

Explaining stable partnerships among FTMs and MTFs: a significant difference?

Frank Lewins

School of Social Sciences, Australian National University

Abstract

Research on male to female (MTFs) and female to male (FTMs) transsexuals has pointed to a number of important differences between these categories, namely their different propensity towards cross dressing and relative levels of mental stability. Recent research demonstrates that these assumed differences are not supported by evidence. One difference remains unchallenged – the greater capacity of FTMs to attain and maintain stable partnerships. Extensive interviewing amongst both categories of transsexual reveals that the capacity to maintain stable partnerships is linked to gender socialization. Being socialized as a girl then as a woman elevates the importance of affective ties in partnerships, such as bonding and caring. By contrast, being socialized as a boy then as a man places more importance on the role of physical characteristics of the man and his partner in attaining and maintaining partnerships.

Keywords: female to male transsexuals, FTM, gender socialization, male to female transsexuals, MTF, physical characteristics – role of, stable partnerships, stable relationships

Over the past two decades, the increasing social visibility of and scholarly interest in female to male transsexuals (FTMs) has prompted some comparisons with male to female transsexuals (MTFs). Drawing on my own and others' research on transsexualism, this paper focuses on one comparison that has been largely overlooked. It addresses the question of why FTMs appear to be more successful than MTFs in establishing stable relationships. In doing so, it examines certain structural properties surrounding individuals' understanding of what it is to be a 'man' and a 'woman' in a social context. This examination includes aspects of gender, such as the

everyday task of ‘doing gender’ (Garfinkel and Stoller, 1967; Kessler and McKenna, 1985), and some consideration of sex and sexual orientation.¹ The partial explanation offered in this paper focuses on a comparison of transsexuals’ understandings of being a ‘man’ and a ‘woman’. These understandings are grounded in gender socialization and, consequently, have wider implications.

Scholarly interest in female to male transsexuals

The appearance of Lothstein’s book *Female-to-male Transsexualism* (1983) was, in his own words, ‘the first attempt to organize the body of literature on female transsexualism and to devote an entire book to the condition of female transsexualism’ (1983: 4). The subsequent increase in scholarly interest is indicated by the appearance of articles and books focusing solely on FTMs (e.g. Devor, 1993b, 1997) and those works systematically making comparisons with MTFs (e.g. Kockott and Fahrner, 1988; Tully, 1992). Over the same period, the increasing social visibility of FTMs is directly related to the increasing appearance of a number of their autobiographies (see Tully, 1992: 270; Lewins, 1995: 13–18).

It is not surprising that before the appearance of Lothstein’s book there should be little scholarly attention paid to FTMs and that Harry Benjamin could say that ‘sometime in the future she [sic] [the female transsexual] *may* merit a book devoted to her alone’ (quoted in Lothstein, 1983: 4, emphasis added). The exclusion of FTMs in earlier research on transsexualism is probably related to the assumption that they were such a small proportion of all transsexuals and therefore not worthy of attention.

The explanations offered for the smaller proportion of FTMs were largely medically oriented. In the early 1970s, Green (1974: 101) offered four reasons:

- there is a likelihood of errors in the psychosexual development of males as a consequence of the masculinizing role of gonadal hormone;
- at the social level, there is more latitude allowed to females in the pursuit of cross-gender roles;
- the first person everyone identifies with is their mother and any subsequent shift of identity is required only of males; and
- the reassignment surgery for FTMs is more difficult than that for MTFs.

The second reason is noteworthy because it goes beyond the medical model and acknowledges a social factor involving the difference between males and females.

There is possibly another reason for the little scholarly attention paid to FTMs before the early 1980s. To the extent that Janice Raymond’s *The Transsexual Empire* (1979) represented a particular stance towards transsexualism, there was little, if any, room for FTMs because transsexualism

was primarily a product of patriarchy. FTMs, therefore, were not the focus of intellectual concern. As Raymond notes, 'the First Cause' of transsexualism 'is a patriarchal society, which generates norms of masculinity and femininity' (1979: 70). In such a society, 'patriarchy is molding and mutilating *male* flesh, but for the purpose of *constructing women*'. Transsexualism 'may be one way by which men attempt to possess females' creative energies, by possessing artifactual female organs' (1979: xvi, emphasis in the original). The few visible FTMs were for Raymond the '*token* that saves the face for the male "transsexual empire"' (1979: 27, emphasis in original).

