminine traits should be more likely observed in college majors that are women-dominated. Women with more masculine traits should be more often observed in men-dominated majors.

B. Men with higher scores on masculine traits should be more likely observed in college majors that are men-dominated. Men with more feminine traits should be more often observed in women-dominated majors.

Alternative possibilities exist, however, based on the literature on doing gender. The literature on doing gender posits that gender is a flexible characteristic (West and Zimmerman 1987). There is no pure “masculine” or “feminine” nature; instead, everyone navigates a gendered world during ordinary, day-to-day behavior (West and Zimmerman 1987). This means that gendered behavior can both influence and be influenced by the surroundings one finds themselves in or chooses to be in (West and Zimmerman 1987). When people do gender, they may feel more comfortable when at least some aspects of their gender presentation are in line with their gender identity as a man or a woman. In other words, men and women who are gender nonconforming on some attributes may want to express some other behaviors that are consistent with their gender identity.

Alternative hypotheses to 1-1 follow:

Hypothesis 1-2: Gendered Traits and Majors Incongruence:

Observed combinations of gender identity and gendered traits should correlate with the gender composition of college major in the following ways:

A. Women with higher scores on masculine traits should be more often observed in women-dominated majors.

B. Men with higher scores on feminine traits should be more often observed in men-dominated majors.

2. Race and Gender

Though the BSRI and its theoretical basis were influential for scholars, the BSRI is imperfect in that it conceptualizes and operationalizes masculinity and femininity as universal concepts when they are not—they vary across time and place. In the BSRI, each respondent indicates on a seven-point scale the degree to which twenty positive feminine characteristics (those judged to be more appropriate for women than men) describe them

and the degree to which twenty positive masculine characteristics (those judged to be more appropriate for men than women) describe them. However, these traits were developed on Stanford undergraduates in the 1970s; thus the conceptions of masculinity and femininity are particular to that time and place.

Because societal conceptions of “masculinity” and “femininity” represent white conceptions of gender, it follows that the BSRI, which is intended to measure these concepts, is also white-centric. Research has demonstrated that judgments of the BSRI differ by subculture, because people of different backgrounds have different perspectives on what behaviors are the norm (Konrad and Harris 2002). For example, the common stereotype that women's roles focus on home and family is most relevant to white middle-class people. African American people have tended to experience gender roles differently as a way of dealing with racism. Because some African American men are forced out of the labor market due to racial discrimination, African American women are more likely than white women to participate in the labor market for financial survival, in addition to tending to the home. This dynamic role sharing in African American families has been in place since slavery. Thus Konrad and Harris (2002) questioned the existence of a cohesive set of “traditional” gender roles, given diverse ways of thinking of gender roles throughout history. Because of the pervasiveness of white privilege, all people of color are marginalized by white-centric standards. This is true even for Asian Americans; recent research has been deconstructing the “model minority” stereotype (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). Asian Americans, particularly those who transgress gender norms, may feel as if they must navigate school environments with caution, because their minority status is salient (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). Asian Americans who are gender

nonconforming or LGBT may feel alienated on both racial and gender/sexuality bases (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016).

Because people of color do not benefit from white privilege, they have historically needed to express agentic traits—those traditionally associated with masculinity in white-centric society—in order to seek financial and social survival. I hypothesize that such agentic traits will appear when people of color and whites are compared with regard to field of study. *Hypothesis 1-3: People of color compared to whites are more likely to choose men-dominated majors.*

C. Data and Analytical Plan

1. Data

This section uses data from Add Health in order to answer the question of how gender expression in addition to gender identity can explain the gender composition of one's major. Add Health is a longitudinal survey designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This survey originated in wave 1 with a nationally representative sample of adolescents (ages 13-21) in 1994-1995. So far, there have been four waves of this survey. The public use Add Health data I use for my study comes from wave 3 (2001-2002; 4882 respondents), with two control variables from previous waves: wave 1 (6504 respondents) and wave 2 (1996; 4834 respondents). Add Health data was collected by interviewers who met respondents in person and inputted their responses to survey questions on computers. This survey only permits respondents to label themselves as a man or woman, so it does not allow researchers to identify who, if anyone, is transgender. Only approximately 0.3% of the population is transgender (Gates 2011), so the number of transgender people in this dataset is likely to be too small to cause noticeable error. Less

than 2% of cases were lost in the regression analyses due to missing values on some variable; however, some questions in Add Health, including those that corresponded to the Bem Sex Role Inventory, were only asked of a portion of respondents, which limits sample sizes.

2. Variables

The BSRI was present in wave 3 only, when most participants were ages 18-26. The full-size BSRI scale has 20 masculine items, 20 feminine items, and 20 neutral items (which are an attempt to reduce social desirability bias and do not figure into the calculation [Bem 1974]). The BSRI available in wave 3 of Add Health was half-size, meaning that it has only 10 questions for each gender-typed factor. These questions are available in Table 2.1. The BSRI questions were asked of one-quarter of respondents; thus sample sizes are limited. I used the masculine and feminine scales to separate respondents into Bem's (1977) categories of masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated. Men and women had approximately the same masculinity score (40 and 41 respectively), which concurs with Auster and Ohm (2000) and Hoffman and Borders (2001), who determined that many traits labeled masculine in the BSRI are now viewed as gender neutral. The four BSRI categories are constructed using a median split method, meaning that each category has an equal number of people. Someone who is above the median on both masculinity and femininity is labeled androgynous; someone below the median on both is undifferentiated. Someone above the median on femininity but below on masculinity is feminine; and someone who is the reverse is masculine.

To measure socioeconomic status, I used the variables in wave 1 regarding the mother's and father's educational level (measured on an ordinal scale: below high school; high school or equivalent; vocational school or some college; bachelor's degree; graduate

or professional school). If the survey respondent lived with one parent, I used that parent's educational status as the measure of socioeconomic status. If the respondent lived with two parents, I used the average of the parents' educational status as the measure of socioeconomic status. I also included information on students' grades, though the most recent information on grades is from wave 2. My grades measure is the average of the students' grades for English, math, history, and science (if the student took all those classes in 1996, when this wave of the survey was conducted) or the average of the classes the student did take if they did not take all four. If all the grades measurements were missing in wave 2, I used data from wave 1. Race is measured as a binary variable: whites and people of color.

Information about respondents' college major was found in wave 3, the same wave as the BSRI. As Kanter (1977) explained, there are no exact tipping points that indicate whether a situation is men-dominated or women-dominated; so to measure gender-dominated major, I used a variable with the percent women in the respondent's major in the regression analyses to allow for precision. In the descriptive statistics, the cutoff point for women-dominated is 75% or more women; and for men-dominated, 75% or more men. All other majors were labeled androgynous. These cutoffs were chosen because when sample sizes are small, more extreme cutoff points for gender segregation can impede the ability to make comparisons (Ely 1995).

3. Methods and Models

In order to test hypotheses 1-1 and 1-2, I conducted regression analyses using gender expression (masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated) as the independent variable and percentage women in the college major as the dependent variable. There are separate models for men and for women. I use these same regression

analyses to test hypothesis 1-3, in which I investigate the relationship between race and the dependent variable of percentage women in the college major. Models including an interaction between race and gender expression did not display statistical significance; thus the race effect on its own is discussed instead. It is unclear whether the lack of significance in the interactions is the result of the small number of minorities in the sample or the result of a lack of significance in the population.

D. Results

1. Descriptive Findings

Table 2.2 descriptively compares between white women, white men, women of color, and men of color on educational attainment, choice of major, secondary school grades, and the BSRI. Regarding educational attainment, women, regardless of race, are more likely to attend and complete postsecondary education than men. Almost half of all women, regardless of race, have attended college (compared to about 40% of men), while about a third have not gone beyond high school (compared to about 40% of men). Although this survey is composed of a young age group, in which some students are still at the traditional college age and have not yet had the opportunity to finish college, the fact that there is still variation in outcomes demonstrates that race and gender are influencing educational attainment. Regarding what percentage of those in college belong to a women-dominated, men-dominated, or androgynous major, about a third of women belong to a women-dominated major, in contrast to about 5% of men. Less than 5% of women belong to a men-dominated major, in contrast to about one-sixth of men. Thus, women are more crowded, or concentrated, in women-dominated majors, while men have greater access to a wider spectrum of majors. Women of color are slightly more likely to belong to a men-dominated or women-dominated major than white women; white women

are slightly more likely to belong to an androgynous major. This highlights the fact that both race and gender influence educational trajectories. Both men and women are more likely to be in gender-neutral majors. Regarding grades, women tend to perform better than men, and whites tend to perform better than people of color. BSRI scores tend to be similar across gender and racial groups. However, one noticeable difference is that white women are more likely to be feminine than women of color (21% compared to 12%). This is consistent with research indicating that mainstream conceptions of femininity are white-centric (Konrad and Harris 2002).

2. Multivariate Findings

Hypothesis 1-1 stated that more feminine women are more likely to be in women-dominated majors, while less feminine women are more likely to be in men-dominated majors. More masculine men are more likely to be in men-dominated majors, while less masculine men are more likely to be in women-dominated majors. Hypothesis 1-2 concerned men and women who are gender-nonconforming: women who are more masculine are more likely to be in women-dominated majors, and men who are more feminine are more likely to be in men-dominated majors. These hypotheses use Add Health data, and the dependent variable is the percent of women in one's major. The results related to these hypotheses depend upon how one compares across BSRI categories.

For men, being androgynous compared to feminine is associated with a decrease in the percent women in the major of 16 points, controlling for other relevant factors, and being masculine compared to feminine is associated with a decrease in the percent women in the major of 19 points, controlling for other relevant factors. Women's patterns are different from men's. For women, being androgynous compared to undifferentiated is

associated with an increase in the percent women in the major of 10 points, controlling for other relevant factors, and being masculine compared to undifferentiated is associated with an increase in the percent women in the major of 13 points, controlling for other relevant factors.

For men, being feminine is positively correlated with the percent women in one's major. This result parallels prior research (Auster and Ohm 2000; Hoffman and Borders 2001; Twenge 1997): while people are more likely to consider many of the Bem masculine traits gender-neutral, the Bem feminine traits are generally still considered feminine, indicating that femininity is a salient devalued characteristic that can influence social outcomes. This result thus supports hypothesis 1-1 and contradicts hypothesis 1-2. However, for women, masculinity and androgyny are correlated positively with the percent of women in one's major. This contradicts hypothesis 1-1 and supports hypothesis 1-2. A potential rationale for this finding is the fact that gender stereotypes are not only descriptive but also always prescriptive (Ridgeway 2011). Gender stereotypes are most obviously descriptive in that they indicate people's beliefs about how women and men behave on average (Ridgeway 2011). However, gender stereotypes are simultaneously maintained by both men and women because people have an interest in maintaining them: these gender beliefs provide a method of making sense of one's self, as well as of communication with other people (Ridgeway 2011). People who take on traits not associated with their sex tend to be more censured than people who lack the traits associated with their sex (Ridgeway 2011). When people do gender, they may thus feel more comfortable when at least some aspects of their gender presentation are in line with their gender identity as a man or a woman (Brines 1994). In other words, people who are gender nonconforming on some attributes may want to express some other behaviors that

are consistent with their gender identity. As a result, women who have masculine traits (which encompasses both androgynous and masculine women) may choose women-dominated majors because they are attempting to minimize their expression of the masculine traits that conflict with feminine expectations.

It is also meaningful that being androgynous is correlated negatively with the percentage of women in one's college major for men. In the BSRI, "androgynous" refers to someone who expresses both masculinity and femininity (Bem 1977). The fact that androgynous men have majors that are less women-dominated indicates that the "masculine" aspect of androgyny predominates when major choice is concerned.

These results suggest that femininity is highly "othered," as that was the characteristic that positively influenced the percentage of women in one's major. People understand that regardless of their own viewpoints about gender, they are held accountable to gendered expectations (Charles and Bradley 2009). Since masculinity is now a "default," (Auster and Ohm 2000), it is femininity that sequesters men who express it into lower-paying, women-dominated positions, while masculinity gives people access to a wider range of options. People who belong to a field that corresponds to their own gender identity or gender beliefs tend to progress in that field instead of dropping out and choosing another field (Antecol and Cobb-Clark 2013; McLaughlin, Muldoon, and Moutray 2010)--thus strengthening the influence of gender on people's minds and absorbing people into a system that devalues women and femininity (Schilt and Connell 2007). This is suggested by the fact that androgynous men have majors that are less women-dominated than feminine men, though both categories of men express femininity: androgynous men, who can express both masculine and feminine traits, emphasize the masculine. This further supports Ridgeway's (2011) assertion that people are more

heavily punished for displaying gendered traits they are expected not to have than for not displaying gendered traits that are associated with their sex.

Hypothesis 1-3 stated that people of color compared to whites are more likely to choose men-dominated majors. There is no support for this hypothesis, as shown in Table 2.3; race had no statistically significant relationship to percentage women in the college major, for either men or women. This negative finding may have a pro-social interpretation; it is possible that racial inequality in higher education is weakening. This would be consistent with Ma's (2009) conclusion, which identified gender as being more relevant to inequality in higher education than race. However, this potential finding should be interpreted with caution due to data limitations: Add Health does not have the means to determine changes in someone's major over time. Data on these changes would benefit sociological research on higher education through identifying why particular classes of people are disproportionately represented in particular fields upon completing college, even if they are not disproportionately represented earlier on (Ma 2009). Investigation of when and why people of different races change majors would thus be a useful topic for future research.

E. Conclusion

The results from this section indicate that Bem's (1974, 1977) theory is sensible. People of any gender identity can express any gendered traits, regardless of whether those traits are traditionally associated with masculinity or femininity. Bem (1974) was thus correct in contradicting the notion that masculinity and femininity are “opposite” traits. The concepts of masculinity and femininity purport to make a distinction between active, task-oriented behavior and nurturing, people-oriented behavior (Bem 1974).

These terms have become gendered due to the assumption that they are most appropriate for either men or women, and this section demonstrates that these traits relate to major differently for men and women. Men who are feminine have majors that fit their gender expression; however, women who are not feminine have majors that are more women-dominated, possibly in order for women to minimize their masculinity. The situation is thus more complicated than my hypothesis suggested. For men, is primarily femininity, a devalued characteristic, operating on its own that encourages people to fit into a women-dominated major. Those who can express masculinity, and move into a major that is less women-dominated, are likely to do so. Women, who are more highly policed than men, have more constraints. Even though women's masculinity scores have been rising (Auster and Ohm 2000; Twenge 1997), women are criticized for taking on traits that conflict with their subordinate status (Ridgeway 2011). As a result, women who do not have feminine traits may belong to majors with a higher percentage of women to fit in better and avoid censure. It is important to remember, however, that the data these results were derived from was collected approximately 20 years ago. It is possible that women nowadays are less censured for expressing masculinity, since the trend of increasing masculinity in women has been going on for so long. In contrast, femininity is still devalued.

The results from this section suggest that differences in gender composition of college majors depends on more than just gender identity; these differences are based on a complex interplay between gender identity, gender expression, and gender stereotyping of academic fields (Heyder and Kessels 2013). In addition, gendered behavior is based on people's knowledge of social norms; people are more likely to succeed in a task when they believe their performance in that task is desirable (Heyder and Kessels 2013).

Women's experiences in fields of study are highly policed; their experiences in college majors are highly conditioned by social norms regarding a sense of belonging and a sense of competence (Stout et al. 2010). This study suggests that women who do not conform to gender norms may be a part of women-dominated majors as a way of affirming femininity. Future research on how gender identity and gender expression are associated with field of study would benefit from including variables concerning people's evaluation of their own competence in different academic subjects (e.g., language, math). Women compared to men have less of a sense that they belong in STEM professions; this is a result of a long history of factors (Stout et al. 2010). From a young age, people tend to attribute boys' success in STEM fields to innate talent (Stout et al. 2010). In addition, science curriculum minimizes women scientists' accomplishments, and women may feel like outcasts when they are the numeric minority in classrooms (Stout et al. 2010). Students' expectations of fields of study tend to be solidified by the time they reach college; thus interventions targeted toward younger people may be necessary in order to disrupt gender inequality (Zafar 2010). Further research could identify how exclusionary environments moderate the effects of gender expression for men and women.

Future research would also benefit from identifying how the gendering of fields changes over time. The way in which people perceive masculinity and femininity as they relate to a field of study can shift across time and place (Charles and Bradley 2009). For example, muscularity is a stereotypically masculine trait traditionally associated with working-class jobs, while logic is a stereotypically masculine trait traditionally associated with white-collar jobs. Furthermore, deviations from general trends are possible, based on the local context (Charles and Bradley 2009; Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012).

Social scientists must do research on distinctions between men and women. This is because the binary gender categories are a primary classification system—a status many people believe in that is easily visible, which people use to simplify their understanding of social life (Ridgeway 2011). Research on these distinctions can improve women's well being; for example, research on gender and field of study can identify factors that drive people out of gender-atypical fields (Stout et al. 2010). However, since conceptions of masculinity and femininity are socially constructed and vary widely across time and place, it is also illuminating to complicate gender through measures of gender in addition to the categories of men and women, as this study did.

The fact that BSRI coefficients were frequently nonsignificant further reinforces the notion that the concepts of masculinity and femininity are broad and subjective. It may be impossible to construct an overall measure of masculinity or femininity, as Bem (1974) attempted to do, because of the degree of distinction between different types of people and change over time. The fact that femininity was statistically significant indicates, consistent with theory (Hoffman and Borders 2001), that this gender expression is still constructed as “other,” while masculinity is valued and default.

In general, I have determined that the general theme of the BSRI (that gender is more than just the identity categories of men and women) remains. However, because the BSRI was a product of a college convenience sample at a particular time and place, the BSRI itself is somewhat outdated, as well as white-centric. Respondents to the BSRI rate the degree to which twenty characteristics judged to be more appropriate for women than men describe them and the degree to which twenty characteristics judged to be more appropriate for men than women describe them. However, these traits were developed on Stanford undergraduates in the 1970s; thus the conceptions of masculinity and femininity

are particular to that time and place. In order to better understand how people conceptualize masculinity and femininity nowadays (whether in the context of education or any other context), it may be useful to construct a BSRI-type analysis again. While there has been much research evaluating the BSRI, there has not been research that attempts to replicate what Bem (1974) did, which was to construct scales of masculinity and femininity. Since the original BSRI was developed on a more privileged population, it would be valuable to replicate the BSRI on a more diverse selection of people, on the bases of gender, race, region, and social class. Such a replication would quantify demographic differences in conceptions of gender that have emerged through qualitative studies (Branch 2011; Pascoe 2005).

There has been some convergence in people's viewpoints about masculine and feminine traits. In recent times, both women and men say they would ideally like to have a blend of traditionally masculine and feminine traits (Auster and Ohm 2000). Women's masculinity scores have been increasing over time; thus the difference between men and women in what is labeled "masculinity" has been in decline (Twenge 1997). However, most BSRI feminine traits are still judged to be feminine (Hoffman and Borders 2001), which concurs with the current study, in which femininity is a salient othered characteristic. Much research evaluating the BSRI since it was created has looked into the degree to which people judge the BSRI traits as masculine or feminine, or into the degree to which people have, or would like to have, those traits. Future research would benefit from identifying qualitatively why people hold these viewpoints. What life experiences contribute to their labeling themselves with particular feminine or masculine traits? What personal traits would people like to have, and why do they feel as if those traits would

benefit them? Such a study may contribute to a revision of the BSRI as suggested in the previous paragraph.

F. Tables

Table 2.1: BSRI Questions (Add Health)

Feminine	Masculine
I am affectionate.	I defend my own beliefs.
I am sympathetic.	I am independent.
I am sensitive to the needs of others.	I am assertive.
I am understanding	I have a strong personality.
I am compassionate.	I am forceful.
I am eager to soothe hurt feelings.	I have leadership abilities.
I am warm.	I am willing to take risks.
I am tender.	I am dominant.
I love children.	I am willing to take a stand.
I am gentle.	I am aggressive.

Table 2.2: Descriptive Statistics: Education (Add Health)

	Women of Color	White Women	Men of Color	White Men
Educational Attainment				
Below High School	10.5%	7.0%	11.9%	9.2%
High School or Equivalent	33.0%	30.4%	43.3%	39.3%
Vocational School or Some College	46.0%	48.1%	37.9%	41.0%
Bachelor's Degree	9.0%	12.1%	5.4%	8.8%
Graduate or Professional School	1.3%	2.5%	1.5%	1.7%
N	634	1418	495	1252
Choice of Major (Among Respondents Who Attended College)				
Women-Dominated	36.4%	29.2%	5.0%	6.5%
Androgynous	60.0%	68.9%	80.0%	78.8%
Men-Dominated	3.5%	1.9%	15.0%	14.7%
N	87	234	41	166
Grades (Secondary School)				
A	9.6%	20.7%	5.2%	10.9%
B	52.8%	53.2%	32.7%	45.8%
C	33.2%	22.2%	39.2%	40.0%
D or Lower	4.4%	3.9%	22.9%	7.3%
N	614	1369	554	1254
BSRI Categories				
Feminine	12.3%	20.8%	13.0%	16.4%
Masculine	19.3%	16.3%	16.0%	19.2%
Androgynous	29.4%	26.5%	33.0%	30.0%
Undifferentiated	39.0%	36.4%	38.0%	34.5%
N	187	442	100	287

Cutoff point for women-dominated is 75% or more women; for men-dominated, 75% or more men. All other majors were labeled androgynous.