With hindsight, we now see that early claims about the ratio of MTFs to FTMs were precarious. In the decades preceding the early 1980s, claims about this ratio varied considerably.² The later claim by Godlewski (1988) that in Poland FTMs outnumber MTFs by 5.5:1 suggests that previous statements of the ratio have confused the social observability of both categories of transsexual with their prevalence. This in turn may have been an artifact of the vantage point of many of those researchers, who, in a medical context, were only able to 'count' those transsexuals who chose to make themselves visible by presenting for 'treatment'. To be clear, I am not suggesting what the actual ratio of MTFs to FTMs may be. Social visibility implies social invisibility, which means that a precise ratio may currently be unknowable. In any case, knowing the precise ratio is not important for this paper. What is important is that we now know that both categories of transsexual exist and that insights are to be gained from an examination of one particular difference between them.

The structure of stable partnerships among transsexuals

This paper is concerned with one of the few unchallenged differences between MTFs and FTMs, that is, the greater success of FTMs in sustaining stable partnerships. By 'stable partnerships' I am referring to those sexual liaisons that are not only subjectively described by participants as stable, but also characterized by longevity, cohabitation and/or joint participation in recreation and leisure. Also, in discussing transsexuals' sexual relationships, I use terms such as 'heterosexual' and 'lesbian' to refer to the nature of those relationships as defined by transsexuals themselves. If, for example, an FTM transsexual is sexually attracted to women, then this person is heterosexual. Similarly, an MTF transsexual attracted to men is also heterosexual. In both cases, this identity applies regardless of whether the transsexual is pre- or post-operative.

The difference in sustaining sexual relationships has attracted little scholarly attention and, unlike, for instance, claims about different patterns of

mental stability and sexual orientation, has not been challenged by researchers in the field. Concerning mental stability, Pauly's conclusion that 'female-to-male transsexuals are "better adjusted, freer of paranoid trends and more realistic in their appraisal of what is possible for them"' (quoted in Kockott and Fahrner, 1988: 540; see also Blanchard and Steiner, 1983; Bower, 2001: 2), although confirmed by Kockott and Fahrner, has been challenged by Lothstein (1983). Notwithstanding the problem of imprecise concepts, Lothstein treated the greater 'stability' among FTMs as a 'myth' (1983: 9, 62ff.; see also Devor, 1997: 55–6). Similarly, the so-called difference in patterns of sexual orientation was unchallenged up to the 1980s. It was assumed that FTMs, unlike MTFs, were largely, if not exclusively, sexually attracted to females (Hamburger, 1953; Pauly, 1974; Kockott and Fahrner, 1988). Again, this assumption has been disputed (Lothstein, 1983: 93; Devor, 1993b, 1997: 475–512).

Turning to the nature of transsexuals' partnerships, Tully notes, in discussing pre-operative transsexuals, that:

... most pre-operative male transsexuals [MTFs] ... do not have stable intimate consorts most of the time ... [whereas] [e]ven before reassignment surgery, many female transsexuals [FTMs] do have stable consort partners. (1992: 102, also 195; see also Pauly, 1974)

This observation is borne out by my own research and is summarized in Table 1. From this comparison emerges, what Kockott and Fahrner (1988: 544) view as, 'an apparent contradiction'. Given that reassignment surgery for MTFs offers a closer approximation of the desired genitalia than it does for FTMs, the latter have more stable relationships 'in spite of unfavorable anatomical conditions' (Kockott and Fahrner, 1988: 544).

Kockott and Fahrner attempt an explanation for this unexpected finding. They suggest that, as FTMs were often living as men in lasting partnerships prior to reassignment surgery, their partners were fully informed about transsexualism. By contrast, MTFs usually embarked on lasting sexual relationships only after reassignment surgery. On closer examination, however, there is little explanation in this account. It does not indicate why FTMs in the former situation were in stable relationships to begin with. It also leaves another question unanswered. As the authors themselves ask, why do post-operative MTFs continue to have difficulty in establishing stable relationships (1988: 544–5)?