Table 2.3: OLS Regression: Bem Categories as IV and Percent Women in College Major as DV (Add Health)

Regressions for Women				
	Undifferentiated as Reference Category	Androgynous as Reference Category	Feminine as Reference Category	Masculine as Reference Category
Undifferentiated		-9.61* (4.19)	-5.85 (4.98)	-12.71* (6.22)
Androgynous	9.61* (4.19)		3.76 (4.76)	-3.09 (5.99)
Feminine	5.85 (4.98)	-3.77 (4.76)		-6.86 (6.57)
Masculine	12.71* (6.22)	3.09 (6.00)	6.86 (6.57)	
Age	0.07 (1.62)	0.07 (1.62)	0.07 (1.62)	0.07 (1.62)
White	0.35 (3.93)	0.35 (3.93)	0.35 (3.93)	0.35 (3.93)
Grades	-1.40 (2.87)	-1.40 (2.87)	-1.40 (2.87)	-1.40 (2.87)
Socioeconomic Status	0.56 (1.57)	0.56 (1.57)	0.56 (1.57)	0.56 (1.57)
N	321	321	321	321
Regressions for Men				
	Undifferentiated as Reference Category	Androgynous as Reference Category	Feminine as Reference Category	Masculine as Reference Category
Undifferentiated		-4.68 (7.18)	-16.18^ (9.39)	2.41 (9.07)
Androgynous	4.68 (7.18)		-11.50 (8.12)	7.09 (7.86)
Feminine	16.18^ (9.39)	11.50 (8.12)		18.59^ (10.14)
Masculine	-2.41 (9.07)	-7.09 (7.86)	-18.59^ (10.14)	
Age	-0.00 (3.33)	-0.00 (3.33)	-0.00 (3.33)	-0.00 (3.33)
White	10.29 (7.37)	10.29 (7.37)	10.29 (7.37)	10.29 (7.37)

Grades	-8.25 (6.97)	-8.25 (6.97)	-8.25 (6.97)	-8.25 (6.97)
Socioeconomic Status	0.66 (3.15)	0.66 (3.15)	0.66 (3.15)	0.66 (3.15)
N	207	207	207	207

^ p<.1; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

CHAPTER 3

TRANSGENDER PEOPLE IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

A. Abstract

Transgender people are those whose gender identity (their sense of their own sex and/or gender expression) differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. People may consider themselves transgender because of their feelings about their biological sex, because of their feelings about societal gender roles, or both. Many factors contribute to bias against transgender people in educational settings, including ignorance among teachers and staff of transgender issues; teachers' refusal to intervene when transphobic bullying takes place; prejudice among teachers and staff; and harassment in gender-segregated spaces such as bathrooms and locker rooms. To evaluate how harassment and discrimination in educational settings, both K-12 and postsecondary, influence the educational attainment of transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinary transgender people, I use data from the National Transgender Discrimination Survey, a nonrandom but large-scale survey of transgender people. Using logistic regression, I find that although all transgender people experience negative school outcomes, some groups are more vulnerable to poor outcomes than others. Specifically, only female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender men have better outcomes than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries; and transgender women have the worst outcomes. Race and ethnicity also matter in shaping the educational outcomes of transgender people: black and Latino transgender people have worse outcomes than white transgender people. Finally, my analyses reveal that transgender people who leave school due to harassment are more likely to enter the school-to-prison pipeline. Thus, the negative educational outcomes of transgender people have long-lasting impacts that shape their pathways after leaving

school. In the next section, I delineate concepts of transgender identity and discuss the impact of gender transition that occurs in school settings.

B. Theory

1. What is a Transgender Person?

Gender identity refers to someone's internal sense of being a man, a woman, or a nonbinary gender. Transgender terminology is complex and rapidly changing.

“Transgender” is an umbrella term that refers to people whose gender identity differs from the sex they were assigned at birth, and the term “cisgender” refers to people whose gender identity corresponds to the sex they were assigned at birth. Thus, someone who is not transgender is cisgender. Gender identity may be based on someone's feelings about their biological sex, their feelings about societal gender roles; or both. Sex is a biological category: the designations of male, female, and intersex are based on a number of factors, including chromosomes, hormones, and genitalia. Though it is typical to view sex as a binary of male and female, categorization has varied across time and place (Fausto-Sterling 2000). Gender expression is distinct from sex, but related: it is the translation of biological realities into social expectations for “men” and “women” (Beemyn and Rankin 2011; Sausa 2002). As with sex, it is common to view gender expression as a binary. Moreover, it is common to marginalize expression that does not conform to this binary.

Gender identity refers to individual people's sense of their own sex and/or gender expression, which may differ from the way other people perceive their sex and/or gender expression (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). People may consider themselves transgender because of their feelings about their biological sex, because of their feelings about gender roles, or both. Gender identity is distinct from sexual orientation, which is the pattern of a person's attraction to others (Sausa 2002). Both transgender and cisgender people may

identify with any sexual orientation, including but not limited to heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, or asexual (Beemyn and Rankin 2011).

People's gender identity may be man or woman, or it may be something else, such as both man and woman, neither man nor woman, or a unique identity. For example, Beemyn and Rankin (2011) conducted a survey in 2005 and 2006, which was open to anyone who considered themselves part of the umbrella term “transgender.” As in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey, there were varied written responses, some of which were unique. Some gender identities that fall under the umbrella term “nonbinary gender” are genderqueer, agender, androgynous, Two-Spirit, gender nonconforming, gender variant, third gender, genderfluid, and bigender. There are no definitive definitions or universal experiences associated with any of these gender identities; they may reflect someone's feelings about their body, their feelings about gender roles, or both (Beemyn and Rankin 2011).

Gender dysphoria refers to transgender people's feelings of distress because of the mismatch between their sex assigned at birth and their gender identity. Gender dysphoria can take the form of physical dysphoria, which is distress regarding sex characteristics such as genitals, breasts and facial hair; social dysphoria, which is distress regarding social interactions such as being perceived as the incorrect gender identity or being forced to wear clothing associated with the incorrect gender identity; or both physical and social dysphoria. All three transgender groups (transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries) can experience physical and/or social dysphoria.

“Transitioning” refers to the process of asserting one's gender identity, which may entail social changes (e.g., manner of dressing or pronoun choice), physical changes (e.g., hormones and surgeries), or both. Transitioning is associated with improvements in

transgender people's emotional health, and psychologists view it as the most effective way to treat gender dysphoria (Winter et al. 2016). However, for many transgender people, medical care for the transition process is unavailable, difficult to access, or difficult to afford (Winter et al. 2016). Even when transition-related healthcare is available, healthcare providers frequently discriminate through providing inadequate care or expressing hostility (Winter et al. 2016). The difficulties with healthcare indicate that transgender people are routinely dehumanized (Winter et al. 2016).

Transgender people have always existed—there have always been people who experience sex dysphoria, as well as people who do not conform to the gender norms of their region and time period. The terminology to refer to the people now known as “transgender” has changed over time, however. For example, there have been societies that have more than two primary gender categories, in contrast to the Western gender binary that currently exists. In addition, what constitutes gender conformity and gender nonconformity has changed across time and place. One example of a society that has a third gender category is India, in which three gender categories are constructed: men, women, and hijra (Herdt 1996). Hijras are intersex or castrated males who hold a ritual caste role (Herdt 1996). Thus, this category is an example of a large, well-established civilization that has had a gender system that incorporates more than just the gender binary.

Though transgender people have always existed, terminology is complex and has changed in drastic ways, and the terminology that is available has real effects on how people interpret their feelings and experiences. Beemyn and Rankin (2011) wrote an account of transgender people's life course experiences, based on a mixed-methods study. This study began with a survey that was spread widely, to transgender listservs, support

groups, public figures, and websites. People who completed the survey were offered the opportunity to participate in interviews to elaborate on their experiences. A total of 3474 people took the survey, and 419 of those participated in an interview.

As Beemyn and Rankin (2011) describe, until the 1990s, Western transgender communities tended to have narrow and specific expectations for their members. There were strict expectations for crossdressers (men who occasionally wore women's clothing as a performance but did not want to change their bodies) and transgender women (who did want to change their bodies from male to female). These were the only “transgender” identity categories at the time; there was no collective understanding even among LGBT communities that nonbinary genders or transgender men existed. The fact that there was no terminology for nonbinaries and transgender men affected how these two groups understood their own identities (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). For example, among transgender men, many of them identified as lesbians (a well-known category that was commonly associated with gender nonconformity) before realizing that the category of transgender men better fit their feelings and experiences. Transgender women, however, were less likely to identify as something else before identifying as transgender women, because that category was already known.

There is not only one transition process for transgender people, even within a category (e.g., transgender women) (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). Even though most transgender people felt “different” as small children, they asserted their identity differently and at different times. For example, most people assigned female at birth who did not identify with femininity were able to express masculinity or other gender-nonconformity as children safely. In contrast, most people assigned male at birth were not able to deviate from masculinity, and if they did, they were victims of assault,

experienced abuse from caretakers, or were sent to psychiatrists because their caretakers believed they had mental disorders (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). Transgender people must carefully determine throughout their lives how and when to express their gender identity. Beemyn and Rankin's (2011) data reveal the diversity of ways individuals express gender identity. Some adults, particularly transgender women, try to suppress their identity out of shame. Some transgender women take on hypermasculine occupations such as the military and only later in life feel a crisis in which they choose to express their true selves. For these people, they know transition is an option but elect to attempt to cover up their identity. In contrast, for people assigned female at birth, part of the transition process often includes acknowledging that the option to identify as something other than a woman exists, since male-to-female transitions were the most common transgender experience in the mass media. As Internet access becomes more commonplace, however, differences among transgender groups in how they tend to transition have been disappearing, since accurate information on transgender people is easier to find and most people have access to the same information (Beemyn and Rankin 2011).

In the following sections, I consider how gender identities, transitioning processes, and educational settings intersect to produce suboptimal outcomes for gender and racial minorities.

2. Harassment and Discrimination

College is increasingly becoming a common time for transgender people to transition (Beemyn et al. 2005). When comparing among youth, there is evidence that bullying of LGBT people declines over time, when comparing middle school to high school (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). This decrease in bias may reflect more information and thus better understanding of LGBT people over time (Kosciw, Greytak,

and Diaz 2009). However, as transgender people become more visible and they become more willing to express their gender identity in public at colleges, a backlash of harassment and discrimination has occurred (Sausa 2002). This harassment and discrimination is sometimes similar to that experienced by K-12 students. People may call a transgender person by incorrectly gendered terminology, possibly in a public setting that may cause embarrassment (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). This can be related to another form of harassment, that of violating someone's bodily privacy by asking intrusive questions or making intrusive comments about someone's primary or secondary sex characteristics. For example, people may say that a person presenting as feminine is a man or ask that person what type of genitalia they have. Other forms of harassment include assuming that a transgender or gender nonconforming person has sexually transmitted diseases or is sexually deviant, using transphobic slurs, and denying or minimizing a transgender or gender nonconforming person's experiences of transphobia (Nadal et al. 2012). Some transgender or gender non-conforming people fear being physically attacked because of this verbal harassment, and some do report physical or sexual harassment because of their gender identity or gender presentation, especially people of color (Nadal et al. 2012; Grant et al. 2011).

In summary, the transition processes for transgender people are diverse. Because educational and work settings, particularly college, are a space where young people are figuring out their identity (Beemyn 2005), it is theoretically useful to study transgender people in these settings. In schools, transgender people may change their name, may explore medical transition procedures, and may visually present themselves as their gender identity instead of the sex they were assigned at birth (Beemyn 2005).

Transitioning in school settings can incite bias on the part of other people. As one student in Snapp et al.'s (2015) study reported:

“The teachers . . . they thought we were selling weed in school, they thought that me and her were both selling weed ‘cause like, the way we were dressing, ‘cause we were the only girls at that middle school that dressed like boys. So it was like ‘now we’re bad.’” (Snapp et al. 2015:67)

Socially constructed categories are part of how gender operates for everyone, not only for transgender people. Ridgeway (2011) described how social relations are based on shared knowledge. Drawing on Goffman, she stated that everyday interactions are based on people's ability to coordinate behavior according to a consensus about how actors in a situation are related to one another and how they can be expected to act (2011:35-36). In order to define who people are and whom those people can be compared to, categories are needed. Because categories are based on contrast and differentiation, social coordination is thus based on directing people's attention to differences between people (Ridgeway 2011:36-37). In order to facilitate everyday interaction, simple categorical systems are necessary. These “primary category systems” must be broad so that they can apply to nearly everyone; thus they must be applicable to many contexts and easily visible. Ridgeway described “sex/gender” as a primary category. The biological baseline of sex becomes culturally specific gender through expanding its range of application (further away from reproductive functions) and expanding behavioral expectations.

Contemporary gender stereotypes incorporate status beliefs: traits associated with men are seen as having more power and higher status than traits associated with women (Ridgeway 2011). Stereotypical traits and differential power and status reinforce each

other in “status hierarchies” (Ridgeway 2011). Cultural lag contributes to the persistence of gender inequality; this means that cultural beliefs about gender lag behind material arrangements based on gender. People's stereotypes change more slowly than their own behavior, and because stereotypes are used when people coordinate their behavior with others', cultural beliefs about gender remain even as people navigate new situations. Confirmation bias can reinforce these cultural beliefs (Ridgeway 2011). Furthermore, formal structures integrate with biases to reinforce inequality (Stainback et al. 2010). In school settings, these hierarchies manifest themselves when other students, or even teachers and staff, treat transgender and gender-nonconforming students differently (Snapp et al. 2015). Transgender and gender-nonconforming students are easily visible, and their visibility leaves them vulnerable to excessive scrutiny (Snapp et al. 2015).

Culturally specific gender can be negotiated through everyday interaction. West and Zimmerman (1987) described gender as a performance that occurs in everyday life, in which people often judge others immediately based on their appearance. When people cannot immediately characterize someone as a woman or man, boy or girl, they become confused and often want to find some way to characterize that person in order to determine how to relate to them (West and Zimmerman 1987). In schools, transgender students have reported that both other students and teachers or staff have encouraged them to be more normative (Snapp et al. 2015).

Nonbinaries, who do not fit the gender binary, disrupt this system. Monro (2003) stated that there is no socially acceptable category for identities or presentations that are neither male nor female. As a result of the lack of interactional routines for people whose identity or expression transgresses the gender binary, most cisgender people lack interactional scripts with which to process these transgressors. This is corroborated by

reports from people whose gender presentation is ambiguous, who describe being stared at in public and overhearing confused remarks (Lucal 1999; Nordmarken 2014). People may internalize binary thinking; Crawley (2008) expressed in an autoethnography the challenge of understanding whether to identify as a lesbian or trans man. She felt this way partly because her tropical climate, where people wore as little clothing as possible to cope with the temperature, conflicted with mainstream stereotypes of dress for LGBT people, such as leather clothing and boots. The main trigger point for transgender discrimination appears to be the beginning of the transition process, because the transition disrupts gendered interactional scripts and generates in at least some people annoyance, irritation, and even aggression (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007:14).

The most significant spaces in which transgender people experience discrimination are employment, education, healthcare, and leisure (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). In other words, transgender people are at risk in almost anything they do, so as a result, some transgender people choose not to transition at all. Almost half of transgender people who are not living in their preferred gender role made that choice in order to prevent employment discrimination (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). Regarding education, transgender students with any gender presentation can be harassed for expressing their identity. In contrast to the popular assumption that people perceived as “tomboys” are socially approved, or at least tolerated, both transgender girls and transgender boys experienced harassment or bullying at school (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007).

Bias is so pervasive that many transgender people feel they have nowhere to turn when they are experiencing it. Even the home and neighborhood can be sites of bias. About half of transgender people report family breakdown arising from bias against their

gender identity, and about a third of transgender people experienced at least some family conflict, such as exclusion from events or estrangement from some people in the family (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). About a fifth of transgender people felt ostracized from their neighborhood due to bias related to their transition (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). In other public places, transgender people report that some police ignore them if they report a problem or assume that they were the cause of a problem (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). Even ordinary mishaps can turn into serious problems for a transgender person due to bias. As one transgender woman reported:

“I dropped biscuits going down stairs at the arts centre... I subsequently went to leave a note to apologise for what happened, knocked over a box of poppies & also a Bonsai plant that was on a plate, the plate smashed. I waited to see someone to say what happened, someone came, told me to leave & go home. A few days later I was arrested & charged for criminal damage. I informed the arts centre of the reasons of my clumsiness & anxiousness. At this stage I was living as a woman. The whole situation was taken like a crime scene, photos of the items that I dropped/knocked over to make it like a real crime scene. I offered to pay for the item that broke which was the plate.” (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007:52).

This woman's story indicates that in any situation, bias can cloud people's judgment when they come into contact with a transgender person. As a result, people treat transgender people more harshly than cisgender people, and knowing this, transgender people may feel anxiety in social situations because they expect negative treatment.

Most research on gender and educational attainment (e.g., Charles and Bradley 2002; Di Prete and Buchmann 2013) focuses on the experiences of cisgender men and women. Transgender students are typically marginalized and neglected, meaning that

research on this population is desperately needed (Dugan et al. 2012). My study will contribute to this research through evaluating harassment and discrimination faced by transgender people in school settings and how these experiences may influence their educational attainment and the school-to-prison pipeline.

Transgender students report harassment and discrimination at all levels of education (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). Harassment can take the form of verbal, physical, or sexual (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009), and discrimination can take the form of exclusion and differential treatment with regard to discipline (Grant et al. 2011; Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). Many transgender students are in fear for their lives on a regular basis and feel as if there is nowhere to turn for help (Sausa 2005). As one student stated:

“I was constantly running from people, because everybody wanted to fight me for some reason. I’d get off the school bus and somebody would come after me, and I would run . . . Every single day that I was in school something was thrown at me in the lunchroom . . . I can never remember a time where someone actually stopped someone from doing things, or took them aside and hugged me or nothing. No one ever, ever gave me support or nurturing . . .” (Sausa 2005:20)

Bullying plays a role in encouraging various negative outcomes in students, including drug use, absenteeism from school, and lower educational aspirations (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). Among transgender students in middle and high school, 5.6% of those who experienced a lower amount of victimization for being transgender did not aspire to obtain a postsecondary degree, compared to 9.3% of those who experienced a higher amount of victimization (Kosciw et al. 2012). Similarly, schools with a higher proportion of students planning to attend college also report a school climate that is more

tolerant of LGBT people (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). This is because bullying is influenced by the norms and resources of a community (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). More affluent communities have access to resources to implement anti-bullying programs and training for staff about bullying. Furthermore, LGBT youth in communities with high levels of college graduates tend to have better outcomes. This is because people who attend college have more of an opportunity to interact with LGBT people, thus decreasing prejudice, and because people learn critical thinking in college, which allows them to rely more on reasoning than on cultural biases (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). Furthermore, since people frequently encounter and develop attitudes in college that are favorable toward civil rights, people with a college education tend to promote such beliefs in their own communities (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009).

Harassment and discrimination influence transgender people's self-esteem; transgender people can internalize negative judgments and abuse and feel as if they are at fault (Wyss 2004). Unsupportive families can compound problems. Some students whose parents advocate on their behalf have experienced improved school circumstances; for example, one student in a focus group explained how their mother spoke to a teacher who criticized the student's gender presentation (McGuire 2010). However, harassment may continue for those students who do not have this support system. Similarly, even though many students would like teachers to intervene when LGBT students are harassed, they report that such intervention rarely occurs (McGuire 2010). This may be because educators do not know when behavior counts as harassment or because educators in very homophobic communities feel overwhelmed and do not know how to address repeated homophobic remarks on a regular basis (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). Regardless of why it occurs, the fact that teachers generally do not interrupt harassment makes many

students, whether or not they are LGBT, feel unsafe in schools, because it makes teachers look as if they do not have the power to ensure safety (McGuire 2010).

A hostile climate for transgender students is not only caused by active aggression. Transgender students express interest in policies that protect students and educate teachers on transgender issues, but these are rarely implemented (Sausa 2005). For example, students frequently report that schools refuse to change names and gender designations on identification documents or do not maintain confidentiality when these are changed (Sausa 2005). Occasionally, bullied students have reported that teachers suggest to them to hide their identity in order to avoid attracting the attention of bullies (Sausa 2005). Even if these teachers mean well, they are blaming the victims for the harassment (Sausa 2005). Transgender young people who graduate are more likely to state that there was someone at their school who respected them and believed in them than transgender young people who drop out due to harassment (Kosciw et al. 2012; McGuire 2010; Sausa 2005). LGBT students who reported that they had many (six or more) staff people who were LGBT allies reported being less likely to feel unsafe at school, had a greater feeling of community, and had higher GPAs (Kosciw et al. 2012). These factors influence attendance; about 20% of students with many LGBT allies among school staff miss school during a month compared to about half with no LGBT allies among staff (Kosciw et al. 2012).

Nadal et al. (2012) described systemic and environmental microaggressions as playing a substantial role in transgender people's lives. A microaggression is a subtle form of discrimination, and a systemic microaggression is one that exists at the institutional or community level (rather than at the level of interpersonal interaction).

Bathrooms are a common source of difficulty for transgender people. Many transgender people report being refused access to bathrooms or being verbally or physically attacked in bathrooms (Herman 2013; Nadal et al. 2012). Some cisgender people view transgender people they encounter in bathrooms as “predators,” in women's bathrooms or “targets,” in men's bathrooms (Nadal et al. 2012). Some transgender people report that finding an acceptable solution is time-consuming or distracting. Transgender people may avoid using public bathrooms, causing physical discomfort, or may spend time searching for bathrooms that are less often used, so that they do not come into contact with another person there (Herman 2013). Some transgender people miss classes or drop out of schools because they cannot find a solution to this issue (Herman 2013). This is not only caused by the immediate problem of physical discomfort but also by the stress transgender people feel as a result of ongoing bias (Herman 2013). Transgender people feel distressed that they frequently and repeatedly need to assert their gender identity when cisgender people do not need to (Herman 2013).

Bathroom issues can be especially prominent when a transgender person is just beginning their transition (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). Westbrook and Schilt (2013) provide a potential explanation for the bathroom problem by describing people as being more likely to use gender identity as a criteria for determining belonging in gender-integrated spaces but more likely to use biology-based criteria for determining belonging in gender-segregated spaces, especially women's spaces. Single-stall bathrooms may provide a safe place for transgender people, though they further segregate transgender people. When single-stall bathrooms are still marked with a gender, people may feel uncomfortable choosing a gender-specific space.