Working from within a medical model, it is not surprising that these researchers should raise questions that focus more on whether transsexuals are pre- or post-operative rather than exploring the role of their social characteristics. Although Kockott and Fahrner acknowledge the sex of transsexuals' partners and therefore the type of sexual relationship involved, the role of this varying characteristic is not explored. Even a superficial glance at Table 1 reveals that transsexuals' stable relationships have more to do

Table 1: Relationship behaviour by subjective sexual orientation among MTFs and FTMs

<i>Sexual Orientation</i>	<i>In a Stable Relationship</i>	<i>Not in a Relationship</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
MTFs				
Lesbian	12	5	17	31
Heterosexual	7	19	26	47
Neutral	–	12	12	22
Total	19	36	55	100
FTMs				
Heterosexual	6	5	11	79
Gay	–	–	0	0
Neutral	–	3	3	21
Total	6	8	14	100

Note: Of the 55 MTFs, 21 (38%) were post-operative, that is had undergone vaginoplasty. This number was roughly evenly divided between those in a stable relationship and those not in a relationship. Also, around 20% of the sample had had breast augmentation surgery and a few had also had cosmetic surgery on the nose and/or larynx.

Among the 14 FTMs, 6 (43%) had had a bilateral mastectomy and one had also had a hysterectomy and oophorectomy. None had undergone any phalloplastic surgery.

with their partners' gender than their operative status. It is not so much whether MTFs are pre- or post-operative but whether their partners are men or women.

Operative status is unrelated to being in a stable relationship. The 21 MTFs who had had surgery were roughly evenly divided between having and not having a stable relationship. By contrast, of the 17 MTFs describing themselves as lesbian, over 70 percent of them (12) were in stable relationships. These same 12 individuals represented 63 percent of all MTFs in such relationships (19). The importance of women as partners for a stable relationship extends to the FTMs. Although the numbers are small, six of the 14 FTMs were in stable relationships and all were self-defined as 'heterosexual', that is, where the partner was a woman. This pattern corresponds to more recent analysis of larger samples (see Bower, 2001: 2).

As noted earlier, the significance of having a female partner is not entirely absent in Kockott and Fahrner's research. 'Female partner' rather than 'woman as a partner' is used in discussing Kockott and Fahrner's work because they speak of transsexuals' partners in terms of biological sex rather than gender. Empirically, they note that all partners of the 12 FTMs in stable relationships were female ('same biological sex'). Also, four of the 10 partners of MTFs in stable relationships were female (1988: 542–3).

These observations, however, were not theoretically pursued. The references to 'only 6 of 10 partners' (emphasis added) of MTFs being male and the 'rare partnerships' between MTFs and female partners (1988: 544) suggest that they did not acknowledge the role of the *different types* of partners of MTFs.

These findings and the pattern of relationships in my own research lead to an important question that goes beyond asking whether the different patterns of stable relationships are 'related to maleness or femaleness' or biological sex (Kockott and Fahrner, 1988: 545). The adoption of a sociological framework necessitates raising questions also about the influence of gender and sexual orientation. This is because transsexuals are at once biological *males* and *females* living as *women* and *men* in *homosexual* and *heterosexual* relationships. Using the terms 'homosexual' and 'heterosexual' is not meant to imply a rigid, dichotomous sexuality. It is used for convenience but also because most respondents resorted to these terms, even if with qualifications (see Devor, 1997: 475–512).

A partial explanation

Applying the notions of gender and sexual orientation to the observed stability of transsexuals' partnerships with women partners clarifies why this pattern exists. In spelling out the steps of the argument, I want to begin by identifying the distribution of these relationships. As Table 2 indicates, the highest proportion of stable relationships is among heterosexual FTMs (six of six). Next are lesbian MTFs (12 of 19), followed by heterosexual MTFs (seven of 19). Although this picture applies to a relatively small opportunistic sample in Australia, the pattern closely matches that found by Kockott and Fahrner (1988: 542–4) in (West) Germany between 1970 and 1980. They found that all partners of FTMs were women (12 of 12) (see also Bower, 2001). Although the proportion of MTFs with women partners was smaller (four of 10) than those with male partners (six of 10), the former 'seem to last longer than partnerships with male partners' (1988: 544).

The rank order above does not explain anything. When, however, transsexuals' gender of early socialization is considered alongside that of their partners, a clearer picture begins to emerge. Table 3 shows that across these three categories of relationships there is a gradation from both individuals being socialized as girls/women, through one socialized as a boy/man and one as a girl/woman, to both being socialized as boys/men. On the assumption that the early socialization of boys/men is different from that for girls/women and that the legacy of their socialization is not easily discarded, the observed gradation suggests that there is a direct relation between both transsexuals and their partners being socialized as girls/women and the stability of their relationships. Of course, the converse also applies in that

Table 2: Category of transsexual by gender of partner showing type and proportion of stable relationships

<i>Category of Transsexual</i>	<i>Gender of Partner</i>		
	<i>Man</i>	<i>Woman</i>	
FTM	0/6 gay	6/6 heterosexual	6/6
MTF	7/19 heterosexual	12/19 lesbian	19/19
	7/25	18/25	25/25

Note: The table needs to be read in conjunction with Table 1. For example, of the 6 FTMs in a stable relationship, all were in a 'heterosexual' relationship with a woman, i.e. 6/6. Partners' gender rather than sex is used because in a few instances partners were also transsexuals.

instability of relationships increases when one and then both individuals are socialized as boys/men. This pattern prompts the question as to whether there is some distinctive feature in the process of gender socialization that explains transsexuals' varying capacity to maintain stable relationships.

I want to argue that there is such a feature. It is a property that attaches to the socialization of boys/men and, because of its relative absence among girls/women, has implications for all gender socialization. Before pursuing this point, it is necessary to stress that when I refer to boys/men and girls/women I am only confident about the claims for those transsexuals I interviewed in my own research. Given, though, the nature of the corroborative evidence from other research on transsexuals, the fact that almost all partners of transsexuals were non-transsexuals, and the evidence derived from research on the nature of masculinity and femininity, there are reasonable grounds for extending the claims to other transsexuals and to non-transsexuals in the wider society.

Table 3: Rank order of stable relationships among categories of transsexuals showing patterns of socialization as men and women

<i>Transsexuals in Stable Relationships</i>		<i>Gender of Early Socialization</i>	
		<i>Transsexual</i>	<i>Partner</i>
Heterosexual FTMs	(6 of 6)	g/w	g/w
Lesbian MTFs	(12 of 19)	b/m	g/w
Heterosexual MTFs	(7 of 19)	b/m	b/m

b/m = boy/man

g/w = girl/woman

The distinctive feature of the socialization of boys/men (when compared to girls/women) is that expressive qualities, such as caring, have little importance, whereas bodily appearance assumes great importance, in attaining and maintaining sexual relationships. The latter value not only applies to men's own bodily appearance but also extends to that of their partners. By bodily appearance I am referring to particular, valued images of sexed male and female bodies, perceptions of overall body morphology and physical attractiveness, which in turn are linked to conventional understandings of masculinity and femininity. By its nature, bodily appearance is closely linked to sexual orientation and sexual attraction. This is because bodily appearance includes that which is often initially attractive about another person and is the focus of individuals' concern about whether they are attractive to others.

This claim concerning the greater role of bodily appearance for men in attaining and maintaining sexual relationships is consistent with wider research on the nature of masculinity and femininity. It is frequently pointed out, for example, that in many societies physical attractiveness is regarded as more appropriate for assessing women rather than men (see Graziano et al., 1993; Williams, 1997; Moghaddam, 1998: 285–9). What is often overlooked in these commentaries is the importance of physical attractiveness in relation to men. It is men as *beholders* of women's physical attractiveness, combined with the claim that it is they who have defined the criteria by which women *and* men will be assessed (Unger and Crawford, 1996), that support the claim above concerning the importance of bodily appearance for men.

The suggestion that there is evidence for women actually giving more importance to the role of physical characteristics than they report (Moghaddam, 1998: 288) is the link to the earlier claim concerning the greater role of expressive qualities for women in interpersonal relationships. First, concerning the former point, Graziano et al. (1993: 530) argue that whatever stress women place on physical characteristics they are 'a consequence of interpersonal processes'. In other words, any role for physical characteristics is dependent on the quality of already established interpersonal relationships.