Another systemic bias affecting transgender people in educational settings is a lack of awareness of transgender issues. Prominently, schools that separate students into activities based on gender may have no nonbinary options, forcing nonbinaries to either affiliate with a gender identity they do not really identify with or be excluded (Woolley 2015). Furthermore, in college, transgender students have described faculty and counselors in their university health services as of having out-of-date information on transgender issues or no information at all (McKinney 2005; Sausa 2002). Some transgender students are dissatisfied with the lack of transgender programming at their universities (McKinney 2005), as well as the lack of procedures that would allow transgender students to express their gender identity, for example, in residence halls that may be sex-segregated (Sausa 2002). Students worry about the potential results of coming out in applications to universities, and application forms may have only two binary gender options, thus invalidating identities outside the binary (Sausa 2002). Students also encounter the issue of staff and faculty who use their legal name and gender, even when they express a preference for something else. At college campuses, transgender students cite LGBT-friendly groups as providing an important social network (Bilodeau 2005); however, this may not be enough if it amounts to merely adding “transgender” to the list of concerns of a lesbian, gay, and bisexual resource center that has only superficial resources specifically for transgender people (Sausa 2002). Because the LGBT category encompasses both sexuality and gender groups, it is possible for even this category to dismiss or misunderstand transgender people. This means that transgender students may lack a real support system (Sausa 2002).

There are a number of issues that make educational environments unwelcoming or even unsafe to transgender students, and these issues may influence transgender people's

educational attainment, since some students drop out of educational environments due to these factors. About three-quarters of LGBT youth hear biased comments frequently in school. About half of students heard these comments from school personnel, but only about one-fifth of students witnessed school personnel intervening when such language was used (Kosciw et al. 2012). As one eleventh-grade transgender student reported:

“Teachers and staff are not educated when it comes to a transgender student and therefore do nothing about it, and most of the time they also question my gender and make me embarrassed, and everyone thinks I’m a freak of nature.” (Kosciw et al. 2012:30)

Students cite verbal and physical harassment, as well as exclusion on the basis of gender and misinformation about transgender people, as common sources of difficulty in educational environments (Grant et al. 2011; Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009). About two-thirds of LGBT students report being harassed in school due to their gender expression, and about one-quarter report physical violence (Kosciw et al. 2012). The level of fear students experience in K-12 can deter them from aspiring for a college degree (Kosciw et al. 2012). Teachers generally do not interrupt harassment, which makes many students feel unsafe in schools, because it makes teachers look as if they do not have the power to ensure safety (McGuire 2010). Ordinary day-to-day activities can be difficult for transgender students; in particular, many transgender people report being refused access to bathrooms or being verbally or physically attacked in bathrooms (Herman 2013; Nadal et al. 2012). Transgender students of color are particularly vulnerable, since they feel isolated not only from the general population but also from their own racial and ethnic communities (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016; Sausa 2005).

3. Different Transgender Groups

Overall, research on transgender students indicates that they encounter challenges in both K-12 and college caused by bias. However, existing research has not provided substantial analysis of how different transgender groups navigate educational environments. There is no socially acceptable category for identities or presentations that are neither male nor female (Monro 2003). As a result of the lack of interactional routines for people whose identity or expression transgresses the gender binary, most cisgender people lack interactional scripts with which to process these transgressors. I do not expect nonbinaries to experience the potential positive effects some transgender men report, because they do not occupy a category (man) often perceived as valued. However, I do not expect them to experience as much negative outcomes as transgender women, because people may be more likely to react to nonbinaries with confusion rather than stereotypes associated with a category (woman) often perceived as devalued (Schilt and Connell 2007). In addition, I hypothesize that transgender women will have the worst outcomes because they are stereotyped as sexual deviants and predators (Nadal et al. 2012).

I will distinguish between nonbinaries based on their sex assigned at birth because research suggests that the way people react to nonbinaries will be based on their assumptions regarding this assignment. As described in the literature, transgender women (assigned male at birth) tend to experience worse outcomes than transgender men (assigned female at birth). Even though there is little research on nonbinaries, analysis of transgender women (who were male-assigned-at-birth) suggests that people assigned male at birth who deviate from masculinity (a valued characteristic) will encounter negative outcomes for doing so, and people assigned female at birth who deviate from

femininity (a less valued characteristic) will encounter fewer negative outcomes for their deviation (Schilt and Connell 2007). Because most people do not easily conceptualize of nonbinary genders (Monro 2012), the way they treat nonbinaries may reflect the way they relate to the two binary transgender categories, based on sex assigned at birth.

Hypothesis 2-1: Transgender women and nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will experience worse school outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth, transgender women and nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will:

Hypothesis 2-1a: be more likely to leave school due to harassment

On the other hand,

Hypothesis 2-2: Transgender men and nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth will experience better school outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth, transgender men and nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth will:

Hypothesis 2-2a: be less likely to leave school due to harassment

A comparison to workplace experiences indicates that it is likely that different transgender people (transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries) will have different school experiences. Transgender women tend to experience the worst workplace outcomes; Schilt and Wiswall (2008) found that transgender women are likely to be harassed or demoted when they transition, while transgender men receive an increase in respect and authority. Transgender women report that their feminine presentation eliminates the respect they were accorded as men and makes at least some people in their workplaces uncomfortable, while some transgender men report that people in their workplace pay little attention to their transition (Schilt and Wiswall 2008). Furthermore,

some transgender men report that they are treated better when they are read as men as opposed to before their transition, when they were read as masculine lesbians (Schilt and Wiswall 2008). In addition, transgender women on average lose approximately a third of their salary after transitioning, while transgender men on average see no change in their salary or a slight increase. This finding relates to the wage gap between men and women more generally; Schilt and Wiswall (2008) connect this inequality to the interactional tendency to treat men with more respect and authority than women. Since there is little data on how different transgender groups experience negative school outcomes, I use experiences regarding the degree to which transgender people are welcomed (or not) in their workplaces to make a parallel to school experience. I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2-1: Transgender women and nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will experience worse school outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth, transgender women and nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will:

Hypothesis 2-1b: be less likely to obtain a high school diploma

Hypothesis 2-1c: be less likely to obtain a college degree

On the other hand,

Hypothesis 2-2: Transgender men and nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth will experience better school outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth, transgender men and nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth will:

Hypothesis 2-2b: be more likely to obtain a high school diploma

Hypothesis 2-2c: be more likely to obtain a college degree

4. School-to-Prison Pipeline

The school-to-prison pipeline refers to an inefficient system of punitive discipline for youth, which disproportionately affects marginalized populations (Snapp et al. 2015). As the U.S. Department of Education (2014) reports, although rates of school violence are in decline, less extreme discipline problems still remain, and these problems can contribute to distraction and feelings of being unsafe in schools. The most common group referenced when studying the school-to-prison pipeline is students of color, particularly black students. Black students are more than three times as likely as white students to be expelled or suspended (U.S. Department of Education 2014). The most common methods of dealing with misbehavior are suspensions and expulsions, but these are not the most effective. Nonviolent, minor disruptions such as lateness to class and disrespect of a teacher accounted for 95% of suspensions (U.S. Department of Education 2014).

When students are suspended or expelled from school, they experience a greater deal of unsupervised time in place of educational opportunities, social opportunities with other young people, and mentoring opportunities from adults. As a result, suspending students is generally ineffective in helping students who misbehave learn better behavior and avoid behavioral problems in the future. When students are suspended as punishment, they are less likely to graduate and more likely to be suspended again, be held back a grade, drop out of school, or go to jail (Mitchum and Moodie-Mills 2014; U.S. Department of Education 2014). Zero-tolerance policies do not improve behavior; in contrast, the school-to-prison pipeline degrades students' trust in school officials and distracts people from other methods of improving school climates. Schools with higher suspension rates also have lower academic achievement (U.S. Department of Education 2014). It is essential for social scientists to conduct further research on the school-to-

prison pipeline, not only to improve the welfare of students but also to improve indirect outcomes arising from lower academic achievement and increased prison populations.

Transgender people are found in the school-to-prison pipeline. There is evidence that LGBT students are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system and disproportionately punished for school misbehavior. They are more likely than cisgender heterosexuals to be expelled (when similar infractions are compared) and more likely to be arrested for nonviolent offenses, such as truancy and running away from home (Snapp et al. 2015). The social processes that influence disparate treatment for LGBT students are similar to the social processes that influence disparate treatment for students of color, which is the population that is most often cited as being part of the school-to-prison pipeline: both groups experience stigma, so officials tend to have implicit biases against both groups (Snapp et al. 2015). These implicit biases prevent people from acknowledging the diverse reasons students find it hard to participate fully in schools. For example, students who miss school frequently due to family problems are disciplined for being truant (Snapp et al. 2015).

Zero-tolerance policies have a substantial effect in maintaining the school-to-prison pipeline. These policies were enacted with the intention of promote school safety and reassure people after highly publicized school-related incidents relating to gun violence, drugs, and gangs (Mitchum and Moodie-Mills 2014). In an effort to protect students, schools minimized their traditional disciplinary measures and outsourced some of them to the criminal justice system. However, these policies have not been proven to solve the above-mentioned problems, and they also enact harsh and rapid punishment against minor infractions. Most arrests occurring due to zero-tolerance policies are for dress code violations, schoolyard fights, and disrespect to teachers (Mitchum and

Moodie-Mills 2014). Furthermore, the implicit racial biases that pervade the criminal justice system also creep into the zero-tolerance system, with black and Latino students punished more than white students for the same offenses (Mitchum and Moodie-Mills 2014).

Biases specifically toward LGBT people manifest themselves in a variety of ways that push LGBT students into the school-to-prison pipeline. Students who violate gender norms may receive verbal harassment from other students, teachers, and administrators, and authority figures sometimes view people who violate gender norms with suspicion and target them with more surveillance than they do more normative students (Snapp et al. 2015). This bias can intersect with other biases, such as racial biases. As one student reported:

“I got bullied, so I, like, started dressing like a boy and got this thug mentality.

They looked at me like I was the bad Chola, the Mexican lesbian bitch. So no one messed with me anymore at school, but the administration, they were always watching me.” (Snapp et al. 2015:64)

This student's experience is not atypical. Other gender-nonconforming students report that school officials fear them and label them as threatening because of their gender presentation (Snapp et al. 2015). Students who violate gender-specific dress codes may also be penalized for actions that would be permissible for students who conform to gender norms (Snapp et al. 2015). In addition, some students who fight back against bullies get suspended and end up dropping out of school because they feel a lack of support (Snapp et al. 2015). This is a particularly noticeable problem because LGBT students are more likely to be targeted by bullies in the first place, meaning that they encounter difficulties after fighting bullies more frequently. LGBT students report a chain

of events leading up to being forced out of educational settings: school officials do not protect or support them when they are being harassed, and if they fight back after extensive harassment, school officials blame them and deny their status as victims. As one adult bystander reported about a transgender girl:

“She was having difficulty with, with just not even like a lot of kids, but just a handful of young people who were bullying her and it went on and on. She reported it every single time that it happened, but for whatever reason, the report . . . never made it to the social worker. She told people at school that she was going to bring a knife to school the next day, and they still didn’t do anything. And then she brought a knife. Now, granted, it was a butter knife. She was arrested at school for that, and she went to juvenile bureau here and was released later that day, but then was put automatically in expulsion proceedings, and she’s also special ed. . . . she has an IEP . . . she’s ADHD. So it’s just stuff like where the admin weren’t in the mood to ask what was going on. I mean, she ended up being bounced around from one house to another because of juvenile court proceedings and family rejection.” (Snapp et al. 2015:70-71)

Gender intersects with family; students with unsupportive families may spend more time than necessary in a detention center or jail because their parents do not retrieve them, and young people who have been kicked out of their homes may be arrested for homelessness (Snapp et al. 2015). Students of color experience the worst outcomes; students of color are more likely than whites to be targeted (Mitchum and Moodie-Mills 2014).

Prior research has determined that LGBT students are found in the school-to-prison pipeline, but much of this research has either been based on small focus groups or

aggregated all LGBT students together. My dissertation will contribute to this research through evaluating the school-to-prison pipeline for transgender students using a large sample. Though the NTDS does not have the means to identify all the relevant factors (such as unsupportive families and dress codes), the literature points to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2-3: When comparing between transgender people who leave school due to harassment and transgender people who do not leave school due to harassment, transgender people who leave school due to harassment will be more likely to be incarcerated.

5. Race and Gender

Gender is not the only axis of inequality that marginalizes transgender people. For those who are not white, race is also a factor. Race and gender are not only identities that individuals hold. They are also entire systems of inequality. Despite the fact that people always interact with people who hold multiple statuses at once (e.g., everyone has a racial identity, gender identity, social class, etc., which come together to construct a unique person), people conceptualize of identity categories as distinct (e.g., race, gender, and class are separate systems that can be measured separately) (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). This influences how social scientists interpret intersectionality: identity categories are culturally distinct and intersect in social relations (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013).

Race is an integral part of the concepts of masculinity and femininity. Often these concepts are white-centric (e.g. Branch 2011, Pascoe 2005). As Branch (2011) explained, the racialization of gender identity is built into the structure of society and influences all social interaction. While people have the agency to construct their racial and gender

identities, their behavior is simultaneously constrained by social expectations surrounding gender and race. The racialization of gender occurs for all genders. For example, black women, who were forced into domestic and agricultural work during slavery, remained in these devalued positions after slavery because of whites' demand for their labor. In particular, white women wanted black women to replace them in dirty, difficult domestic roles. This devaluation of black women's work continues to the present, where black women are underrepresented in high-quality private-sector jobs (Branch 2011). The experience of being a woman has thus been different according to race, with white women tending to have the best work outcomes; thus the overall concept of femininity represents white femininity (Branch 2011). Pascoe (2005) described masculinity in a complementary way to how Branch described femininity; both covered exclusivity by race. Negative judgments about perceived femininity in boys were applied only to white boys, with black boys excluded from white masculinity and not expected to abide by white masculine behavior and appearance norms (Pascoe 2005). For example, white boys in this study ridiculed other white boys who paid meticulous attention to their physical appearance and cleanliness as “fags” (unmasculine); however, they did not ridicule black boys who cared about clean and fashionable clothing, because for the black boys in this study, clothing was a way of signaling interest in hip-hop culture.

Branch's (2011) analysis and Ridgeway's (2011) analysis complement each other. Ridgeway focuses on how the biological concepts of sex (male and female) have been extended further from their biological differences (for reproduction) into other sectors of society, such as work, to become expectations for behavior applied to people of a particular sex. Ridgeway (2011) emphasized the fact that gender is one of the “primary categories” that humans use to make sense of their environment, the others being race

and age. These are characteristics that most people take note of immediately, which allow people to quickly make distinctions between people; thus they become engrained into society as social structures. Branch's theory builds upon Ridgeway's through explaining that as sex categories are extended into gendered behavioral expectations, race influences the process and becomes part of the gendered behavioral expectations that result, as shown in the above examples from Branch's book. In a separate piece, Ridgeway (2013) specified that many people construct race, class, and gender as distinct in everyday life. That means that even though these statuses are actually intertwined, the fact that people can easily categorize people into these statuses, and can thus portray them as separate, has implications for inequality. Specifically, the "generic" construction of a particular status tends to be restrictive. For example, since white men are the dominant group, the generic concept of "woman" is a white woman (Ridgeway 2013).

The intersection of gender identity and race has frequently been ignored in research (Fish 2007). Much early LGBT research used samples that were predominantly privileged in other ways: white, able-bodied, middle class, and well educated (Fish 2007). Part of the reason for this is that randomly sampled surveys generally do not provide LGBT-inclusive questions, and if they did, the samples would need to be very large in order to provide substantial numbers of LGBT people. Thus people researching LGBT people may need to use innovative research plans to study this population (Fish 2007).

Furthermore, even language used to refer to transgender people may reflect white-centrism and thus exclude people of color (Sausa 2005). This means that even people who intend to be allies to transgender young people may not understand everyone's experiences. The following statement from Keisha, a transgender person who identifies as a femme queen, demonstrates how language usage is diverse.

“Especially the African American gay community, we address the transgenders as femme queens. And then like the female to male, we address them as butches. I don’t know. It’s a choice kind of thing. When you’re talking to your own kind, we don’t go 'transgender male to female'; that takes too long.” (Sausa 2005:18)

For some students, bullying on the basis of being transgender intersects with bullying based on other aspects of identity, such as race, disability, sexual orientation, and religion (Earnshaw et al. 2014). Students of color are more likely than white students to encounter transphobic language in high school (Wernick, Kulick, and Inglehart 2014). This is because the behavior of people of color is widely scrutinized and held up to dominant racial and gender norms (Wernick et al. 2014).

Overall, research has shown that while transgender people overall are at risk of harassment in school settings, people of color are more vulnerable than whites. The following hypothesis and its subcategories uses theory on the intersection of gender identity and race to posit that racial disadvantage will persist among the transgender population, just as it is found in the cisgender population. Since the NTDS does not have any cisgender respondents, it cannot be used to hypothesize about the degree to which racial disadvantage is experienced differently in the transgender population relative to the cisgender population. In other words, while data limitations do not allow me to test the intersectional argument, this hypothesis will test the persistence of racial disadvantage, which is suggested by the literature.

Hypothesis 2-4: Transgender people of color will experience worse school outcomes than white transgender people. Specifically, relative to white transgender people, transgender people of color will be:

Hypothesis 2-4a: more likely to leave school due to harassment

Though Asian Americans on average have higher educational attainment than people of other races and ethnicities in the United States, the “model minority” stereotype can break down among LGBT Asian American students (Hahm and Adkins 2009; Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). LGBT Asian Americans may feel excluded due to both race and being LGBT, partly because of the lack of representation in the mainstream of LGBT Asian Americans (Hahm and Adkins 2009; Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). Harassment for being LGBT in school can negatively influence Asian American students' success, further alienating them on the basis of both race and being LGBT and setting them up for poorer socioeconomic outcomes once they have finished school and entered the workforce (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016).

Since people tend to think of categories as separate (e.g., race is different from gender) instead of identifying the ways in which categories intersect (e.g., black women, white women) (Crenshaw 1989; Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013), each category comes with defaults. For example, the category of blacks is assumed to be men, and the category of women is assumed to be white (Crenshaw 1989). This means that there can be tension between groups, as described by Hahm and Adkins (2009) and Ocampo and Soodjinda (2016). Due to the fact that LGBT people are considered “white” as default, there is frequently tension between LGBT identities and racial identities.

Another major point of tension is related to the intersection of race, gender, and sexual orientation (Moore 2006). During the 1960s and 1970s, black lesbians were primarily concerned with police brutality and racial socioeconomic disparities, which were the issues that heavily affected the racially segregated communities where they lived. These women did not distinguish between the needs of black lesbians and the needs of the black community more generally, but women in the mainstream feminist

movement at the time felt that these issues were less relevant to women's well-being and felt as if black women were blaming them rather than blaming patriarchy. At this point in history, many black women were employed as private household workers by middle- and upper-class white women, meaning that racial and class hierarchy among women made it difficult for diverse women to see their interests as mutual. These historical differences have still not been entirely resolved in the LGBT community in general (Moore 2006). Collectively, this existing research indicates that some LGBT people of color cannot rely on either the solidarity of the LGBT community or the solidarity of a racial or ethnic community, meaning that they are further isolated.

Research on the intersection of race and LGBT has demonstrated that LGBT people of color habitually experience exclusion on both bases (e.g., Hahm and Adkins 2009; Moore 2006; Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). They may be unable to rely upon the LGBT community for support due to its racial bias, and they may feel like outsiders in their racial community due to being gender and sexuality minorities. People who are both a racial minority and LGBT typically have less social support for their school performance (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). School officials typically have limited knowledge of working with multiply marginalized populations and attending to their complex needs (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). My dissertation furthers this research by investigating how this lack of support influences educational attainment:

Hypothesis 2-4: Transgender people of color will experience worse school outcomes than white transgender people. Specifically, relative to white transgender people, transgender people of color will be:

Hypothesis 2-4b: less likely to obtain a high school diploma

Hypothesis 2-4c: less likely to obtain a college degree

C. Data and Analytical Plan

1. Data

This section uses data from the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. The NTDS contains responses from transgender people only (no cisgender people), and the researchers obtained participants through about 800 transgender organizations and about 150 online listserves. In addition, in order to obtain responses from hard-to-find participants, they distributed more than 2000 paper surveys to rural, homeless, and low-income people (Grant et al. 2011). The survey was available in both English and Spanish. The total number of respondents in this survey was 6456. The NTDS follows the precedent of Blumstein and Schwartz's (1983) American Couples study in size and methods. For that study, they surveyed about 6000 couples in order to investigate experiences of marriage and cohabitation across sexual orientation, demonstrating the value of large-sample non-random surveys for studying LGBT people.

2. Variables

The NTDS had two ways for respondents to specify their gender identity. One question asks “What is your primary gender identity today?” and has the options “male/man,” “female/woman,” “part time one gender, part time another,” and “a gender not listed here.” Another question asks “For each term listed, please select to what degree it applies to you” and provides a list of common transgender terminology, such as “androgynous,” “genderqueer,” “MTF,” and “FTM.”

In contrast to much prior research on transgender people, based on small samples, often from clinical settings (Kuper, Nussbaum, and Mustanski 2012), the NTDS was designed to be large and as representative as possible of the transgender and gender nonconforming population of the United States. Though it is not a random sample and

probably has some representational bias, perhaps underrepresenting racial and ethnic minorities and overrepresenting highly educated people (Harris 2015), it does represent a demographically diverse population, including substantial variation along the lines of race, education, and age.

As Table 3.1 demonstrates, people who identify in this survey as transgender men or as nonbinary genders tend to be much younger than the general population. This is likely because part of the process of taking on these identities involves understanding that the option to identify as such exists (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). Those identities have not been part of the mainstream discourse as long as that of a transgender woman, which has been in the media since coverage of transgender women such as Christine Jorgensen in the 1950s (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). As a result, it is younger cohorts who are more likely to identify with all three transgender categories, particularly transgender men and nonbinaries.

All gender identities found in the NTDS sample have more non-Hispanic white people than the general population. Black and Hispanic identities are represented at between a third and a half of their population rates.

The NTDS sample is more highly educated than the general population, with particularly strong representation among those with some college and BA level education and minimal representation among high school and lower graduates. The NTDS nonbinary population is younger, whiter, and more educated than the general population. It is similar to the population of transgender men on other demographic factors; this may be because more female-assigned-at-birth people than male-assigned-at-birth people identify as nonbinary genders (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). It is possible that people who are transgender obtain more education in order to attempt to compensate for the potential

discrimination they will face in the labor market (Leppel 2016). It also may be that more educated people are more likely to identify with transgender labels (Leppel 2016). It is also possible that they are the result of more educated people (who are also more likely to be white and young) having higher response rates or being more likely to participate in the transgender communities the survey was distributed to.

This section uses data from the NTDS. To determine who in this dataset is a nonbinary transgender person, transgender man, or transgender woman, I used the question about sex assigned at birth and the question about gender identity. The question about sex assigned at birth had two responses, “male” and “female.” The question about gender identity had four responses, “male/man,” “female/woman,” “part time one gender, part time another,” and “other.” The NTDS also had questions in which respondents could express the degree to which they identify “not at all,” “somewhat,” or “strongly” with certain transgender terms.

I coded write-in responses as nonbinaries, regardless of whether they were assigned male or female at birth, for a total of 859. In order to determine who from the category “part time as one gender, part time as another” counts as a transgender man, a transgender woman, or a nonbinary person, I used the questions regarding identification with certain transgender terms. To create a category of nonbinaries, I added to the respondents who wrote in their gender the respondents who chose “part time as one gender, part time as another” who identified strongly with the terms gender nonconforming or gender variant, genderqueer, androgynous, third gender, Two-Spirit, and other, which are all terms that fall under the umbrella category of “nonbinary gender.” I added these 695 people to the category of nonbinaries, for a total of 1554.

The category of transgender women includes those people who chose “female/woman” as their gender identity but did not choose “female” as their sex assigned at birth (2273 people). In addition, the category of transgender women is composed of those people who chose “part time as one gender, part time as another” and also stated that they identified strongly with the term “male to female” (679 people), for a total of 2952 transgender women. Similarly, I placed into the category of transgender men those people who chose “male/man” as their gender identity but did not choose “male” as their sex assigned at birth (1319 people). In addition, this category includes those people who chose “part time as one gender, part time as another” and also stated that they identified strongly with the term “female to male” (119 people), for a total of 1438 transgender men. Respondents who fit none of these criteria, including cross-dressers and drag queens (1214), were dropped. This means that the resulting 5242 people identify as a gender other than that associated with their sex assigned at birth and are more likely to express their being transgender in everyday settings, such at school or work. It is important to identify which people from the “part time as one gender, part time as another” category are transgender and include them because this category does not only contain cross-dressers and drag queens; it also includes people who are transgender who are closeted some of the time (and thus feel they can express their gender only “part time”) (Beemyn and Rankin 2011).

3. Methods and Models

Models for all dependent variables use logistic regression because all dependent variables are dichotomous. The dependent variables I investigate are: leaving school due to harassment, graduation from high school, graduation from college, and having been incarcerated (all dichotomous). Models using all dependent variables other than having

been incarcerated are used to test hypotheses 2-1, 2-2, and 2-4. The model using having been incarcerated as a dependent variable is used to test hypothesis 2-3. Each regression analysis includes these variables: gender identity (transgender men, transgender women, or nonbinaries), which will be used to test hypotheses 2-2 and 2-3; and race (white, black, Latino, Asian, and other/mixed), which is used to test hypothesis 2-4. The regression analysis whose dependent variable is having been incarcerated includes one additional variable, which is the variable of interest: whether the respondent has left school due to harassment. All models control for age in order to account for the fact that the respondents attended school in different decades. Models including an interaction between race and gender did not display statistical significance; as a result, the race effect on its own is discussed instead. Because of small sample sizes for racial minorities, the reason for the lack of significance is inconclusive; the lack of significance may indicate no differences in the population, or it may be a result of the sample size.

I report odds ratios for all these regression models; an odds ratio higher than 1 represents a higher likelihood of the dependent variable occurring, while an odds ratio lower than 1 represents a lower likelihood of the dependent variable occurring.

D. Results

1. Descriptive Findings

Table 3.2 descriptively compares among transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries (people of color and whites separately) on the following variables: leaving school due to harassment and having been incarcerated (separated by whether or not someone has left school due to harassment). People of color are more likely to leave school due to harassment than whites, and transgender women are the most likely of all gender groups (30% of people of color and 16% of whites). Among people who have left

school due to harassment, people of color are more likely than whites to have been incarcerated; in addition, transgender women have higher rates than transgender men or nonbinaries. This finding is in contrast to the fact that among cisgender people, more men than women have been incarcerated. All people who left school due to harassment are more likely to end up incarcerated than those who did not; however, the difference for transgender men is striking (39% versus 17% for people of color and 29% versus 12% for whites). The differences for other groups are less dramatic, suggesting that harassment in a school setting has particularly severe effects for men's future life outcomes. Thus, these findings suggest that transgender women, transgender men, and nonbinaries experience unique and separate devalued statuses.

2. Multivariate Findings

I next turn to regression analysis to test the hypotheses outlined in my theoretical section. Tables 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 cover the dependent variables of leaving school due to harassment, graduation rates, and incarceration, and these tables display odds ratios. Odds ratios above 1 indicate higher likelihood; odds ratios below 1 indicate lower likelihood. For example, an odds ratio of 1.5 indicates a 50% higher chance, while an odds ratio of 0.5 indicates a 50% lower chance.

Hypothesis 2-1 posited that transgender women and nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will experience worse school outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth. In contrast, Hypothesis 2-2 posited that transgender men and nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth will experience better school outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth. The following paragraphs thus make separate comparisons, some focusing on male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and some focusing on female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries.

First, I make comparisons that focus on male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries. Overall, these results indicate that male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender women typically have similar outcomes and that these outcomes tend to be worse than those of transgender men and female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries. Notably, as shown below, compared to female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are more likely to leave school due to harassment and less likely to obtain either a high school diploma or a bachelor's degree, which is consistent with Hypothesis 2-1. In other words, transgender people who were assigned male at birth may be disadvantaged on account of their rejection of the socially valued label of man.

Specifically, the following results, all of which are consistent with Hypothesis 2-1, arise from those analyses in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 that use male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries as the reference category. These tables use gender and race as independent variables and school outcomes as dependent variables. Female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are 49% less likely to leave school due to harassment compared to male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries (an odds ratio of 0.51). Regarding the likelihood of graduating from high school, transgender men are 197% more likely and female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are 267% more likely than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries (odds ratios of 2.97 and 3.67 respectively). Regarding the likelihood of obtaining a bachelor's degree, transgender women are 44% less likely and female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are 94% more likely than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries (odds ratios of 0.56 and 1.94 respectively). All of these results are consistent with hypothesis 2-1. As predicted in the literature, these results suggest that in school environments, people tend to treat a person of a nonbinary gender who was male-assigned-at-birth with some of the negativity they apply to women in general, in contrast

to a transgender man, or by extension, a person of a nonbinary gender who was female-assigned-at-birth (Schilt and Connell 2007). These results suggest that school environments are hostile to male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries in the same way that they are hostile to transgender women (Nadal et al. 2012).

Next I compare female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries. These comparisons provide results that are consistent with the themes arising from the comparisons that focused on male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries: when female-assigned-at-birth people distance themselves from the socially devalued category of woman, whether they identify as men or a nonbinary gender, they receive less of a penalty than male-assigned-at-birth people distancing themselves from the category of men. This theme is consistent with Schilt and Connell's (2007) results in their study of transgender men and women: people tend to treat a transgender woman (or, as my results suggest by extension, a person of a nonbinary gender who was male-assigned-at-birth) with some of the negativity they apply to women in general; people tend to treat a transgender man (or, as my results suggest by extension, a person of a nonbinary gender who was female-assigned-at-birth) with some of the respect they apply to men in general. Femininity is stigmatized, particularly for those assigned male at birth.

Specifically, the following results arise from those analyses in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 that use female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries as the reference category. Most results are consistent with Hypothesis 2-3. When looking at the likelihood of leaving school due to harassment, transgender women are 114% more likely and male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are 68% more likely than female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries (odds ratios of 2.14 and 1.68 respectively). This indicates that male-assigned-at-birth transgender people are more likely than female-assigned-at-birth transgender people to leave school due to

harassment. Regarding the likelihood of graduating from high school, transgender women are 67% more likely (the one finding inconsistent with Hypothesis 2-3); and male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are 50% less likely (odds ratios of 1.67 and 0.50 respectively). Regarding the likelihood of obtaining a bachelor's degree, transgender men are 30% less likely, transgender women are 62% less likely, and male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are 39% less likely (odds ratios of 0.70, 0.38, and 0.61). This suggests that female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are the most likely of all transgender groups to complete college once they are accepted. The results pertaining to transgender women are consistent with the literature pointing to their extreme levels of disadvantage (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). The fact that the one finding (that transgender women are more likely to graduate high school than female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries) that is inconsistent with this hypothesis relates to youth is significant, since many transgender women have reported that they did not transition until later in life due to shame (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). Beemyn and Rankin's (2011) study suggests that some of the transgender women in the NTDS went through high school being perceived as cisgender men. But later in life, once more transgender women have made the decision to transition, they lose the respect they were accorded when people perceived them as men and thus experience more negative outcomes relative to female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries.

Taken as a whole, the results for Hypotheses 2-1 and 2-2 suggest that while educational institutions are frequently unwelcoming sites for transgender people (Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz 2009), they do not treat all transgender groups the same. Only female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender men have better outcomes than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries; transgender women have worse. Compared to female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, all the statistically significant coefficients other than one

indicate that male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender women have worse outcomes. The one exception is transgender women's higher likelihood of graduating from high school. Furthermore, although these results identify distinctions between groups, the exact mechanisms are undetermined. Prior research suggests that differences in how people feel they are welcome in their school environments contributes to educational attainment. However, other factors, such as family support and finances, also contribute.

Hypothesis 2-3 stated that when comparing between transgender people who leave school due to harassment and transgender people who do not leave school due to harassment, transgender people who leave school due to harassment are more likely to be incarcerated. Table 3.5 uses leaving school due to harassment as an independent variable in order to evaluate incarceration as an outcome. As shown in this table, there is support for Hypothesis 2-3. Transgender people who have left school due to harassment are 93% more likely to be incarcerated compared to those who have not (an odds ratio of 1.93). This result points to a sequence of negative events in the lives of some transgender people; those transgender people who leave school due to harassment are more likely to enter the school-to-prison pipeline. This result suggests that interventions at the K-12 level may benefit transgender people from youth through adulthood. In particular, it is important to provide guidelines for how anti-transgender harassment and bias will be dealt with in schools, and to actually enforce these guidelines, since students can be pushed out of the school system when they attempt to resist victimization on their own.

As Snapp et al. (2015) elaborated on in their study, which incorporated interviews and focus groups including both students and administrators, when LGBT youth attempt to protect themselves from bullies, they can be targeted by teachers or administrators

instead of, or in addition to, the bullies. Some transgender youth feel they are forced to engage in physical fights, whether to defend themselves when a bully provokes them or to start a fight first so as to avoid being perceived as weak and picked on even more than before. Students who are regularly harassed lose trust in the school and may leave because they do not see the value in attempting to navigate both interpersonal conflict with other students and staff people who either deny that the problem exists or blame the transgender student. For example, some students have reported that staff say that students would not be bullied if they conformed to gender norms, assume that harassment is normal in a school setting and does not deserve attention, or ask students intrusive questions when they report harassment based on their LGBT status (Snapp et al. 2015).

The results of my study are consistent with this literature and suggest that if the root problem—the harassment and violence targeted toward transgender students—were reduced, it may be possible to disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline. But when LGBT students feel as if the school does not support them and is setting them up to be kicked out, violence escalates, putting both transgender and cisgender students at risk not only during school hours but also throughout their lives, due to the ramifications of leaving school. Interventions targeted not only at K-12 students but also at the adults in the lives of these students, in which people are educated about gender identity and taught conflict resolution strategies, may begin to disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline.

Hypothesis 2-4 states that transgender people of color experience worse school outcomes than white transgender people. As shown in Tables 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, there is support for this hypothesis, consistent with both the general argument of racial disadvantage persisting among the transgender population, as well as the intersectional literature pointing to the multiple disadvantages faced by transgender people of color

(e.g., Grant et al. 2011). Furthermore, my results show that among the racial and ethnic groups analyzed, black and Latino transgender people face the most racial disadvantage compared to white transgender people. The following results look at the regression analyses using male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and whites as the reference categories. When looking at the likelihood of leaving school due to harassment, the odds ratio for Latinos compared to whites is 1.99, indicating that Latinos are 99% more likely to leave school due to harassment than whites. Regarding the likelihood of graduating from high school, the odds ratio for blacks compared to whites is 0.38; and for Latinos compared to whites, 0.37, indicating that blacks and Latinos are approximately 62% less likely to graduate. Regarding the likelihood of obtaining a bachelor's degree, the odds ratio for blacks compared to whites is 0.52; and for Latinos compared to whites, 0.58, indicating that blacks are 48% less likely and Latinos are 42% less likely. The experiences of Asians, and the experiences of people of mixed race or ethnicity or people of a race or ethnicity other than white, black, Latino, or Asian, were not statistically significantly different from those of whites. Black and Latino transgender people have lower educational attainment than white transgender people, and Latino transgender people are more likely to leave school due to harassment than white transgender people. This is consistent with research indicating that these two racial groups tend to experience the most bias in schools relative to whites (Mitchum and Moodie-Mills 2014).

Graduation rates from educational institutions are an important but complex phenomenon. There are diverse reasons why students who enter an educational institution do not get a diploma or degree, though much of the details of the prevalence of these reasons is unknown (Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner 2013). Some reasons may not be negative; with regard to college, some attrition is natural as students decide whether their

skills and interests require a college education (Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner 2013). However, low graduation rates may be caused by problems such as unsupportive parents, difficulties with peers, or (in the case of college) a lack of funding or time conflicts with other life circumstances (Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner 2013). It is essential to identify racial and gender distinctions in graduation rates, because this is the first step to identifying ways of mitigating the gap.

E. Conclusion

Transgender people, including nonbinaries, are increasingly becoming better represented in everyday life and in the media. For example, some jurisdictions have recently changed their options for gender on official documents. In 2017, Oregon became the first state in the United States to legally recognize nonbinary genders. Drivers' licenses in Oregon now have the gender labels of M, F, and X, which can apply to nonbinaries and intersex people. However, the fact that a transgender gender identity is recognized does not simultaneously indicate that that gender identity is respected or treated equally. Collectively, the results of this study demonstrate that there is a progression from a hostile educational climate for transgender people to negative future outcomes, including lower educational attainment and incarceration, which will have repercussions throughout people's lives.

Prior research on LGBT people of color has demonstrated that LGBT people of color habitually experience exclusion (Hahm and Adkins 2009; Moore 2006; Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). They may feel like outsiders in the LGBT community due to its racial bias, and they may feel like outsiders in their racial community due to being LGBT. LGBT people of color typically have less social support for their school performance; furthermore, school officials typically have limited knowledge of working with multiply

marginalized populations and attending to their complex needs (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). While my data do not allow me to make an intersectional comparison between transgender and cisgender people, this study is in line with intersectional research; black and Latino students overall have worse school outcomes than whites. These results are thus suggestive and consistent with the intersectional argument. There was no statistically significant difference between the outcomes of whites and Asians, however.

There are numerous factors that work against transgender people in schools. Much of the time, school officials understand little of the needs of transgender students; they may work with out-of-date information or no information at all (McKinney 2005; Sausa 2002). Even something as simple as bathroom use often becomes a problem due to bias. Many transgender people are refused bathroom access verbally or physically attacked there (Herman 2013; Nadal et al. 2012). Transgender people may either avoid using public bathrooms or waste time searching for unoccupied spaces, so that they do not come into contact with another person there. As a result of these problems, some transgender people miss classes or drop out of schools because they cannot find a solution to this issue (Herman 2013). Existing research suggests that that transgender women will have the worst outcomes because they are stereotyped as sexual deviants and predators (Nadal et al. 2012). Furthermore, people tend to emphasize biology in women's spaces, meaning that transgender women are at risk of bias due to being assigned male at birth (Westbrook and Schilt 2013).

While nonbinaries will probably not be granted the same respect as men, they may be viewed more with confusion than with the fear and hate transgender women experience (Monro 2003). Since transgender women (assigned male at birth) tend to experience worse outcomes than transgender men (assigned female at birth), there may

be a parallel in nonbinaries: those assigned male at birth who deviate from masculinity (a valued characteristic) will encounter negative outcomes for doing so, and those assigned female at birth who deviate from femininity (a less valued characteristic) will encounter less hostility for doing so (Schilt and Connell 2007).

In comparing between nonbinaries and other transgender groups, my results support what is implied by existing research. Compared to female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, almost all statistically significant coefficients indicate that male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender women have worse outcomes than female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries. Furthermore, only female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries and transgender men have better outcomes than male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries; transgender women have worse.

This study of transgender people in school settings has built upon existing research on negative educational outcomes for transgender people. In contrast to many small-scale surveys, however, this study has compared among different transgender groups. My research has demonstrated that transgender people are not a homogeneous group; with a few exceptions, transgender women tend to have worse outcomes in educational settings than nonbinaries, while nonbinaries and transgender men tend to have similar outcomes. This suggests that femininity is a primary characteristic that contributes to bias.

LGBT students report a chain of events leading up to being forced out of educational settings: school officials do not protect or support them when they are being harassed, and if they fight back after extensive harassment, school officials blame them and deny their status as victims (Snapp et al. 2015). This section identifies harassment as a key point in pushing transgender students into the school-to-prison pipeline.

Theoretically, these results parallel studies of the experiences of people in other civilizations who fall outside the gender binary. Among societies that recognize genders other than those of cisgender men and women, it is common for people with statuses or identities outside of the binary to be devalued, despite their behavior. Hijras serve as an example here as well, as described by Haidt (1996). In Indian society, some believe hijras have ritual power to bless and curse, and as a result, they are considered to have power over life and death. Elimination of the penis serves to mark them with this role. Despite the fact that they serve an established societal role, hijras are simultaneously considered a discredited category, and they are associated with other devalued groups, such as sex workers and the poor. They are considered a potential threat to upper castes, and tend not to originate in upper castes. This parallels the current study because in both cases, when a category outside the binary is recognized, it is sequestered in a lower status.

The fact that different transgender groups sometimes experience the same challenges indicates that some similar interventions may improve their school outcomes. Educating teachers and school administrators on the diversity of transgender identities could help improve the climate. Administrators have reported confusion regarding the diverse identities within the transgender umbrella, as well as confusion regarding the purpose and scope of LGBT activist organizations (Monro and Richardson 2010). Thus it would be useful to provide this information, as well as to cover how gender identity is different from sexual orientation, since these groups can experience different challenges in school. In addition, some teachers and administrators have a “gender-blind” attitude, treating everyone under their reach the same regardless of whether they are transgender or cisgender (Monro and Richardson 2010). This is an inefficient strategy because it does not recognize how different types of people have different experiences and needs (Monro

and Richardson 2010). As a result, interventions targeted toward specific groups should be tested systematically so as to determine how best to implement such strategies.

Although the NTDS was intended to provide comprehensive information on transgender people, it was not derived from a random sample. Large-scale and random-sample surveys in the future should include transgender-inclusive questions about gender (Grant et al. 2011). The size of the transgender population has been estimated at 0.3% of people (Gates 2011), so a large-scale survey with transgender-inclusive questions would be needed to provide an adequate sample size of transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries. Such random samples are important in order to obtain accurate statistics on how many people are transgender. It is difficult to evaluate the characteristics of transgender people and their experiences when no formal random samples of this population are available. Furthermore, such rigorous data would be better suited to influence people who have misinformed or bigoted beliefs than non-random data or smaller samples, which could be perceived as invalid. In addition, comprehensive gender questions on well-known, large-scale surveys would normalize the existence of transgender people. When people are accustomed to encountering surveys that only have two binary gender options, it is easy for them to dismiss other identities.

Finally, it would be useful for future research to investigate the perpetrators of bias against transgender people in educational settings. This is a more difficult data collection problem than that of obtaining information on bias from those who have been victims of it, not only because of social desirability bias but also because people's negative judgments of transgender people are sometimes implicit rather than explicit. Rather than explicitly asking teachers and school administrators about their biases, researchers may be able to obtain data on the circumstances of punishment in K-12

schools or on the prevalence of anti-transgender incidents in K-12 and postsecondary schools. An interdisciplinary perspective would be useful; psychological research on implicit bias could better help us understand the nuances of how teachers and administrators can view gender-nonconforming students as more threatening than those who conform to gender norms.

F. Tables

Table 3.1: Demographic Information for the General U.S. Population, Nonbinaries, Transgender Men, and Transgender Women, 2008

Source	National Transgender Discrimination Survey			2008 Current Population Survey
Population	Nonbinaries	Transgender Men	Transgender Women	General Population
Age				
18-24	26%	22%	10%	8%
25-34	41%	47%	23%	13%
35-44	15%	19%	20%	14%
45-54	11%	11%	27%	15%
55-64	8%	2%	19%	11%
65+	1%	0%	3%	12%
Race				
Non-Hispanic White	79%	79%	83%	64%
Black	5%	5%	5%	12%
Hispanic	6%	7%	5%	14%
Asian	3%	4%	3%	5%
Multiracial or Other	7%	5%	4%	5%
Education				
Below High School	4%	3%	4%	13%
Only High School/GED	7%	7%	9%	29%
Some College, Associate's Degree, or Technical School Degree	39%	40%	45%	26%
Bachelor's Degree	30%	30%	24%	19%
Graduate or Professional Degree	20%	20%	19%	11%

CPS broke down age categories into 15-19 and 20-24, so I added 1/5 of the 15-19 value to the 20-24 value to arrive at the 18-24 value.