Also stressing the greater role of the quality of interpersonal factors in relationships for women and the lesser role of physical factors, Chodorow (1978; see also van Krieken et al., 2000: 393–5; cf. Gilligan, 1982) argues that gender socialization leads to different types of 'relational potential' for males and females. Originating from the different psychic bonds men and women develop with their children, they recreate the same kinds of interpersonal relationships with each other in adulthood. For women, their sense of femininity is 'expressive' and characterized by a sense of connectedness with others. Men, by contrast, are socialized into a masculine, 'instrumental' role that is more precarious than femininity because of males' separation from child rearing and family life.

This broader, albeit limited, picture of the nature of masculinity and of femininity is consistent with the patterns among transsexuals. MTFs, socialized first as boys then as men, are more likely than other women to place greater weight on the importance of their own appearance and rely less on expressive and affective qualities in attaining and maintaining relationships. The most unstable pattern of relationships, the heterosexual MTFs with men as partners, is precarious because both partners have strong expectations of themselves and each other surrounding bodily appearance. As the latter includes the physical capacity for sexual intercourse, a preoccupation with bodily appearance helps to explain pre-operative, heterosexual MTFs' avoidance of sexual relationships. Less obvious, though, this same preoccupation also helps clarify why post-operative MTFs, especially those who see themselves as heterosexual, continue to have difficulty negotiating relationships (see also Kockott and Fahrner, 1988: 544).

By contrast, it is a reasonable inference that FTMs' relationships with women are more likely to be stable because both parties were socialized as girls and then as women. As women value, more than do men, the expressive properties of relationships and, correspondingly, place less stress on the importance of physical qualities, this wider pattern helps to explain the, arguably, counter-predictive nature of FTMs' relationships. Despite the anatomical disadvantage of not having a naturally functioning penis for sexual intercourse, FTMs' relationships with women are the most stable category.

These insights not only derive from my own interview data from transsexuals but are also corroborated by other researchers. Kockott and Fahrner (1988: 540, 542; see also Devor, 1997: 475–512; Pauly, 1974), for example, note that, in FTMs' stable relationships with women, the latter did not doubt the masculinity of their partners. Also, research on the nature of 'gender styles' and elements of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' among transsexuals corresponds to the discussion of the role of physical and expressive properties above. Devor (1997: 74–5), who has written extensively on transsexualism, comments that notable aspects of masculinity in social relations include 'emotional distance' and the creation of circumstances that enable face saving, whereas femininity is characterized by the creation of 'safety and succor', 'in-group solidarity' and the 'submersion of the self to the needs of others'.

At this point, the question arises as to whether the value placed on bodily appearance by those MTFs socialized as boys/men is a recent preoccupation rather than the result of a longer process of socialization. Tully, a British researcher whose research is based on more than 200 transsexuals, provides evidence to support the role of early socialization. He shows that MTFs in particular had a high degree of self-consciousness about their 'spoiled appearance' even as children. As he says, 'abnormalities of appearance in the subject's own mind often predate a final adoption of a

transsexual role. These matters ... were so almost always for males [MTFs]' (1992: 67). In addition he notes that '[f]or many ... the sense of failure as a male, is the most striking component of their recollections' (1992: 32) and that the 'awareness of a poor standard of masculinity is a common precursor to a transformation of that standard to "feminine"' (1992: 68). Among Tully's respondents, 60 percent of MTFs compared to 11 percent of FTMs were significantly anxious about aspects of their physical appearance in childhood. When the actual conditions that led to this greater level of concern are examined, they are not only more numerous among MTFs but also support Tully's point concerning MTFs' anxiety over spoiled masculinity. Whereas MTFs were concerned about a total of 44 conditions, which included, for example, small testes, small-size penis, puny strength, fat legs, small hands, clumsiness, lack of hair and Chinese looking, the FTMs expressed concern over only four conditions. These were mental handicap, bronchitis, stammer and hirsute on face ('billy goat appearance') (1992: 265–6). Reinforcing the point that these spoiled physical appearances were accompanied by anxiety, especially among MTFs, Tully shows that 60 percent of MTFs had a significant history of childhood nervous timidity compared to only 10 percent among FTMs, who in the main had 'happy autonomous childhoods' (1992: 36, 267).