Table 3.2: Descriptive Statistics: Leaving School Due to Harassment and Incarceration (NTDS)

	Transgender Men		Transgender Women		Nonbinaries	
(If the respondent reported harassment in a school setting): Has the respondent left school due to harassment?						
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Yes	21% (35)	13% (85)	30% (51)	16% (91)	16% (30)	13% (72)
No	79% (133)	87% (583)	70% (118)	84% (474)	84% (159)	87% (500)
Has the respondent been incarcerated? (For those who left school due to harassment.)						
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Yes	39% (9)	29% (31)	27% (9)	17% (10)	19% (6)	20% (13)
No	61% (14)	71% (75)	73% (34)	83% (48)	81% (25)	80% (51)
Has the respondent been incarcerated? (For those who did not leave school due to harassment.)						
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Yes	17% (25)	12% (75)	26% (27)	13% (60)	15% (24)	12% (59)
No	83% (118)	88% (532)	74% (75)	87% (398)	85% (134)	88% (449)

Table 3.3: Logistic Regression: Gender and Race as IV and Leaving School Due to Harassment as DV (NTDS)

Male-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries as Reference Category	
Transgender Men	0.69 (1.28)
Transgender Women	1.21 (1.30)
Female-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries	0.52 ** (1.30)
Black	1.39 (1.26)
Latino	1.99 *** (1.21)
Asian	0.79 (1.38)
Other/Mixed	1.84 (1.25)
Age	0.96 *** (1.01)
N	2313
Female-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries as Reference Category	
Transgender Men	1.27 (1.17)
Transgender Women	2.14 *** (1.17)
Male-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries	1.68 *** (1.27)
Black	1.39 (1.26)
Latino	1.90 *** (1.22)
Asian	0.80 (1.38)
Other/Mixed	1.86 *** (1.25)
Age	0.96 *** (1.02)
N	2313

Odds ratios are reported. Standard errors are in parentheses. This analysis includes only those respondents

who reported harassment in a school setting.
^ p<.1; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 3.4: Logistic Regression: Gender and Race as IV and Graduation as DV (NTDS)

Male-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries as Reference Category		
	Graduation from High School	Graduation from College with Bachelor's
Transgender Men	2.97 ** (1.40)	1.25 (1.16)
Transgender Women	1.48 (1.27)	0.66 *** (1.13)
Female-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries	3.67 *** (1.38)	1.94 *** (1.13)
Black	0.38 *** (1.25)	0.52 *** (1.14)
Latino	0.27 *** (1.22)	0.58 *** (1.14)
Asian	2.10 (1.68)	1.20 (1.17)
Other/Mixed	0.97 (1.43)	0.77 (1.14)
Age	1.06 *** (1.01)	1.03 (1.00)
N	5404	5154
Female-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries as Reference Category		
	Graduation from High School	Graduation from College with Bachelor's
Transgender Men	1.07 (1.27)	0.70 *** (1.09)
Transgender Women	0.60 * (1.22)	0.38 *** (1.09)
Male-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries	0.50 *** (1.25)	0.62 *** (1.11)
Black	0.35 *** (1.25)	0.51 *** (1.15)
Latino	0.27 *** (1.68)	0.59 *** (1.14)
Asian	1.96 (1.43)	1.23 (1.17)
Other/Mixed	0.89 (1.01)	0.77 * (1.14)
Age	1.06 ***	1.03 ***

	(1.01)	(1.00)
N	5404	5154

Odds ratios are reported. Standard errors are in parentheses.

^ p<.1; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 3.5: Logistic Regression: Gender and Race as IV and Having Been Incarcerated as DV (NTDS)

Left School Due to Harassment	1.93 *** (1.16)
Transgender Men	0.40 *** (1.30)
Transgender Women	1.05 (1.28)
Female-Assigned-at-Birth Nonbinaries	0.42 *** (1.31)
Black	3.64 *** (1.22)
Latino	1.59 * (1.23)
Asian	1.01 (1.38)
Other/Mixed	1.20 (1.28)
Age	1.00 (1.00)
N	2303

Odds ratios are reported. Standard errors are in parentheses. Male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries are the reference category.

^ p<.1; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

CHAPTER 4

TRANSGENDER PEOPLE IN WORK SETTINGS

A. Abstract

Transgender people are those whose gender identity (their sense of their own sex and/or gender expression) differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. Identifying as transgender may be based on one's feelings about their biological sex, on one's feelings about societal gender roles, or both. Many factors contribute to negative outcomes for transgender people in work settings, including bias on the part of employers, coworkers, or clients; conflicts between one's gender presentation and legal documentation; gossip; harassment in bathrooms; and gender-specific dress codes. This analysis of transgender people in the workplace uses the National Transgender Discrimination Survey, a nonrandom but large-scale survey of transgender people. I use logistic regression to compare workplace outcomes among multiple groups of transgender people. As I will elaborate below, this chapter primarily focuses on nonbinary transgender people, since that is the most understudied transgender group. Nonbinary transgender identities encompass an array of identities beyond man, woman, transman, and transwoman, such as genderqueer, agender, androgynous, Two-Spirit, gender nonconforming, gender variant, third gender, genderfluid, and bigender. This chapter suggests that being out at the workplace as a nonbinary transgender person is sometimes associated with negative outcomes. Nonbinaries who are out at the workplace are less likely to be unemployed but more likely to have been denied a promotion, suggesting that some employers discriminate against nonbinaries in access to authority even if they are willing to hire them. Furthermore, the experiences of nonbinaries who are out at the workplace differ based on sex assigned at birth. While employers appear more inclined to avoid hiring

people assigned male at birth who are out as nonbinary compared to those assigned female at birth who are out as nonbinary, they appear more inclined to discriminate against nonbinaries assigned female at birth than those assigned male at birth once hired. In addition, nonbinaries of color, particularly African Americans and those of mixed race, experience worse outcomes than white nonbinaries.

B. Theory

1. What is a Transgender Person?

A person's gender identity is their internal sense of being a man, a woman, or a nonbinary gender. Terminology referring to transgender people has changed over time, and continues to change, so some general definitions follow. Transgender people are those whose gender identity differs from the sex they were assigned at birth; cisgender people are those whose gender identity corresponds to the sex they were assigned at birth. Thus, someone who is not transgender is cisgender. Gender identity may be based on feelings about biological sex, societal gender roles, or both. Sex is a biological category: the designations of male, female, and intersex are based on a number of factors, including chromosomes, hormones, and genitalia. Though it is typical to view sex as a binary of male and female, categorization has varied across time and place (Fausto-Sterling 2000). Gender expression is distinct from sex, but related: it is the translation of biological realities into social expectations for “men” and “women” (Beemyn and Rankin 2011; Sausa 2002). It is common to view both sex and gender expression as a binary and to devalue those outside this binary.

Nonbinary transgender people may identify as both man and woman, neither man nor woman, or a unique identity. For example, Beemyn and Rankin (2011) conducted a survey in 2005 and 2006, which was open to anyone who considered themselves part of

the umbrella term “transgender.” As in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey, there were varied written responses, some of which were unique. Some of the more common gender identities that nonbinary transgender people may have are genderqueer, agender, androgynous, Two-Spirit, gender nonconforming, gender variant, third gender, genderfluid, and bigender (Beemyn and Rankin 2011). However, there are no specific definitions or universal experiences associated with any of these gender identities; individuals have diverse reasons for identifying as such (Beemyn and Rankin 2011).

All three transgender groups (transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries) can experience gender dysphoria (physical and/or social). “Gender dysphoria” is distress caused by mismatch between someone's sex assigned at birth and gender identity. Physical dysphoria is distress regarding sex characteristics such as genitals, breasts and facial hair; social dysphoria is distress regarding social interactions such as being addressed with the wrong pronoun or being forced to wear clothing inconsistent with one's identity.

Gender is negotiated in day-to-day, ordinary interaction (West and Zimmerman 1987). People frequently feel uncomfortable when encountering gender expression outside the binary (West and Zimmerman 1987); indicating that nonbinaries easily disrupt gendered expectations. Cisgender people may feel uncertain how to socialize with nonbinaries, since nonbinaries are different from the binary they were socialized into (Monro 2003). This is corroborated by reports from people whose gender presentation is ambiguous, who describe being stared at in public and overhearing confused remarks (Lucal 1999; Nordmarken 2014).

2. Out at the Workplace

Since the workplace is such a significant part of most people's lives, it is theoretically useful to study the experiences of transgender people, particularly nonbinaries, in the workplace. While there is some data available on the experiences of transgender men and women in the workplace, there is very little information on nonbinaries in this social context. This section of the dissertation mitigates this limitation, through evaluating nonbinaries' experiences with discrimination at work. It is important to conduct research on discrimination against nonbinaries in the workplace, because obtaining information on how particular categories of people manage interactional resources in a particular social context helps social scientists begin to combat inequality (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). This section of the dissertation thus evaluates transgender people's experiences with employment discrimination, with a focus on nonbinaries, since they are the most understudied transgender category. While nonbinaries are the primary focus of this chapter, nonbinaries are compared to transgender men and transgender women at the end.

In any situation, the local context (such as idiosyncrasies of a particular workplace) influences social relationships and inequality (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). In many workplaces, when a transgender person transitions and is not dismissed from their job, colleagues and management expect the transgender person to uphold binary gender standards. These standards are often maintained in informal interaction. For example, transgender people often find that they are absorbed into a friendship or acquaintance group corresponding to their gender identity, while people who belong to the other binary gender identity treat them with less familiarity (Schilt and Connell 2007). It is possible to be more inclusive of transgender people, however;

transgender people who report that management makes an effort to dispel gender bias and reward people according to merit also report that they experience little change due to transitioning on the job (Schilt 2010). These findings from studies on transgender men and women, which point to a heavy emphasis on the gender binary in the workplace, suggest that nonbinaries would be pushed to fit into a binary gender category in the workplace.

The “labor force” refers to those people who are available for work (whether they are currently employed or unemployed); people out of the labor force are those who neither have nor want employment. Leppel (2016) reported that transgender people have higher rates of being in the labor force than cisgender people; the rates for transgender women and men were 78% and 85% respectively, compared to 60% and 75% respectively for cisgender women and men. However, transgender people have reported difficulty securing and maintaining employment as a result of their gender identity and expression, meaning that even if they are more likely to be in the labor force, they are also more likely to be unemployed. Unemployment rates for transgender people are approximately twice as high as those for cisgender people (Grant et al. 2011). This is about the same magnitude of difference as that between whites and blacks (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015). About half of transgender people have reported adverse job outcomes, such as being fired, not hired, or denied a promotion as a result of their gender identity or expression (Grant et al. 2011). This is higher than the rates for cisgender people; for example, 5.6% of cisgender people report being fired because of discrimination, 16.0% report not being hired because of discrimination, and 12.7% report being refused a promotion because of discrimination (Kessler, Mickelson, and Williams 1999). Even after factors including age, race, and education are taken into account,

transgender people are more likely than cisgender people to be unemployed and be in poverty (Carpenter, Eppink, and Gonzales 2016).

Hypothesis 3-1: Nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity, nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will:

Hypothesis 3-1a: be more likely to be unemployed

Negative employment outcomes persist even in states with strong protections for transgender people (Davis and Wertz 2009). In California, less than half of transgender people work full time, indicating that many are underemployed (Davis and Wertz 2009). Approximately half of transgender people in California reported job loss resulting from being transgender, and two-thirds reported harassment on the job (Davis and Wertz 2009). Employment and underemployment are influenced by bias associated with the transition process. If previous employers are not supportive of an employee's transition, they may omit that employee when providing a reference, and the prospective employer may discriminate against the transgender person because their appearance or identity documents conflict with the pronouns previous employers use to refer to them (Schilt 2010). As a result, some transgender people must start their work history from the beginning instead of relying on references from previous full-time jobs. This means that transgender people may be forced into underemployment as they take on temporary and part-time entry-level positions that are below their experience and education level (Schilt 2010).

Hypothesis 3-1: Nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who are not out about their

gender identity. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity, nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will:

Hypothesis 3-1b: be more likely to be underemployed, measured as working in a job one is overqualified for

Transgender people have identified a number of issues in their workplaces that influence their ability to feel comfortable in their work environment, demonstrating the variety of experiences transgender people have. For transgender people who are transitioning, one issue is workplaces' lack of procedures for ensuring that others in the workplace are aware of how to treat a transgender person who is transitioning (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). Transgender people must carefully determine the degree to which they can be out at the workplace to avoid harassment or job loss (Dietert and Dentice 2009). They may only be able to be out to some people—possibly only authority figures, and possibly never authority figures (Dietert and Dentice 2009). Some transgender people who have already completed their transition attempt to avoid disclosing their transgender status (Dietert and Dentice 2009). This is not possible for those who transition while working. For example, in Dietert and Dentice's (2009) study, George used a name other than that on his legal identification and had to reveal his transgender status to human resources in order to be addressed properly. Because George was physically transitioning, however, other employees became curious about him. In his words:

“I know they are aware at work that I’m transitioning. But it’s not official because my name hasn’t changed. And I’m fortunate not only because of my specific job but just women quote unquote in general are allowed to dress fairly androgynously. And you know khakis and a polo shirt or whatever. It’s not as bad

as in the past when I had to wear a skirt and jacket. . . . Even though my boss and the HR manager know I'm transitioning, the general population at work doesn't. And as I've become more androgynous on my way to being male bodied, I can tell that people are starting to wonder what's going on." (Dietert and Dentice 2009:131)

Within the workplace, much like in schools, bathrooms can be a source of bullying and exclusion. About a quarter of respondents in a survey of transgender employees conducted in Washington, DC reported being denied access to bathrooms or verbally harassed in bathrooms (Herman 2013). The experiences of transgender people in bathrooms on the job parallel their experiences in educational settings. As in educational settings, some people are absent or tardy as a result of dealing with bathroom problems (Herman 2013). Like those students who are forced out of school, some people quit their jobs or change jobs due to an unwelcoming workplace (Herman 2013).

Transgender and gender non-conforming people report that gender-specific dress codes cause them difficulty, because they require them to dress in a manner inconsistent with their identity (Levi 2007). For example, a transgender woman may be asked to wear short hair because her legal documentation states that she is male. People may lose their jobs for disregarding dress code rules (Levi 2007). In addition, conflicts between someone's gender identity or expression and official identity documentation can lead to confusion or unintended outing. Changing one's name and gender on official identity documents can be difficult, because changing one document is sometimes dependent on changing another, which is in turn dependent on another (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). In most places, it is impossible to obtain official identity documents listing a nonbinary gender. Local, county, state, and federal governments may not have explicit

procedures for changing official identity documents (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007), and some transgender people are not interested in obtaining surgery, which may be necessary to change official documents. Employers who are unfamiliar with difficulties involved in changing identity documents may be confused and not know how to react to requests to do so in the work setting (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007).

Hypothesis 3-1: Nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity, nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will:

Hypothesis 3-1c: be more likely to lose a job

In conclusion, there is a lack of data on nonbinary transgender people in the workplace; however, prior research regarding transgender and gender-nonconforming people in general has demonstrated that they tend to encounter hostile or confused reactions from people in everyday situations. Employment policies acknowledging and protecting transgender people are often lacking, and when they do exist, they may elicit confusion and negative reactions. In many situations, nonbinaries' identities are not acknowledged, and nonbinaries are forced to affiliate with a binary gender option. Thus in many employment situations, nonbinaries find it difficult to fit in, to be acknowledged and accepted by coworkers.

People who are out as nonbinary disrupt, and do not fit into, the status quo. Because there is no socially acceptable category for nonbinary identity or presentation, there is a state of anomie with regard to how to engage with this population: people do not have social scripts for how to communicate with this population, the way that they have scripts for how to communicate with men and women according to existing gender

stereotypes (Monro 2012). People whose gender does not conform to either binary stereotype are easily visible (Lucal 1999; Nordmarken 2014). The transition process can trigger negative reactions in the workplace, because it troubles the binary (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007:14). Though there is currently no data specifically on nonbinaries' status in the workplace, prior research on how people react negatively and with confusion suggests that nonbinaries may be denied promotions, because higher-status people in workplaces (those with power to allocate employees to particular jobs) do not want to provide access to other high-status positions to a person who seems alien (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005).

Hypothesis 3-1: Nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity, nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will:

Hypothesis 3-1d: be more likely to be denied a promotion

Furthermore, higher-status people may remove nonbinaries from contact with clients, customers, or patients in order to avoid triggering the potential biases of their clientele. In other words, employers prefer for the most visible employees to be those who are similar to them and who do not disrupt existing social norms (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005).

Hypothesis 3-1: Nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity. Specifically, relative to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity, nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will:

Hypothesis 3-1e: be more likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients

There is little research on nonbinaries, so this dissertation uses research on transgender men and women to hypothesize about nonbinaries. As described in the literature, transgender women (assigned male at birth) tend to experience worse outcomes than transgender men (assigned female at birth). Prior research suggests that people assigned male at birth who deviate from masculinity (a valued characteristic) will encounter negative outcomes for doing so, and people assigned female at birth who deviate from femininity (a less valued characteristic) will encounter less hostility for doing so (Schilt and Connell 2007). I construct the following set of hypotheses based on the premise that in most social spaces, deviating from masculinity is more heavily penalized than deviating from femininity. Because most people do not easily conceptualize of nonbinary genders (Monro 2012), the way they treat nonbinaries will reflect the same gender biases they use when engaging with cisgender people.

Hypothesis 3-2: Nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth. Specifically, compared to nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth, nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will:

Hypothesis 3-2a: be more likely to be unemployed

Hypothesis 3-2b: be more likely to be underemployed

Hypothesis 3-2c: be more likely to lose a job

Hypothesis 3-2d: be more likely to be denied a promotion

Hypothesis 3-2e: be more likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients

3. Race and Gender

Statuses such as race, class, and gender are intertwined (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). However, antidiscrimination law tends to treat each axis of inequality (e.g., gender bias, racial bias) as a separate issue, rather than identifying ways particular groups (e.g., black women) may be affected (Crenshaw 1989). As a result, each axis of inequality tends to have a “generic” construction—for example, the assumption in the law that women are white (Crenshaw 1989). Multiply marginalized people are thus othered (Browne and Misra 2003; Ferguson 2001; Ispa-Landa 2013). For example, because black boys are stereotyped as criminal and expected to end up in jail, adults place responsibility on black girls to maintain the welfare of their communities (Ferguson 2001; Ispa-Landa 2013). Loudness, activity, or excitability in black girls is criticized more than the same behavior in black boys or white girls because black girls are expected to take on uniquely gendered and raced responsibilities (Ferguson 2001; Ispa-Landa 2013). A process by which expectations are placed upon black women also occurs for adults. When black men in college work to moderate their expressions of anger and other emotions in order to avoid the “angry black man” stereotype, they portray emotion as feminine, thus diverting the angry stereotype to black women (Wilkins 2012). In both of these instances, when black men attempt to fit into dominant white norms, negative racial bias is shifted to black women.

When looking at transgender people, there are also examples of how bias is shifted to multiply marginalized portions of this population (Spade 2006). White supremacist viewpoints privileging white, upper-class families are pervasive in the LGBT community, because the most vocal portions of this community tend to be the most privileged (Spade 2006). As a result, the needs of multiply marginalized transgender

people, such as those who are people of color or homeless, are ignored, both by mainstream organizations and LGBT-specific organizations (Spade 2006).

When Crenshaw (1989) first developed the concept of intersectionality, she focused her analysis on black women because they experienced multiple types of marginalization. Following from the general theme of acknowledging multiply marginalized people, it is essential to acknowledge the challenges faced by transgender people of color, particularly transgender women of color, compared to white transgender people. Transgender people of color experience marginalization across various sectors of life. Although any specific transgender identity is composed of a diverse group of people, there are some stereotypes attached to transgender people, particularly transgender women (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). For example, some transgender women, particularly those of color, have reported being profiled as sex workers (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). This is because when people see a person presenting as a woman whom they know or suspect was assigned male, they tend to focus on their genitalia, and may make comments that are intrusive or lewd (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). This connects to stereotypes of cisgender black women (Harvey Wingfield 2007) and cisgender Latina women (Garcia 2009) as hypersexual. This stereotype is present throughout the lives of women of color. For example, when they seem interested in learning about sex education in schools, they are put down for being “too sexual” or “inappropriately sexual,” and told they should have no interest in knowing about sex (Garcia 2009). This connects to the stereotype that women of color have too many children to afford (Garcia 2009). Within the workplace, men may view women of color as sexually available, making them targets for sexual harassment (Harvey Wingfield 2007). Authority figures who believe stereotypes about transgender people may treat them

unequally or harshly. For example, transgender people of color have reported experiencing more disrespectful language and physical assault when dealing with police than white transgender people have (Grant et al. 2011; Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012; Spade 2006). Of particular relevance to this study is the fact that there is some evidence that transgender people of color experience more negative workplace outcomes than white transgender people. Transgender people of color, particularly African Americans, report poorer employment outcomes than white transgender people, paralleling the experiences of cisgender people of color and cisgender whites (Grant et al. 2011).

Overall, transgender people who fit into mainstream conceptions of what is appropriate for their gender have better outcomes (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). For example, transgender men who fit hegemonic masculinity norms have better outcomes than those who do not (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Transgender men who are tall and white and who appear to be cisgender men tend to gain more status in the workplace than transgender men who are short, men of color, or who do not appear to be cisgender men (Schilt 2010:16). When a transgender man first begins testosterone therapy, he gets “peach fuzz” before getting full facial hair and as a result, looks younger. As a result, a transgender man beginning the physical transition can experience a drop in status caused by assumptions that he is new on the job (Schilt 2010). In addition, men who are short tend to feel as if they are looked down upon and viewed as less authoritative by other men (Schilt 2010). Race intersects with these common experiences to further marginalize transgender people of color. A subject in Schilt's (2010) study, Christopher, who is a transgender man, believed that both his short stature and the fact that he is Asian contribute to his lack of gender advantage at work. He experiences much of the bias that affects Asian men in the United States in general. In his words:

“To the wide world of America, I look like a passive Asian guy. That is what they think when they see me. Oh, Asian? Oh, passive—People have this impression that Asian guys aren't macho and therefore they aren't really male. Or they are not as male as [a white guy].” (Schilt 2010:85)

Transgender black men may be bombarded by the same bias that affects cisgender black men, primarily the attitude that they are violent, incompetent, and dangerous. Trey, who identifies as a black transgender man who is stealth (someone who does not disclose their transgender status), reported that his predominantly white coworkers spoke to him, but not to white people, in what they perceived to be black slang, thus solidifying his status as an outsider (Schilt 2010). In other examples, one black man was written up for rolling his eyes “aggressively” while protesting a new policy in a meeting, and another was asked to roleplay a criminal in a training exercise (Schilt 2010). When transgender people transition in the workplace, they become aware of how people's attitudes toward them shift as well. For example, one black transgender man in Schilt's study, Keith, believed he had the privilege of being more direct as a man than as a woman, but that being a black man limited his ability to express anger. In his words, “I went from being an obnoxious black woman to a scary black man” (Schilt 2010:85).