This contrasting picture of MTFs compared to FTMs concerning their anxiety over physical appearances corresponds to my own research. Among MTFs, there was similar concern over physical appearances, both as adults and as children. In some cases, this concern bordered on fantasy and partially corroborates claims of narcissism among MTFs (Cummings, 1992: 18; Lewins, 1995: 17). One MTF, for instance, spent some time showing me photographs and drawings of women to illustrate her ideal female. These images were also her physical standard to be used in future surgery to achieve this ideal. Such surgery would have entailed lengthening the long bones of the arms and legs, reducing the size of feet and hands, facial reconstruction and cosmetic changes to nose and larynx. Although not all MTFs experience this level of concern for their appearance, such concern may explain why over 60 percent described their childhood as unpleasant. This experience included anxiety over physical appearance, bullying at school, feelings of not fitting in, being a loner and feeling rejected. In a few cases, MTFs related their attempts at physical self-mutilation.

MTFs' larger concern for appearance also manifested itself in their greater anxiety in doing gender. It has been observed that FTMs assume their new gender role 'more naturally' (Kockott and Fahrner, 1988: 540). Tully, in discussing 'passing' among transsexuals, observes the particular difficulties experienced by MTFs. Although focusing solely on the role of physical appearances in doing gender or passing, Tully implicitly acknowledges the crucial factor in successfully doing gender. That factor is the con-

fidant presentation of oneself either as a man or as a woman (Lewins, 1995: 110–43).³ As Tully says:

[w]hilst many [MTFs] practice (sic) hard to ‘acquire’ female gestures and small movements, it is easy to overdo this creating an image of a drag queen or tart ... a bad actor may end up looking like a poor drag queen. (1992: 197)

Tully correctly notes that MTFs often lack confidence in presenting themselves as women. He does not, however, go far enough in his analysis. The lack of confidence among MTFs manifests itself as anxiety over their physical appearance in social situations. In the latter, often their anguished attempts to establish that they are *really* women involve the use of those same physical appearances in a mistaken manner, such as the excessive use of make up and inappropriate clothing in particular social settings. To reinforce this point and to understand the situation of MTFs vis-a-vis FTMs, a slight recasting or rewording of an important insight by Devor (1993b: 314) is appropriate:

[c]lothing, coiffures and cosmetics, body building, hair transplants, electrolysis, and surgeries are all used by transsexual and non-transsexual members of society to make ourselves more perfectly fit society’s sex, gender, and sexual ideals. Perhaps, in the end, the biggest difference between [MTFs and FTMs] ... lies not so much in the identity-supporting processes they must pass through but in the anguish and consciousness with which they must negotiate them.

A few concluding comments are appropriate at this point. First, observations of the strong emphasis that MTFs place on the value of physical appearances in social situations, particularly in conducting relationships and in doing gender, are not to say that there is *no* role for these appearances or that FTMs do not exhibit a concern for their own physical appearances. My own observations of FTMs indicate that their concern for physical appearances is more than whether they choose beards, tattoos and studded leather clothes to establish their identities as men. It also extends to their more accurate reading of the appropriate appearances for men in particular social settings. Put differently, the lower and more realistic value that FTMs place on physical appearances helps clarify why they are generally more successful in and less anguished about doing gender. It also clarifies why FTMs are more successful in sustaining relationships.

Second, the greater value that MTFs place on physical appearances in social situations may be a major factor in understanding the phenomenon of transvestism, which occurs mainly among men. Semantic distinctions aside, and given the fine line between transvestites and transsexuals, the lack of social visibility of anything approximating transvestism among women raises questions concerning the possible explanatory value of the theoretical approach offered in this paper.

Third, the significance of the role of early socialization as a boy/man in conducting relationships may extend beyond both categories of transsexual.

If there is veracity in the observation that lesbian vis-a-vis gay relations are more stable (Kockott and Fahrner, 1988: 545), then the explanation outlined above may have some application.

Finally, the positing of a partial rather than a full explanation is not to indicate any theoretical half-heartedness. A partial explanation merely acknowledges that, alongside of this sociological explanation for variation in the patterns of stable relationships, other forces may be at work. No doubt psychological factors, for instance, account for why some transsexuals and not others decide to make the transition to living in their preferred gender.