While transgender people overall are at risk of bias in the workplace, people of color are more vulnerable than whites. When looking at the general population, whites have lower unemployment rates than all other racial groups, though Asians' rates are very similar (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Because jobs are scarce, people of color tend to be sequestered into particular occupations, which may shelter them from discrimination but can depress wages and restrict career mobility (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). For example, in New York City, types of businesses such as small

restaurants and taxi companies provide ethnic niches. Audit studies have proven that whites are more likely to be offered jobs than people of color, particularly blacks and Latinos (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Transgender people are also restricted in their career mobility. For example, many transgender women are segregated in “purple collar” jobs: jobs that coincide with pervasive stereotypes of transgender people, such as entertainment and beauty (David 2015). If they take on other options, they seek out opportunities that allow them to express their gender. In Thailand, some transgender women work in the business process outsourcing (BPO) industry, such as in call centers, because some of these jobs have more leniency in their dress codes and other ways transgender women can express their gender, such as their voice (David 2015).

Overall, research has shown that while transgender people overall are disadvantaged with regard to employment status, people of color are more vulnerable than whites. The following hypothesis and its subcategories uses theory on the intersection of gender identity and race to posit that racial disadvantage will persist among the transgender population, just as it is found in the cisgender population. Since the NTDS does not have any cisgender respondents, it cannot be used to hypothesize about the degree to which racial disadvantage is experienced differently in the transgender population relative to the cisgender population. In other words, while data limitations do not allow me to test the intersectional argument, this hypothesis will test the persistence of racial disadvantage, which is suggested by the literature.

Hypothesis 3-3: Nonbinaries of color will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to white nonbinaries, as specified below:

Hypothesis 3-3a: Compared to white nonbinaries, nonbinaries of color will be more likely to be unemployed.

Hypothesis 3-3b: Compared to white nonbinaries, nonbinaries of color will be more likely to be underemployed.

Hypothesis 3-3c: Compared to white nonbinaries, nonbinaries of color will be more likely to lose a job.

The behavior of people of color is widely scrutinized and held up to dominant norms (Wernick et al. 2014). In the modern service economy, employers value soft skills, which are subjective and highly vulnerable to bias (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). “Soft skills” include such things as people's clothing, mannerisms, speaking style, and cheerfulness (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Employers tend to implicitly assume that whites have superior soft skills; in particular, they assume that blacks do not, viewing them instead as hostile and intimidating (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). These same implicit biases influence how employers perceive the performance of employees of color: employers can exaggerate differences in performance between blacks and whites because of their tendency to stereotype by race, which is reinforced in pervasive negative representations of people of color in the media (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Othering in the workplace influences transgender employees. For example, purple collar workers in call centers generally have limited upward mobility due to the fact that employees do not view them as being strong and fitting into the corporate culture (David 2015). Because transgender people are a devalued group, race further alienates multiply marginalized people. Because the following two measures regard status in the workplace, I hypothesize that employers will deprive multiply marginalized people of status in these ways, both for their own comfort and to avoid activating the biases of their clientele.

Hypothesis 3-3: Nonbinaries of color will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to white nonbinaries, as specified below:

Hypothesis 3-3d: Compared to white nonbinaries, nonbinaries of color will be more likely to be denied a promotion.

Hypothesis 3-3e: Compared to white nonbinaries, nonbinaries of color will be more likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients.

4. Different Transgender Groups

When comparing among transgender groups, transgender women overall experience the worst workplace outcomes. Specific hypotheses and explanations follow. Most transgender women report difficulty obtaining a job, which is why they are disproportionately represented among sex workers (Nemoto, Bodeker, and Iwamoto 2011).

Hypothesis 3-4: Transgender women will encounter more negative employment outcomes than nonbinaries, as specified below:

Hypothesis 3-4a: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender women will be more likely to be unemployed.

Furthermore, transgender women are likely to be harassed or demoted when they transition, while transgender men receive an increase in respect and authority (Schilt and Wiswall 2008). This is because transgender women's feminine presentation eliminates the respect they were accorded as men and makes at least some people in their workplaces uncomfortable, since some people believe feminine presentation in a person assigned male at birth is an abomination (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012).

Hypothesis 3-4b: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender women will be more likely to be underemployed.

There is evidence that transgender women are at high risk of losing a job due to their identity or presentation. In workplaces with dress codes, a transgender woman

whose identification labels her as male may be forced out due to improper dress if she presents as feminine (Levi 2007). Transgender women may be harassed by coworkers or told they should leave, and people may gossip about them (Schilt and Wiswall 2008). It is common to view transgender women as “predators” in women-only spaces (Nadal et al. 2012). This is because gender-segregated spaces, especially women's spaces, are heavily policed, because people fear a perceived trespasser or outsider (Westbrook and Schilt 2013). Transgender women are especially at risk of harassment concerning bathroom use. As one transgender woman reported:

“When I transitioned at work, some of the other women complained behind my back because they didn't want me to use the women's room along with them, and at least one of them started going to the women's room on a different floor of the building just to shun me.” (Herman 2013:75)

Collectively, prior research points to a number of contexts that could lead a transgender employee, especially a woman, to be fired (including but not limited to unintended outing due to identity documents; dress code violations; controversies over using segregated bathrooms; or employer bias).

Hypothesis 3-4c: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender women will be more likely to lose a job.

When transgender women transition in the workplace, it is commonplace for their coworkers to believe their competence has declined, even when their work performance is the same (Schilt and Connell 2007). When transgender women transition, they lose the homosocial bonds they developed as men and are thus absorbed into a gender system in which women's work is devalued (Schilt and Connell 2007). Transitions do not break down the gender system but instead reinforce it, and its bias against women (Schilt and

Connell 2007). In other words, transgender women's upward mobility may be constrained due to the fact that people perceive them, much like cisgender women, to be less competent than men.

Hypothesis 3-4d: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender women will be more likely to be denied a promotion.

Nonbinaries disrupt gendered expectations, since there is no commonly accepted category for identities or presentations that are neither male nor female (Monro 2003). As a result, most cisgender people lack social scripts with which to engage with nonbinaries. Nonbinaries and people who are gender-nonconforming frequently report identifying people's confusion at their gender, including being stared at in public and overhearing confused remarks (Lucal 1999; Nordmarken 2014). In contrast, transgender women occupy a category that is frequently met with disgust, and fear reactions are commonplace (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). Employers, customers, and coworkers may thus be more likely to react to nonbinaries with confusion rather than hostility directed toward a highly devalued category (that of transgender woman).

Hypothesis 3-4e: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender women will be more likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients.

There has been very little social science research about transgender men (Schilt 2010). In contrast, there is a vast amount of research specifically about transgender women, as well as much research lumping all transgender groups together (Schilt 2010). However, it is theoretically useful to study transgender men, as they occupy an uncommon status: while there is a penalty for being transgender, transgender men as opposed to other transgender groups transition into a socially valued category (Schilt 2010). For these reasons, although there is not much literature on transgender men to

draw upon, I anticipate that transgender men will overall have better outcomes than nonbinaries since they have some access to this socially valued category of man. It is possible that transgender men's rejection of femininity is more palatable in a patriarchal society than transgender women's rejection of masculinity.

Hypothesis 3-5: Transgender men will encounter better employment outcomes than nonbinaries, as specified below:

Hypothesis 3-5a: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender men will be less likely to be unemployed.

Hypothesis 3-5b: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender men will be less likely to be underemployed.

Hypothesis 3-5c: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender men will be less likely to lose a job.

Hypothesis 3-5d: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender men will be less likely to be denied a promotion.

Hypothesis 3-5e: Compared to nonbinaries, transgender men will be less likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients.

C. Data and Analytical Plan

1. Data

This section uses data from the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. As described in detail in the previous section on transgender people in educational settings, within the NTDS, there are 2952 transgender women, 1438 transgender men, and 1554 nonbinaries. All gender identities found in the NTDS sample have more non-Hispanic white people than the general population. Black and Hispanic identities are represented at between a third and a half of their population rates. The NTDS population is younger and

whiter than the general population. It is unclear whether these represent the proportions of transgender women, transgender men, and nonbinaries in the general population. It is possible that these proportions are the result of particular types of transgender people having higher response rates or being more likely to participate in the transgender communities the survey was distributed to.

2. Variables

The dependent variables, the employment outcomes I investigate, are whether the respondent is currently unemployed and whether as a result of anti-transgender bias the respondent has been underemployed, lost a job, been denied a promotion, and been removed from direct contact with clients, customers, or patients. I counted as unemployed both those respondents who are currently looking for a job and those who have stopped looking. The other four dependent variables are yes/no questions.

I include outness and transgender appearance in the models. The outness and transgender appearance variables are ordinal. The question regarding outness (“How many people know or believe you are transgender/gender nonconforming on the job?”) has these responses: none, a few, some, most, and all. For simplicity, I collapsed the responses into three categories: none, some (composed of “a few” and “some” from the previous question), and most/all (composed of “most” and “all” from the previous question).

The question about transgender appearance (“People can tell I’m transgender/gender non-conforming even if I don’t tell them”) has these responses: always, most of the time, sometimes, occasionally, and never. I collapsed this question into three responses: always/most of the time (composed of “always” and “most of the time” from the previous question), sometimes (composed of “sometimes” and

“occasionally” from the previous question), and never. For all three transgender groups, the survey did not have the means to compare nuances of appearance, such as whether people know whether someone is transgender based on clothing, secondary sex characteristics, mannerisms, a combination of these, or something else. The literature on categorization demonstrates that transgender or gender-nonconforming appearance can lead to negative outcomes for transgender people, so appearance is a control variable in my analyses to distinguish between the effects of appearance and the effects of outness.

3. Methods and Models

Models for all dependent variables use logistic regression because all five dependent variables are dichotomous. I report odds ratios (a measure of the likelihood of an event occurring). There are two sets of models: one set that compares among nonbinaries for each dependent variable, and a second set that compares among all three transgender groups—nonbinaries, transgender men, and transgender women—with nonbinaries as the reference group. The first set allows me to test hypotheses 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3, and the second set allows me to test hypotheses 3-4 and 3-5. I report odds ratios, where an odds ratio higher than 1 represents a higher likelihood of the dependent variable occurring, while an odds ratio lower than 1 represents a lower likelihood of the dependent variable occurring. Each model includes outness, appearance (appearing transgender or gender nonconforming), and sex assigned at birth. For sex assigned at birth, 0 stands for male and 1 stands for female; for outness, “not out” is the reference group, and for appearance, “not visibly transgender” is the reference group. There is only a moderate correlation (0.38) between outness and appearance. In addition to these variables, each model also contains several demographic and human capital variables available in the NTDS dataset, so as to control for other factors influencing employment outcomes:

education (an ordinal measure including below high school, high school, associate's degree/technical school/some college, bachelor's degree, and graduate or professional degree), race (including white, black, Latino, Asian, and other/mixed, with white as the reference group), age, and disability (yes/no). I also run a set of models that supplement the first set (on nonbinaries only) that add an interaction between sex assigned at birth and outness, allowing me to provide further information on hypothesis 3-2 by evaluating how experiences with outness differ by sex assigned at birth. An interaction between gender and race was attempted but did not display statistical significance, possibly because of small sample sizes and possibly because of no difference in the population. The race effect on its own is discussed in the results section.

D. Results

1. Descriptive Findings

Within the NTDS, there are 2952 transgender women, 1438 transgender men, and 1554 nonbinaries. In other words, transgender women make up about half of the sample, while the other half is almost evenly split between nonbinaries and transgender men. It is unclear whether these represent the proportions of transgender women, transgender men, and nonbinaries in the general population. It is possible that these proportions are the result of particular types of transgender people having higher response rates or being more likely to participate in the transgender communities the survey was distributed to. As shown in Table 4.1, racial demographics for all transgender groups are very similar; in all cases, non-Hispanic whites are the numeric majority, with approximately four-fifths of the sample identifying as white. This exceeds the proportion of whites in the general population. Again, it is unknown whether this reflects the racial demographics of transgender people generally or whether it reflects data limitations.

This section will study a variety of employment outcomes. I begin with descriptive statistics on employment and follow with regression analyses that explore the magnitude of these differences, controlling for relevant demographic and human capital factors. Table 4.2 descriptively compares nonbinaries, transgender women, and transgender men in terms of labor market outcomes, distinguishing between people of color and whites. Unemployment and underemployment rates for these three transgender groups are similar when they are compared among the same racial group (either among whites or among people of color). All groups of transgender people have a higher unemployment rate than the general population. (The unemployment rate, including discouraged workers, for the United States as a whole in 2008 was 10.5% [Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011]). Transgender women of any race are much more likely to have lost a job than other transgender groups (40% of women of color and 36% of white women report this—about twice as high as the rates for nonbinaries and transgender men). When looking at whether respondents were denied a promotion, the statistics show an intersectional story. About 30% of nonbinaries of color and transgender women of color report having been denied a promotion, compared to about 20% of transgender men of color. About 20% of white nonbinaries and white transgender men report having been denied a promotion, compared to 29% of white transgender women. Collectively, these results suggest that while transgender men of color may benefit from some male privilege that affords them status in the workplace, nonbinaries of color and transgender women of color do not. White transgender people, other than women, have the lowest burdens; transgender women of color receive the heaviest burden due to being marginalized on both bases. Finally, transgender men of any race and white nonbinaries are the least likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients, with these groups having

a rate of about 15%. However, nonbinaries of color and transgender women of any race report being removed from contact at about double this rate. This suggests again that men are afforded higher status than other groups; in addition, white nonbinaries, who hold a privileged racial status and who reject devalued femininity, are also afforded some status.

2. Multivariate Findings

I next turn to regression analysis to test the hypotheses outlined in my theoretical section. The tables display odds ratios. Odds ratios above 1 indicate higher likelihood; odds ratios below 1 indicate lower likelihood. For example, an odds ratio of 1.5 indicates a 50% higher chance, while an odds ratio of 0.5 indicates a 50% lower chance.

I begin my analysis by evaluating how being out as nonbinary influences discrimination. Hypothesis 3-1 stated: nonbinaries who are out about their gender identity will encounter more negative employment outcomes compared to nonbinaries who are not out about their gender identity. There is some evidence that nonbinaries' outness influences their employment outcomes, although not all of it supports Hypothesis 3-1. Table 4.3 shows how gender and outness as independent variables influence several employment outcomes, one outcome per column. As Table 4.3 shows, on average, each additional degree of outness is associated with a decrease in the likelihood of being unemployed of 36% (an odds ratio of 0.64). However, each additional degree of outness is also associated with an increase of 27% in the likelihood of being denied a promotion (an odds ratio of 1.27). This may mean that when employers recognize nonbinaries as a category, they are willing to employ them, though they may discriminate against them in job assignment. It may also mean that nonbinaries conceal their gender identity when applying for jobs and are penalized if they come out later on. This would concur with the

fact that there was no statistically significant relationship between outness and underemployment or job loss, and with Dietert and Dentice's (2009) explanation of how transgender people carefully determine when and how to come out in the workplace. Finally, it is possible that employers do not notice or comprehend nonbinaries' identity or gender nonconformity until after they have been hired.

The next hypothesis addresses differences between nonbinaries according to sex assigned at birth. Hypothesis 3-2 was: nonbinaries who were assigned male at birth will encounter more negative employment outcomes than nonbinaries who were assigned female at birth. There is conflicting evidence for this hypothesis. As Table 4.3 shows, female-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries have a 44% lower likelihood of being removed from direct contact with clients, customers, or patients compared to those assigned male at birth (an odds ratio of 0.54). The other results were not statistically significant. In an attempt to further explore the impact of outness, one model investigates the interaction between sex assigned at birth and outness, as shown in Table 4.4. Employers' reactions to nonbinaries are highly conditioned by sex assigned at birth, but their reactions are not consistent. Outness does not increase the odds of unemployment for nonbinaries assigned male at birth, but it is associated with substantially lower unemployment among those who were assigned female at birth. In contrast, outness does not increase the odds of underemployment, job loss, denial of promotion, or removal from contact with clients, customers, or patients for nonbinaries assigned male at birth but is associated with higher levels of those four negative employment outcomes for nonbinaries assigned female at birth. Thus, outness appears to primarily contribute to inequality in hiring for nonbinaries assigned male at birth and to discrimination while on the job for nonbinaries assigned female at birth. Specifically, compared to nonbinaries assigned male at birth, those

assigned female at birth are 42% less likely to be unemployed, but 52% more likely to be underemployed, 65% more likely to be denied a promotion, and 70% more likely to be removed from contact with clients, customers, or patients (odds ratios of 0.58, 1.52, 1.65, and 1.70).

These interactions suggest that a person assigned female at birth who is out as nonbinary is disadvantaged due to their rejection of femininity. This would be consistent with Schilt and Connell's (2007) analysis of how people police gender expression in the workplace. Though Schilt and Connell focused on transgender men and women, their analyses of masculinity and femininity parallel nonbinaries' experiences. They provided examples of transgender women whose coworkers perceived them as losing competence in their work upon their transition to female. Possibly male-assigned-at-birth nonbinaries, who also reject masculinity, are also devalued by employers. Schilt and Connell (2007) also provided examples of transgender men who reported that women coworkers communicated with them as they do with other women. This parallels the salience of sex assigned at birth in the workplace for nonbinaries assigned female at birth. Since employers may not know what to think of nonbinaries, they may revert to using sex assigned at birth to make distinctions. Discrimination is not the only possible explanation for why unemployment differs between nonbinaries who are male-assigned-at-birth and those who are female-assigned-at-birth, however. It is possible that other life experiences or human capital factors contribute to differences in outcomes. As shown in the prior section, many transgender people, especially those assigned male at birth, experience harassment in school settings. This may lead them to leave school, or may cause their performance to suffer due to constant stress and fear. Their experiences early on can lead to negative outcomes in work settings later on.

Removing a transgender person from contact with clients, customers, or patients may be a less risky way of discriminating against an employee, since employers can make a business argument for this differential treatment; moreover, in contrast to firing someone or denying them a promotion, this form of discrimination may appear to be a horizontal shift. However, this type of discrimination may still result in a drop in status, since it may be the first step in demoting or firing an employee. Employers may remove a transgender worker from contact so as to avoid the possibility that a patron of the business could become offended by the presence of someone who appears transgender (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). This interpretation is supported by a significant association between appearing transgender and being removed from contact, as shown in Table 4.4. For each additional degree of appearing transgender, the likelihood of being removed from contact increases by 90% (an odds ratio of 1.90). This suggests that when it is more visually apparent that someone is transgender, employers will choose to remove them from contact with the patrons of the business, hoping to avoid activating the patrons' prejudice or discomfort.

The next hypothesis focuses on how race influences nonbinaries' outcomes. Hypothesis 3-3 stated: nonbinaries of color will encounter more negative employment outcomes than white nonbinaries. Consistent with prior research on transgender men and women and providing support for Hypothesis 3-3, nonbinaries of color sometimes experience worse outcomes compared to white nonbinaries. These findings indicate that racial disparities persist among nonbinaries, as they do among cisgender people. As Table 4.3 shows, on average, blacks compared to whites have a 99% higher likelihood of being unemployed, a 118% higher likelihood of losing a job, and a 155% higher chance of being removed from direct contact with customers, clients, or patients (odds ratios of

1.99, 2.18, and 2.55). People of mixed race compared to whites have a 70% higher likelihood of being underemployed, a 256% higher likelihood of losing a job, a 290% higher likelihood of being denied a promotion, and a 186% higher likelihood of being removed from direct contact with clients, customers, or patients (odds ratios of 1.70, 3.56, 3.90, and 2.86). While a comparison between transgender and cisgender people is not possible due to the fact that the NTDS does not have any cisgender people, the results of this section are consistent with literature pointing to persistent racial bias, in both transgender and cisgender people. These coefficients suggest that black and mixed race nonbinaries experience racial bias. People of color, particularly African Americans, are stereotyped as threatening, angry, or violent (Schilt 2010). This is because the actions of people of color are more heavily policed than the actions of whites (Wernick et al. 2014). Employers' perceptions of soft skills, including manner of dressing, speaking style, and perceived friendliness, are subjective and highly vulnerable to racial bias (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Employers tend to assume that whites have superior soft skills, and implicit racial bias influences how they view people of color. Blacks tend to be viewed as particularly unfriendly and intimidating (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005).

The last two hypotheses compare nonbinaries to other transgender groups. Hypothesis 3-4 stated: Transgender women will encounter more negative employment outcomes than nonbinaries. Hypothesis 3-5 stated: Transgender men will encounter better employment outcomes than nonbinaries. There is evidence that some outcomes are worse for transgender women. Specifically, as shown in Table 4.5, on average, transgender women compared to nonbinaries have a 116% higher likelihood of losing a job and a 43% higher likelihood of being removed from direct contact with clients, customers, or patients (odds ratios of 2.16 and 1.43). The distinctions between nonbinaries and

transgender women are not statistically significant for the other dependent variables. There are no statistically significant differences between the outcomes of transgender men and nonbinaries, suggesting again that being a woman leads to the most negative outcomes. The fact that transgender women are likely to lose a job due to bias suggests that their transitions place them in a gender system in which women's work is devalued (Schilt and Connell 2007). Furthermore, this result highlights removal from contact as a key opportunity for employers to discriminate. This result corroborates prior research on transgender women's experiences, such as the fact that transgender women are frequently the target of fear and disgust (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012; Westbrook and Schilt 2013). In addition to their own biased feelings, employers may remove transgender women from contact with clients, customers, or patients in order to avoid triggering the potential biases of their clientele (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005).

E. Conclusion

In summary, the results from this section suggest that being out at the workplace is only sometimes associated with negative outcomes for nonbinaries. Nonbinaries who are more out at the workplace are less likely to be unemployed but more likely to have been denied a promotion, indicating that although employers may be willing to work with nonbinaries, some are inclined to discriminate against them in access to authority. Employers also treat nonbinaries who are out differently based on sex assigned at birth. While employers appear more inclined to avoid hiring people assigned male at birth who are out as nonbinary compared to those assigned female at birth who are out as nonbinary, they appear more inclined to discriminate against nonbinaries assigned female at birth than those assigned male at birth once hired. The results also indicate that nonbinaries of color, particularly African Americans, tend to face major challenges. The

fact that nonbinaries of color have the worst outcomes confirms that an intersectional analysis of transgender issues is necessary in order to understand how transgender people are treated. Transgender women tend to have the worst outcomes of all transgender groups, suggesting that they receive a harsh penalty for rejecting the socially valued identity of man, disrupting patriarchal supremacy.

Overall, the regression analyses point to unemployment and removal of contact with clients, customers, or patients as key points at which transgender people experience discrimination. This is consistent with research on how people react negatively and with confusion toward nonbinaries. Because nonbinaries disrupt expectations, those people in workplaces with power to allocate employees to particular jobs do not want to provide access to high-status positions to a person who seems alien (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Furthermore, higher-status people may remove nonbinaries from contact with clients, customers, or patients in order to avoid triggering the potential biases of their clientele. In other words, employers prefer for the most visible employees to be those who are similar to them and who do not disrupt existing social norms (Spalter-Roth and Lowenthal 2005). Furthermore, employment and underemployment are influenced by bias associated with coming out as transgender. If previous employers are biased, they may omit that employee when providing a reference or refuse to provide a reference. In addition, prospective employers may discriminate against a transgender person when their appearance or identity documents conflict with the pronouns previous employers use to refer to them (Schilt 2010).

Some of the biases in the workplace operate similarly for different transgender groups, meaning that workplace education on transgender issues may benefit transgender people overall. Employers and coworkers would benefit from understanding more about

the diversity within the transgender community, as well as the purpose of transgender-specific policies in the workplace (Monro and Richardson 2010). A major problem facing transgender people in the workplace is the fact that there are generally no guidelines for employees regarding how to treat a transgender person (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). People who feel they have no social script to follow may feel confused or angry, so this is a trigger point for harassment and discrimination (Whittle, Turner, and Al-Alami 2007). Furthermore, the local context is relevant to this issue. Since most workplaces are hierarchical, transgender people are faced with the difficulty of determining whom to come out to, if anyone (Dietert and Dentice 2009). They may only feel comfortable being out to authority figures, or they may only feel comfortable being out to peers (Dietert and Dentice 2009). Future research would benefit from tracking potential trends in this process—from what point in the hierarchy do transgender people experience the most problems? In any case, authority figures' behavior sets a tone for other employees, so interventions targeted at this group may be particularly important. Policies and programs regarding transgender people in the workplace should be evaluated to determine their effectiveness and improve their implementation.

Harassment in bathrooms is a major problem for many transgender people in the workplace, and it has recently become a major topic in the media. Sixteen states considered bills in 2017 that would restrict access to men's and women's bathrooms to people who were assigned male or female respectively at birth. Access to bathrooms influences transgender workers in multiple ways. First, finding safe bathrooms to use may be time-consuming or distracting for a transgender worker. Transgender people may need to avoid using certain bathrooms, causing physical discomfort, or may waste time searching for less populated bathrooms, so that they do not come into contact with

another person who may harass them there (Herman 2013). Beyond the immediate problems, harassment in bathrooms causes transgender people to feel stressed and to feel like outcasts (Herman 2013). Transgender people feel distressed that they frequently and repeatedly need to assert their gender identity in these spaces when cisgender people do not need to, and they can be victims of gossip when their presence in these spaces is salient to other employees (Herman 2013). Since bathroom access in workplaces is such a substantial issue, it would be useful for future research to address how laws related to bathroom use influence the well-being of transgender people, whether in the workplace or in other public contexts.

While it is possible to make general inferences about inequality, the local context also influences social relationships (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). Notably, some transgender people who report that management makes an effort to be inclusive of transgender people by dispelling gender bias and rewarding employees equally also report that they experience little difficulty transitioning on the job (Schilt 2010). Future research on employment inequality would benefit from studying local factors to determine how strongly they influence the well being of transgender employees. In hierarchical workplaces, whose behavior has the most effect on setting a positive tone for other employees (upper management, middle management, lower-ranked employees)? How might size of the organization influence managers' behavior and ability to encourage tolerance, knowing that owners and upper-level management in corporate jobs may be inaccessible to lower-ranked employees?

Many cisgender people feel confused regarding communication with transgender people, since transgender people disrupt the sex/gender binary that organizes mainstream

social life (Ridgeway 2011). Most people do not have social expectations and guidelines for how to communicate with this population, the way that they have expectations and guidelines for how to communicate with men and women according to existing gender stereotypes (Monro 2012). However, not all people are uncomfortable or awkward about communicating with transgender people. It would be valuable for surveys regarding transgender people in the workplace to ask for information on the industry, occupation, and characteristics of employers and workplaces, such as transphobic employers or the existence of an antidiscrimination statement. This would allow us to understand the degree to which transgender people attempt to sort themselves into more supportive work environments. Such occupational sorting has already been noted for gay men and lesbians (Tilcsic, Anteby, and Knight 2015).

In order to be more inclusive of transgender people, businesses should avoid recording gender unless necessary, and they should permit people to respond with gender identity (including the option to write in a response) rather than sex when possible (Grant et al. 2011; Miller and Weingarten 2005; Sausa 2002). Demographic information should be kept confidential. Businesses with more than 100 employees (or those with more than 50 if federal contractors), are required by the EEOC to report employees' gender in order to evaluate bias, but the EEOC only permits the options of male and female. If this were changed to provide transgender-inclusive options (adding transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries), researchers would be able to investigate transgender employment inequality with more precision. If the EEOC did provide this option, it would educate employers that the category exists and is protected. However, since being out at the workplace can trigger employers' biases, not all employees will feel comfortable sharing their transgender status. Possibly reporting this information should

be voluntary, as it is on job applications.

It would be useful for future research to investigate the feelings and behaviors toward transgender people among employers and coworkers. Data on harassment and hate crimes should be reported and their sources evaluated. In addition, data should also be collected regarding implicit biases toward transgender people, following the lead Harvard's Project Implicit has taken in producing methods of measuring these biases. Psychological studies on anti-transgender implicit bias would complement sociological research on this population.

F. Tables

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics: Race and Gender (NTDS)

	Female- Assigned-at- Birth Nonbinaries	Male-Assigned- at-Birth Nonbinaries	Transgender Men	Transgender Women
White	79% (608)	80% (491)	79% (1049)	83% (2076)
Black	5% (35)	6% (36)	5% (64)	5% (123)
Latino	7% (54)	4% (24)	7% (96)	5% (116)
Asian	4% (28)	3% (19)	5% (64)	4% (111)
Other	6% (49)	7% (45)	4% (48)	3% (78)

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics: Labor Market Outcomes of Nonbinaries, Transgender Men, and Transgender Women (NTDS)

	Nonbinaries		Transgender Men		Transgender Women	
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Unemployed	18% (52)	11% (122)	15% (42)	13% (141)	22% (95)	15% (302)
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Experienced Underemployment	49% (98)	42% (342)	42% (89)	41% (354)	52% (149)	49% (720)
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Lost Job	29% (60)	16% (134)	21% (45)	19% (166)	40% (124)	36% (553)
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Denied Promotion	31% (59)	18% (135)	18% (36)	17% (139)	32% (90)	29% (410)
	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites	People of Color	Whites
Removed from Contact	30% (58)	16% (120)	14% (28)	13% (111)	30% (76)	26% (379)

Table 4.3: Logistic Regression: Influence of Gender and Race on Employment Outcomes (Nonbinaries only; NTDS)

	Currently Unemployed	Have Been Underemployed	Lost Job	Denied Promotion	Removed from Contact
Birth Female	1.06 (1.27)	0.89 (1.19)	0.84 (1.25)	0.77 (1.25)	0.66 ^ (1.26)
Outness	0.64** (1.15)	1.11 (1.10)	1.01 (1.14)	1.27 ^ (1.14)	1.21 (1.14)
Transgender Appearance	1.25 (1.20)	1.21 (1.13)	1.23 (1.17)	1.31 ^ (1.16)	1.86 *** (1.19)
Education	0.63 *** (1.12)	1.04 (1.08)	0.84 ^ (1.11)	0.84 (1.11)	0.90 (1.11)
Black	1.99^ (1.48)	1.35 (1.36)	2.18 * (1.45)	1.68 (1.46)	2.51 *** (1.45)
Latino	1.63 (1.46)	1.35 (1.35)	0.46 (1.72)	1.11 (1.45)	1.45 (1.44)
Asian	1.54 (1.67)	0.76 (1.51)	1.11 (1.67)	0.70 (1.75)	0.79 (1.43)
Other	1.73 (1.43)	1.70 (1.30)	3.56 *** (1.31)	3.90 *** (1.31)	2.86 *** (1.77)
Age	0.99 (1.01)	1.00 (1.01)	1.01 (1.01)	0.99 (1.01)	1.00 (1.34)
Disability	2.01 *** (1.23)	1.75 (1.23)	1.99 *** (1.21)	1.40 ^ (1.21)	1.66 (1.21)
N	1071	910	921	860	876

Each column is a separate model, and a respondent could respond affirmatively to more than one of these five questions (or to none). All coefficients were derived from logistic regression; the columns display odds ratios, with standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes vary due to respondents who did not answer a question or who noted that the question did not apply.

^ p < .1; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 4.4: Logistic Regression: Influence of Gender and Race on Employment Outcomes (Nonbinaries Only, with Interactions; NTDS)

	Currently Unemployed	Have Been Underemployed	Lost Job	Denied Promotion	Removed from Contact
Birth Female	1.73 (1.40)	0.57 * (1.31)	0.48 * (1.43)	0.42 * (1.45)	0.35 ** (1.49)
Outness	0.87 (1.23)	0.86 (1.16)	0.76 (1.21)	0.94 (1.21)	0.90 (1.22)
Female * Outness	0.58 * (1.31)	1.52 * (1.21)	1.65 ^ (1.30)	1.68 * (1.30)	1.70 * (1.31)
Transgender Appearance	1.22 (1.20)	1.23 ^ (1.13)	1.26 (1.17)	1.33 ^ (1.17)	1.90 *** (1.19)
Education	0.65 (1.12)	1.02 (1.08)	0.83 ^ (1.10)	1.33 * (1.11)	0.88 (1.11)
Black	1.95 ^ (1.48)	1.38 (1.38)	2.29 * (1.45)	1.79 (1.46)	2.55* (1.45)
Latino	1.65 (1.46)	1.32 (1.35)	0.44 (1.72)	1.08 (1.46)	1.40 (1.43)
Asian	1.48 (1.67)	0.78 (1.51)	1.15 (1.67)	0.76 (1.75)	0.86 (1.77)
Other	1.70 (1.43)	1.73 * (1.30)	3.63 *** (1.32)	3.94 *** (1.31)	2.89 *** (1.37)
Age	1.00 (1.01)	1.00 (1.00)	1.01 (1.01)	0.99 (1.01)	1.00 (1.00)
Disability	2.01 *** (1.23)	1.75 *** (1.16)	1.99 *** (1.21)	1.39 * (1.21)	1.67 ** (1.21)
N	1071	910	921	860	876

Each column is a separate model, and a respondent could respond affirmatively to more than one of these five questions (or to none). All coefficients were derived from logistic regression; the columns display odds ratios, with standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes vary due to respondents who did not answer a question or who noted that the question did not apply.

^ p < .1; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 4.5: Logistic Regression: Influence of Gender and Race on Employment Outcomes (All Transgender Groups; NTDS)

	Currently Unemployed	Have Been Underemployed	Lost Job	Denied Promotion	Removed from Contact
Transgender Men	1.17 (1.18)	1.00 (1.13)	1.25 (1.16)	0.92 (1.16)	0.81 (1.17)
Transgender Women	1.25 (1.23)	1.06 (1.17)	2.16*** (1.21)	1.36 (1.21)	1.43^ (1.22)
Birth Female	1.20 (1.26)	0.82 (1.19)	0.76 (1.23)	0.68^ (1.23)	0.76 (1.25)
Outness	0.84 (1.07)	1.03* (1.05)	0.96 (1.06)	1.09 (1.06)	1.16* (1.06)
Transgender Appearance	1.16^ (1.09)	1.20** (1.06)	1.06 (1.07)	1.19* (1.07)	1.22** (1.08)
Education	0.74*** (1.05)	1.06 (1.04)	0.93 (1.04)	0.97 (1.05)	0.98 (1.05)
Black	1.57* (1.22)	1.07 (1.17)	1.14 (1.21)	1.07 (1.22)	1.13 (1.23)
Latino	1.45^ (1.22)	1.31^ (1.16)	1.07 (1.20)	1.35* (1.19)	1.30 (1.21)
Asian	1.03 (1.31)	0.69^ (1.22)	0.88 (1.27)	0.66 (1.30)	0.73 (1.32)
Other	1.27 (1.25)	1.36^ (1.17)	1.99*** (1.19)	1.77** (1.19)	1.79** (1.20)
Age	0.99 (1.00)	1.00 (1.00)	1.00 (1.00)	0.99** (1.00)	1.00 (1.00)
Disability	1.88*** (1.12)	1.72*** (1.08)	1.77*** (1.09)	1.63*** (1.09)	1.48*** (1.11)
N	3837	3362	3488	3259	3316

Each column is a separate model, and a respondent could respond affirmatively to more than one of these five questions (or to none). All coefficients were derived from logistic regression; the columns display odds ratios, with standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes vary due to respondents who did not answer a question or who noted that the question did not apply.

^ p < .1; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This study moves forward both the scholarship on cisgender people and the scholarship on transgender people, including how these relate to race. Not only have I unpacked measurement of the concept of gender by considering gender identity, gender traits, and their intersections with race, my study also disaggregates transgendered people to consider how their educational and employment outcomes differ.

While prior research has established evidence of educational and employment difficulty for transgender people, much of this research used small qualitative samples without comparison baselines, limiting the analysis of the scope of the problem and comparisons of inequality between different categories of transgender people. Unpacking the heterogeneity of subgroups of transgender people is a major contribution that my dissertation makes toward this field. My research has demonstrated that transgender people are not a homogeneous group; with a few exceptions, transgender women tend to have worse outcomes in educational and employment settings than nonbinaries, while nonbinaries and transgender men tend to have similar outcomes. This suggests that femininity is a primary devalued characteristic that contributes to negative outcomes.

LGBT people of color habitually experience exclusion on both bases (Hahm and Adkins 2009; Moore 2006; Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). They may feel like outsiders among LGBT people due to their racial bias, and they may feel like outsiders in their racial community due to being LGBT. Within the general population, people typically have limited knowledge of working with multiply marginalized populations and attending to their complex needs (Ocampo and Soodjinda 2016). My dissertation has documented that black and Latino transgender students overall have worse school outcomes than

white transgender students (though there was no statistically significant difference between the outcomes of whites and Asians). Within workplaces, blacks and mixed race people tend to have the most challenges relative to whites. Thus my dissertation has emphasized the fact that it is essential to incorporate race into a study of transgender people.

It is important for social scientists to do research on distinctions between men and women. This is consistent with Ridgeway's (2011) concept of sex/gender as a primary classification system—something generally easily visible that people use to simplify their understanding of social life. As a similar example, Stout et al. (2010) found that seeing women experts in STEM fields was sufficient to encourage women to identify more with STEM. However, prior research on gendered expectations has demonstrated that they are socially constructed and can vary widely across time and place. Furthermore, at times, sex and gender do not line up. When looking at educational and employment settings, both gender variation within sex assigned at birth (i.e., differences in gender expression among cisgender people) and variations in sex assigned at birth within gender identity categories (i.e., transgender people) are important. Thus it is essential for social scientists to complicate gender in their research through different and comprehensive measures of gender.

A. Cisgender Men and Women in Educational Settings

The frequent nonsignificant relationships in my study between the BSRI and higher education outcomes indicate that its indicators of masculinity and femininity may be too broad, subjective, or malleable to help social scientists measure specific life outcomes. It may be impossible to construct an overall measure of masculinity or femininity, as Bem (1974) attempted to do, because of the degree of distinction between

different types of people and change over time. Attempting to measure masculinity and femininity in a national sample in order to predict outcomes may be too broad an undertaking given the vast differences on the basis of traits such as race and socioeconomic status in how masculinity and femininity can be conceptualized and expressed. Alternately, the BSRI may be outdated and insensitive to current variation in gender expression.

Furthermore, occupational gender labeling is a complex phenomenon (Charles and Bradley 2009). Different versions of masculinity and femininity can be more or less applicable to different positions, and these notions can shift over time (Charles and Bradley 2009). For example, muscularity and logic are both associated with masculinity, but they intersect with different social classes and thus are associated with different types of jobs, with physical strength increasingly de-emphasized in much of the white collar work that rewards cognitive skills. While it is valuable to document general gendered patterns in field segregation, it is essential to remember that deviations are possible, which reflect local circumstances (Charles and Bradley 2009; Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). In addition, there is some arbitrariness and malleability in labeling, since most occupations require both expressive and analytical characteristics (Charles and Bradley 2009). For example, scientific and technical work still incorporates some service expectations, and women-dominated service occupations incorporate analytical components (Charles and Bradley 2009).

The general theme of the BSRI is that gender is more than just the identity categories of men and women: each individual can express masculinity, femininity, both, or neither. My research has documented how incorporating a measure of gender expression in addition to gender identity is a valuable way of interpreting higher

education outcomes. However, because the BSRI was a product of a college convenience sample at a particular time and place, the BSRI itself is somewhat outdated, as well as white-centric. Surveys with probability samples would benefit from including some measures of gender in addition to gender identity categories in order to better understand cisgender men's and women's outcomes, but such gender measures should be more sensitive to contemporary variation in gender expression. Furthermore, in order to better understand how people conceptualize masculinity and femininity nowadays (whether in education or any other context), it may be useful to construct a new BSRI-type scale. While research has evaluated the BSRI over time, research has not attempted to replicate what Bem (1974) did, which was to construct scales of masculinity and femininity. Since the original BSRI was developed on a more privileged population, it would be valuable to develop a BSRI-type scale on people who are more diverse in their race, region, and social class. Much research evaluating the BSRI since it was created has looked into the degree to which people judge the BSRI traits as masculine or feminine, or into the degree to which people have, or would like to have, those traits. Future research would benefit from identifying qualitatively why people feel the way they do about these traits. What demographic characteristics or life experiences contribute to their labeling themselves with particular feminine or masculine traits? Why do they feel as if particular traits would benefit them? Such a study may contribute to a new BSRI-type scale.

B. Transgender People in Educational and Work Settings

Transgender women experience the worst workplace and educational outcomes. These results are consistent with existing theory explaining how and why people fear transgender women (Nadal, Skolnik, and Wong 2012). Patriarchy is far-reaching, and transgender people, especially women, disturb patriarchal supremacy in a variety of

everyday situations. Transgender people are visible and scrutinized based on their manner of dress and their use of gender-segregated facilities, and their competence, particularly if they are transgender women, is questioned. My research suggests that transgender women experience the worst outcomes because they reject the socially valued label of man and take on the socially devalued label of woman. My research builds upon existing information on how different transgender groups are treated by theorizing specifically on nonbinaries. I had hypothesized broadly that nonbinaries would have outcomes in between those of transgender women and transgender men. However, I generally found no difference between the outcomes of nonbinaries and transgender men, while transgender women did the worst. These results suggest that people are generally reacting to nonbinaries with confusion. Because there is no socially acceptable category for identities or presentations that are neither male nor female, people lack social scripts with which to engage with nonbinaries (Monro 2003). As a result, nonbinaries frequently avoid the level of hatred that is often expressed toward transgender women (Schilt and Connell 2007).

The fact that different transgender groups sometimes experience the same challenges indicates that some similar interventions may improve their school and workplace outcomes. Broader education about and recognition of all transgender identities could help put into practice effective transgender-inclusive policies. Administrators have reported confusion regarding the diverse identities within the transgender umbrella, as well as confusion regarding the purpose and scope of LGBT activist organizations (Monro and Richardson 2010). So to begin with, it is essential that school administrators and workplace managers become aware of general information on transgender people, as well as how gender identity is different from sexual orientation.

Furthermore, some administrators report having a “gender-blind” attitude, treating everyone under their reach the same regardless of whether they are LGBT (Monro and Richardson 2010). This is an inefficient strategy because it ignores diverse people's experiences and needs (Monro and Richardson 2010). As a result, effectiveness of interventions targeted toward specific groups should be gathered so as to emphasize this fact to administrators of schools and workplaces.

Transgender equality is important not only for social justice reasons but also for businesses' bottom line. As transgender people become more visible and more likely to express their identity in public, businesses may lose out on talented workers by not hiring or promoting transgender people. Furthermore, businesses can better serve a diverse customer base by ensuring diversity and inclusion among their employees. Businesses and schools can be inclusive of transgender people by evaluating their methods of recording gender, permitting people to respond with gender identity (including the option to write in a response) rather than sex when possible (Grant et al. 2011; Miller and Weingarten 2005; Sausa 2002). Furthermore, the option to avoid filling in gender information must be available unless there is a legal reason not to, and in those cases, the information should be kept confidential, among only those people who need it. In the case of businesses with more than 100 employees (50 if federal contractors), the EEOC currently mandates that they report employees' gender, but the EEOC only permits the options of male and female. If this were changed to provide transgender-inclusive options (adding transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries), researchers would be able to investigate transgender employment inequality with more precision. The EEOC currently interprets the prohibition against sex discrimination to cover transgender and LGB people. If the EEOC did provide more ways of measuring the transgender

population, it would educate employers that the category exists and is protected. Businesses and schools can permit transgender people to change their name and gender on that institution's documentation, even if they have not done so legally (Beemyn 2005). Because the number of people who are likely to use transgender-specific options is small, the inclusion of these options should not pose a burden for data collection (Miller and Weingarten 2005). Businesses can include gender identity and expression on antidiscrimination policies and implement standards for reporting transphobic incidents (Sausa 2002).

To view systems of inequality as separate ignores the multiple ways people lack privilege. However, antidiscrimination law tends to treat systems of inequality as separate. For example, in the case *De Graffenreid v General Motors*, the plaintiffs attempted to make a case for black women specifically, not blacks only or women only, because black women had been laid off as a result of having the least seniority. The sex discrimination portion of the suit was dismissed because white women (though not black women) had been hired in the past, and the court recommended that the race suit be consolidated with another race suit (Crenshaw 1989).

Focusing activism on people who experience intersecting systems of inequality also benefits those who experience only one form of inequality (Crenshaw 1989). Without intersectionality, activism can benefit some members of a group at the expense of others (Chun, Lipsitz, and Shin 2013). The results from this dissertation regarding transgender people in educational and employment contexts indicate that there is extensive marginalization of transgender people of color, in various contexts. LGBT people of color have reported hostility and violence from both within and outside their racial and ethnic communities (Meyer 2012). As a result, advocacy on behalf of

transgender people must make an effort to acknowledge race and other intersections with gender identity in order to reach everyone falling under the transgender umbrella.