Notes

- 1 'Sex' refers to the biological status of being male or female. 'Gender' is the social interpretation and organization of biological sex differences. 'Sexuality' or sexual orientation denotes the patterns of individuals' sexual desires and practices. See Devor, 1993a.
- 2 A more complete picture of the range of ratios posited by researchers is as follows:

Hamburger (1953)	4.3:1
Pauly (1963)	3.7:1
Walinder (1971)	2.8:1
Hoening and Kenna (1974)	3.2:1
Ross et al. (1981)	6.1:1
Godlewski (1988)	1:5.5
- 3 Along with the confident presentation of self as a woman, other factors involved in successfully doing gender include having the appropriate gender markers, such as the presence or absence of facial hair, breasts and appropriate voice, the clothes one wears and the company one keeps (Lewins, 1995).

References

- Blanchard, Ray and Betty W. Steiner (1983) 'Gender Reorientation. Psychological Adjustment, and Involvement with Female Partners in Female-to-male Transsexuals', *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 12(2): 149–57.
- Bower, Herbert (2001) 'The Gender Identity Disorder in the DSM-IV Classification: A Critical Evaluation', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 35: 1–8.
- Chodorow, N. (1978) *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cummings, Katherine (1992) *Katherine's Diary: The Story of a Transsexual*. Melbourne: Heinemann.
- Devor, Holly (1993a) 'Toward a Taxonomy of Gendered Sexuality', *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality* 6(1): 23–55.
- Devor, Holly (1993b) 'Sexual Orientation Identities, Attractions, and Practices of Female-to-male Transsexuals', *The Journal of Sex Research* 30(4): 303–15.
- Devor, Holly (1997) *FTM: Female-to-male Transsexuals in Society*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Garfinkel, Harold and Robert J. Stoller (1967) 'Passing and the Managed Achievement of Sex Status in an "Intersexed" Person Part 1', in Harold Garfinkel (ed.) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Godlewski, Julian (1988) 'Transsexualism and Anatomic Sex Ratio Reversal in Poland', *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 17(6): 547–8.
- Graziano, W.G., L.A. Jensen-Campbell, C.J. Shebilske and S.R. Lundgren (1993) 'Social Influence, Sex Differences, and Judgements of Beauty: Putting the Interpersonal back in *Interpersonal Attraction*', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 65: 522–31.
- Green, Richard (1974) *Sexual Identity Conflict in Children and Adults*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books Inc.
- Hamburger, C. (1953) 'Desire for Change of Sex as Shown by Personal Letters from 465 Men and Women', *Acta Endocrinologica* 14: 361–75.
- Hoenig, J. and J. Kenna (1974) 'The Prevalence of Transsexualism in England and Wales', *British Journal of Psychiatry* 124: 181–90.
- Kessler, S. and W. McKenna (1985) *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kockott, G. and E.M. Fahrner (1988) 'Male-to-female and Female-to-male Transsexuals: A Comparison', *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 17(6): 539–46.
- Lewins, Frank (1995) *Transsexualism in Society: A Sociology of Male to Female Transsexuals*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Lothstein, Leslie Martin (1983) *Female-to-male Transsexualism: Historical, Clinical and Theoretical Issues*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Moghaddam, Fathali M. (1998) *Social Psychology*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Pauly, I. (1963) 'Female Psychosexual Inversion: Transsexualism', in *American Psychiatric Association, Summaries of the Scientific Papers of the 119th Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Pauly, I. (1974) 'Female Transsexualism: Part 1', *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 3: 487–526.
- Raymond, Janice G. (1979) *The Transsexual Empire*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Ross, M., J. Walinder, B. Lundstrom and I. Thuwe (1981) 'Cross Cultural Approaches to Transsexualism, a Comparison between Sweden and Australia', *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 63: 75–82.
- Tully, Bryan (1992) *Accounting for Transsexualism and Transhomosexuality*. London: Whiting & Birch Ltd.
- Unger, R. and M. Crawford (1996) *Women and Gender: A Feminist Psychology*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- van Krieken, Robert, Philip Smith, Daphne Habibis, Kevin McDonald, Michael Haralambos and Martin Holborn (2000) *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, 2nd edn. Sydney: Pearson Education Australia.
- Walinder, J. (1971) 'Incidence and Sex Ratio of Transsexualism in Sweden', *British Journal of Psychiatry* 119: 195–6.
- Williams, S. (1997) 'Modern Medicine and the "Uncertain" Body: From Corporeality to Hyperreality', *Social Science and Medicine* 45: 1041–9.