Policies specific to transgender people of color should be implemented and their effectiveness evaluated. Such a process would move beyond just nondiscrimination to encompass “gender self-determination”: in other words, allowing marginalized people to speak for, and label, themselves, their needs, and their experiences (Spade 2006).

Even though Title VII is insufficient to protect gender-nonconforming people from harassment, so is the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) (Alemzadeh 2013). ENDA must be accompanied by extension of Title VII to cover more issues. Title VII has been generally based on sexual harassment, particularly heterosexual harassment; thus it has not been sufficient to cover same-gender harassment or harassment on the basis of gender identity (Alemzadeh 2013). Furthermore, ENDA is insufficient because it prohibits discrimination, not harassment (Alemzadeh 2013). Expanding Title VII could be an effective way of providing protections to transgender people, because historically it has been widely accepted and viewed as legitimate (Alemzadeh 2013). Even when protections exist, not everyone knows about the laws, and not everyone who experiences discrimination reports it (Davis and Wertz 2009). Furthermore, some people fear retaliation at their jobs if they file a complaint (Davis and Wertz 2009). As a result, increased education on the law may be beneficial.

Finally, there are some things researchers can do in the future to improve our understanding of transgender people's educational and employment outcomes. Though the NTDS was intended to provide comprehensive information on transgender people, it was not derived from a random sample. Institutions that have the resources for large-scale or random sampling should include transgender-inclusive questions about gender (Grant

et al. 2011). The size of the transgender population has been estimated at 0.3% of people (Gates 2011), so a large-scale survey with transgender-inclusive questions would be needed to provide an adequate sample size of transgender men, transgender women, and nonbinaries.

The NTDS had only one question about the degree to which others can tell whether the respondent was transgender or gender nonconforming. Because the NTDS is unable to determine nuances of appearance, researchers should also investigate how different types of gender presentation, such as masculine, feminine, mixed, and neutral, influence how transgender people are treated. Future studies should explain nuances of appearance, such as perceptions of transgender people's clothes, mannerisms, and sex assigned at birth. Researchers could also investigate how transgender people alter their gender expression for work and school environments. This is important because marginalized people can modify their presentation of self depending on the situation, often in order to ensure their own safety (Jones 2009). Finally, surveys regarding transgender people in the workplace should ask for information on the industry, occupation, and characteristics of employers and workplaces, such as transphobic employers or the existence of an antidiscrimination statement. This would allow us to understand the degree to which transgender people attempt to sort themselves into more supportive work environments.

Intersectional theory posits that the relationships between categories create new and unique meanings (Browne and Misra 2003; Warner 2008). It is essential for surveys that include transgender people to be large in order to provide enough variation within transgender categories on other demographic bases. Since all categories can intersect with other categories, it is useful for research on transgender people to provide a variety of

demographic questions so as to allow researchers the opportunity to investigate diverse intersections.

It is essential to obtain accurate statistics on how many people are transgender. It is difficult to evaluate the characteristics of transgender people and their experiences when no formal random samples of this population are available. It is also difficult to advocate on behalf of this population when such statistics are unavailable. If large-scale randomly sampled data were gathered, those data would be better suited to influence people who have misinformed or bigoted beliefs than non-random data or smaller samples, which could be perceived as invalid. Furthermore, including comprehensive gender questions on formal, large-scale surveys would serve to normalize the existence of transgender people. When people are accustomed to encountering surveys that only have two binary gender options, it is easy for them to dismiss other identities. Ensuring confidentiality in such surveys will be essential; because employment protections for transgender people are often lacking, transgender people may be reluctant to answer honestly on such surveys otherwise.

Although coefficients for most control variables in my analyses were nonsignificant, the intersections between transgender status and disability would be useful topics for future research. Because transgender people with disabilities are at a high risk of developing psychological difficulties as a result of the multiple types of discrimination they experience, it is essential for social scientists to understand their needs better (Ballan et al. 2011). Furthermore, policies commonly portray LGBT people and people with disabilities as two separate groups; for example, having a Disability Services office and an LGBT organization on a college campus that do not interact with one another (Harley et al. 2002). Researchers can prevent such “dissecting” of

marginalized groups through investigating how such categories intersect (Harley et al. 2002).

It would be useful for future research to investigate the perpetrators of bias against transgender people in educational and employment settings. Social desirability bias limits the likelihood of direct responses to this question, so measuring implicit bias would be useful. An interdisciplinary look at transgender issues would thus be useful; psychological research on implicit bias could better help us understand the nuances of how people in educational and employment settings view gender-nonconforming people as more threatening than those who conform to gender norms.

Future research on transgender people should also take into account characteristics of the location in which discrimination occurs. Inequality is not only a question of particular categories of people (e.g., transgender, cisgender); inequality is a complex phenomenon involving the entire context in which interactions occur (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). In a study of LGBT school harassment among primarily public school students, Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz (2009) found that students in the West and Midwest of the United States were less likely to report having heard homophobic remarks than students in the Northeast. In addition, they found that students in urban areas were less likely to hear such remarks than students in rural areas. These findings on homophobia indicate that it would be productive to construct a study in which the experiences of transgender students in schools representing different contexts (public or private; urban or rural; different regions of the United States [or another country of interest]) are compared. Such a study would serve both theoretical and practical purposes, as it would not only help social scientists understand how interactions operate in different

contexts but also help transgender advocates identify problems more specifically and target interventions appropriately.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alemzadeh, Sheerine. 2013. "Protecting the Margins: Intersectional Strategies to Protecting Gender Outlaws from Workplace Harassment." *N.Y.U Review of Law and Social Change* 37:339-370.
- Antecol, Heather, and Deborah A. Cobb-Clark. 2013. "Do Psychosocial Traits Help Explain Gender Segregation in Young People's Occupations?" *Labour Economics* 21:59-73.
- Beemyn, Brett Genny. 2005. "Making Campuses More Inclusive of Transgender Students." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education* 3(1):77-87.
- Beemyn, Genny, and Susan Rankin. 2011. *The Lives of Transgender People*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1977. "On the Utility of Alternative Procedures for Assessing Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 45(2):196-205.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1974. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42(2):155-162.
- Bilodeau, Brent. 2005. "Beyond the Gender Binary: A Case Study of Two Transgender Students at a Midwestern Research University." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education* 3(1):29-44.
- Blau, Francine D., and Lawrence M. Kahn. 2007. "The Gender Pay Gap: Have Women Gone As Far As They Can?" *Academy of Management Perspectives* 21(1):7-23.
- Blumstein, Philip, and Pepper Schwartz. 1983. *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex*. New York: William Morrow.
- Branch, Enobong Hannah. 2011. *Opportunity Denied: Limiting Black Women to Devalued Work*. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press.
- Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3):652-688.
- Brown, Michael. 2012. "Gender and Sexuality I: Intersectional Anxieties." *Progress in Human Geography* 36(4):541-550.
- Browne, Irene, and Joya Misra. 2003. "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:487-513.
- Bryant, Alyssa. 2003. "Changes in Attitudes Toward Women's Roles: Predicting Gender-Role Traditionalism Among College Students." *Sex Roles* 48(3/4):131-142.

- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2015. "Economic News Release: Employment Status of the Civilian Population by Race, Sex, and Age." Retrieved March 18, 2015 from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t02.htm>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2011. "Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization for States, 2008." Retrieved April 24, 2015 from <http://www.bls.gov/lau/stalt08.htm>.
- Campbell, Colin, and Jonathan Horowitz. 2016. "Does College Influence Sociopolitical Attitudes?" *Sociology of Education* 89(1):40-58.
- Carpenter, Christopher S., Samuel T. Eppink, and Gilbert Gonzalez. 2016. "Transgender Status, Employment, and Income."
- Charles, Maria, and Karen Bradley. 2009. "Indulging Our Gendered Selves? Sex Segregation by Field of Study in 44 Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(4):924-976.
- Charles, Maria, and Karen Bradley. 2002. "Equal but Separate? A Cross-National Study of Sex Segregation in Higher Education." *American Sociological Review* 67(4):573-599.
- Chatard, Armand, and Leila Selimbegovic. 2007. "The Impact of Higher Education on Egalitarian Attitudes and Values: Contextual and Cultural Determinants." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 1(1):541-566.
- Chun, Jennifer Jihye, George Lipsitz, and Young Shin. 2013. "Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates." *Signs* 38(4):917-940.
- Connell, R.W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19:829-859.
- Crawley, Sara. 2008. "The Clothes Make the Trans: Region and Geography in Experiences of the Body." *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 12(4):365-379.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *U. Chi. Legal F.* 139-167.
- David, Emmanuel. 2015. "Purple-Collar Labor: Transgender Workers and Queer Value at Global Call Centers in the Philippines." *Gender & Society* 29(2):169-194.
- Davis, Masen, and Kristina Wertz. 2009. "When Laws Are Not Enough: A Study of the Economic Health of Transgender People and the Need for a Multidisciplinary Approach to Economic Justice." *Seattle Journal for Social Justice* 8(2):467-495.

- Davis, Shannon N., and Theodore N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:87-105.
- Dietert, Michelle, and Dianne Dentice. 2009. "Gender Identity Issues and Workplace Discrimination: The Transgender Experience." *Journal of Workplace Rights* 14(1):121-140.
- Di Prete, Thomas A., and Claudia Buchmann. 2013. *The Rise of Women: The Growing Gender Gap in Education and What It Means for American Schools*. Baltimore: Russell Sage.
- Donnelly, Kristin, and Jean M. Twenge. 2017. "Masculine and Feminine Traits on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, 1993–2012: A Cross-Temporal Meta-Analysis." *Sex Roles* 9-10:556-565.
- Dugan, John P., Michelle L. Kusel, and Dawn M. Simounet. 2012. "Transgender College Students: An Exploratory Study of Perceptions, Engagement, and Educational Outcomes." *Journal of College Student Development* 53(5):719-736.
- Earnshaw, Valerie A., Laura M. Bogart, V. Paul Poteat, Sari L. Reisner, Mark A. Schuster. 2016. "Bullying Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth." *Pediatr Clin N Am* 63:999-1010.
- Ely, Robin J. 1995. "The Power in Demography: Women's Social Constructions of Gender Identity at Work." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(3):589-634.
- England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society* 24(2):149-166.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Ferguson, Ann Arnett. 2001. *Bad Boys: Public Schools and the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fish, Julie. 2007. "Navigating Queer Street: Researching the Intersections of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Trans (LGBT) Identities in Health Research." *Sociological Research Online* 13(1).
- Garcia, Lorena. 2009. "Now Why Do You Want to Know About That?": Heteronormativity, Sexism, and Racism in the Sexual (Mis)education of Latina Youth." *Gender & Society* 23(4):520-541.
- Gates, Gary. 2011. "How Many People Are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender?" Williams Institute.

- Geijtenbeek, Lydia, and Erik Plug. 2015. "Is There a Penalty for Becoming a Woman? Is There a Premium for Becoming a Man? Evidence from a Sample of Transsexual Workers." IZA Discussion Paper No. 9077.
- Goyette, Kimberly A., and Ann L. Mullen. 2006. "Who Studies the Arts and Sciences? Social Background and the Choice and Consequences of Undergraduate Field of Study." *The Journal of Higher Education* 77(3):497-538.
- Grant, Jaime M., Lisa A. Mottet, Justin Tanis, Jack Harrison, Jody L. Herman, and Mara Keisling. 2011. "Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey."
- Gupta, Sanjiv. 2007. "Autonomy, Dependence, or Display? The Relationship Between Married Women's Earnings and Housework." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69:399-417.
- Hahm, Hyeouk Chris, and Chris Adkins. 2009. "A Model of Asian and Pacific Islander Sexual Minority Acculturation." *Journal of LGBT Youth* 6:155-173.
- Harley, Debra A., Theresa M. Nowak, Linda J. Gassaway, and Todd A. Savage. 2002. "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender College Students with Disabilities: A Look at Multiple Cultural Minorities." *Psychology in the Schools* 39(5):525-538.
- Harris, Benjamin Cerf. 2015. "Likely Transgender Individuals in U.S. Federal Administrative Records and the 2010 Census." U.S. Census Bureau Center for Administrative Records Research and Applications Working Paper 2015-03.
- Harrison, Jack, Jaime Grant, and Jody L. Herman. 2012. "A Gender Not Listed Here: Genderqueers, Gender Rebels, and OtherWise in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey." *LGBTQ Policy Journal at the Harvard Kennedy School* 2:13-24.
- Harvey Wingfield, Adia. 2007. "The Modern Mammy and the Angry Black Man: African American Professionals' Experiences with Gendered Racism in the Workplace." *Race, Gender, & Class* 14(1/2):196-212.
- Herd, Gilbert. 1996. *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. New York: Zone Books.
- Herman, Jody L. 2013. "Gendered Restrooms and Minority Stress: The Public Regulation of Gender and Its Impact on Transgender People's Lives." *Journal of Public Management and Social Policy* 19(1):65-80.
- Hoffman, Rose Marie, and L. DiAnne Borders. 2001. "Twenty-Five Years after the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A Reassessment and New Issues Regarding Classification Variability." *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development* 34:35-55.

- Ispa-Landa, Simone. 2013. "Gender, Race, and Justifications for Group Exclusion: Urban Black Students Bussed to Affluent Suburban Schools." *Sociology of Education* 86(3):218-233.
- Jones, Nikki. 2009. "I Was Aggressive for the Streets, Pretty for the Pictures": Gender, Difference, and the Inner-City Girl." *Gender & Society* 23(1):89-93.
- Judge, Timothy A., and Beth A. Livingston. 2008. "Is the Gap More than Gender? A Longitudinal Analysis of Gender, Gender Role Orientation, and Earnings." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93(5):994-1012.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(5):965-990.
- Kessler, Ronald C., Kristin D. Mickelson, and David R. Williams. 1999. "The Prevalence, Distribution, and Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination in the United States." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 40(3):208-230.
- Konrad, Alison M., and Claudia Harris. 2002. "Desirability of the Bem Sex Role Inventory Items for Women and Men: A Comparison Between African Americans and European Americans." *Sex Roles* 47(5/6):259-271.
- Kosciw, Joseph G., Emily A. Greytak, Mark J. Bartkiewicz, Madelyn J. Boesen, and Neal A. Palmer. "The 2011 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth." GLSEN.
- Kosciw, Joseph G., Emily A. Greytak, and Elizabeth M. Diaz. 2009. "Who, What, When, Where, and Why: Demographic and Ecological Factors Contributing to Hostile School Climate for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth." *J Youth Adolescence* 38:976-988.
- Kreuter, Frauke, Stanley Presser, and Roger Tourangeau. 2008. "Social Desirability Bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72(5):847-865.
- Kuper, Laura E., Robin Nussbaum, and Brian Mustanski. 2012. "Exploring the Diversity of Gender and Sexual Orientation Identities in an Online Sample of Transgender Individuals." *Journal of Sex Research* 49(2-3):244-254.
- Leppel, Karen. 2016. "The Labor Force Status of Transgender Men and Women." *International Journal of Transgenderism* 17(3-4):155-164.
- Levi, Jennifer L. 2007. "Some Modest Proposals for Challenging Established Dress Code Jurisprudence." *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy* 14:243-255.

- Lucal, Betsy. 1999. "What It Means to Be Gendered Me: Life on the Boundaries of a Dichotomous Gender System." *Gender & Society* 13:781-797.
- McGuire, Jenifer K., Charles R. Anderson, Russell B. Toomey, and Stephen T. Russell. 2010. "School Climate for Transgender Youth: A Mixed Method Investigation of Student Experiences and School Responses." *J Youth Adolescence* 39:1175-1188.
- McLaughlin, Katrina, Orla T. Muldoon, and Marianne Moutray. 2010. "Gender, Gender Roles, and Completion of Nursing Education: A Longitudinal Study." *Nurse Education Today* 30:303-307.
- Miller, Nathan and Lori Weingarten. 2005. "Creating LGBTQIA-Inclusive Forms: Suggestions for Policy and Implementation."
- Mitchum, Preston, and Aisha C. Moodie-Mills. 2014. "Beyond Bullying: How Hostile School Climate Perpetuates the School-to-Prison Pipeline for LGBT Youth." Center for American Progress.
- Monro, Surya. 2003. "Transgender Politics in the UK." *Critical Social Policy* 23(4):433-452.
- Moore, Mignon R. 2006. "Lipstick or Timberlands? Meanings of Gender Presentation in Black Lesbian Communities." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 32(1):113-139.
- Nadal, Kevin L., Avy Skolnik, and Yinglee Wong. 2012. "Interpersonal and Systemic Microaggressions Toward Transgender People: Implications for Counseling." *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling* 6:55-82.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 2017. "Public High School Graduation Rates." Retrieved March 5, 2018, from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_coi.asp.
- Nemoto, Tooru, Birte Bodeker, and Mariko Iwamoto. 2011. "Social Support, Exposure to Violence and Transphobia, and Correlates of Depression Among Male-to-Female Transgender Women with a History of Sex Work." *American Journal of Public Health* 101(10):1980-1988.
- Nordmarken, Sonny. 2014. "Becoming Ever More Monstrous: Feeling Transgender In-Betweenness." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20:37-50.
- Ocampo, Anthony C., and Daniel Soodjinda. 2016. "Invisible Asian Americans: The Intersection of Sexuality, Race, and Education Among Gay Asian Americans." *Race, Ethnicity, and Education* 19(3):480-499.
- Pascoe, C.J. 2005. "Dude, You're a Fag!: Adolescent Masculinity and the Fag Discourse." *Sexualities* 8(3):329-346.

- Ridgeway, Cecilia. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia, and Tamar Kricheli-Katz. 2013. "Intersecting Cultural Beliefs in Social Relations: Gender, Race, and Class Binds and Freedoms." *Gender & Society* 27(3):294-318.
- Sausa, Lydia A. 2002. "Updating College and University Policies: Meeting the Needs of Trans Students, Staff, and Faculty." *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 6(3/4):43-55.
- Schilt, Kristen. 2010. *Just One of the Guys? Transgender Men and the Persistence of Gender Inequality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Schilt, Kristen, and Catherine Connell. 2007. "Do Workplace Gender Transitions Make Gender Trouble?" *Gender, Work and Organization* 14(6):596-618.
- Schilt, Kristen, and Matthew Wiswall. 2008. "Before and After: Gender Transitions, Human Capital, and Workplace Experiences." *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy* 8(1).
- Snapp, Shannon D., Jennifer M. Hoenig, Amanda Fields, and Stephen T. Russell. 2015. "Messy, Butch, and Queer: LGBTQ Youth and the School-to-Prison Pipeline." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 30(1):57-82.
- Spade, Dean. 2006. "Compliance is Gendered: Struggling for Gender Self-Determination in a Hostile Economy." Pp 217-241 in *Transgender Rights*, edited by P. Currah, R. M. Juang, and S. P. Minter. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta, and Terri Anne Lowenthal. 2005. "Race, Ethnicity, and the American Labor Market: What's at Work?" *Sydney S. Spivack Program in Applied Social Research and Social Policy*.
- Stainback, Kevin, Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, and Sheryl Skaggs. 2010. "Organizational Approaches to Inequality: Inertia, Relative Power, and Environments." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:225-247.
- Stinebrickner, Ralph, and Todd Stinebrickner. 2013. "Academic Performance and College Dropout: Using Longitudinal Expectations Data to Estimate a Learning Model." CIBC Working Paper Series 2013-5.
- Stout, Jane G., Nilanjana Dasgupta, Matthew Hunsinger, and Melissa A. McManus. 2010. "STEMing the Tide: Using Ingroup Experts to Inoculate Women's Self-Concept in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 100(2):255-270.

- Tilcsik, Andras, Michel Anteby, and Carly R. Knight. 2015. "Concealable Stigma and Occupational Segregation: Toward a Theory of Gay and Lesbian Occupations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
- Tilly, Charles. 1998. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Twenge, Jean M. 1997. "Changes in Masculine and Feminine Traits Over Time: A Meta-Analysis." *Sex Roles* 36(5):305-325.
- United States Census Bureau. 2015. "CPS Historical Time Series Tables." Retrieved May 25, 2015 from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/historical/index.html>.
- United States Census Bureau. 2012. "Age and Sex Composition in the United States: 2008." Retrieved May 25, 2015 from <https://www.census.gov/population/age/data/2008comp.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. 2014. *Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline*. Retrieved February 17, 2018 from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf>.
- Warner, Leah R. 2008. "A Best Practices Guide to Intersectional Approaches in Psychological Research." *Sex Roles* 59(5-6):454-463.
- Wernick, Laura J., Alex Kulick, and M.H. Inglehart. 2014. "Influences of Peers, Teachers, and Climate on Students' Willingness to Intervene When Witnessing Anti-Transgender Harassment." *Journal of Adolescence* 37:927-935.
- West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2):125-151.
- Westbrook, Laurel, and Kristen Schilt. 2014. "Doing Gender, Determining Gender: Transgender People, Gender Panics, and the Maintenance of the Sex/Gender/Sexuality System." *Gender and Society* 28(1):32-57.
- Whittle, Stephen, Lewis Turner, and Maryam Al-Alami. 2007. "Engendered Penalties: Transgender and Transsexual People's Experiences of Inequality and Discrimination."
- Wilkins, Amy. 2012. "'Not Out to Start a Revolution!': Race, Gender, and Emotional Restraint Among Black University Men." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 41(1):34-65.
- Williams, Christine L. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions." *Social Problems* 39(3):253-267.

- Winter, S., et al. 2016. "Transgender People: Health at the Margins of Society." *The Lancet* 388:390-400.
- Woolley, Susan W. 2015. "'Boys Over Here, Girls Over There': A Critical Literacy of Binary Gender in Schools." *Transgender Studies Quarterly* 2(3):376-394.
- Wyss, Shannon E. 2004. "'This Was My Hell': The Violence Experienced by Gender Non-Conforming Youth in US High Schools." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 17(5):709-730.
- Zafar, Basit. 2012. "College Major Choice and the Gender Gap." *Journal of Human Resources* 48(3):545-595.