

The Impact Of Gender Reassignment On The Professional Career Path And Power Relations

Simona RODAT

Adventus University, Department of Social Work, Cernica, Ilfov

simona@rodat.net

ABSTRACT

The present paper deals on a general level with the relationship between transsexuality and power, approaching the extent to which gender reassignment and the transition from one gender to another influence the position of power of the people involved. Specifically, the research presented here aimed to analyse the interconnection between gender, work, leadership and power position in the case of transgender people who have gone through a process of gender transition. Using a qualitative methodology, which involved a sociological case study within there were conducted three semi-structured in-depth interviews and a two-week participant observation, there was on one hand ensued to identify to what extent there is a proportionality between the reassignment of gender and the position of power, and on the other hand how transsexuality and gender reassignment/ transition impact the professional career path and the leadership position of the concerned persons. The results of the empirical study highlight the complexity of the relationship between

gender and power, pointing out not only the dependence between them, but also their transcendence rapport and its circumstances.

Keywords: *gender reassignment; transsexuality; power; professional career; gendered habitus; hegemonic masculinity*

INTRODUCTION

Transsexuality is no longer a taboo topic in the social sciences. It is a subject of research often found in gender studies, as well as in sociology and psychology, in analyses which aim mainly the investigation of identity construction processes, and emotional and social impact of bodily transformations.

Although there are many approaches to transsexuality and to the transition from one gender to another, being particularly framed in the constructivist, deconstructivist and feminist theoretical perspectives, most studies address mainly the individual level rather than that of the social practices, including that of behaviours and interactions specific to social contexts. Moreover, although there exist studies that specifically approach – mostly through analysing some case studies – the impact of gender reassignment on the professional situation of people who are going through such a process, few researches directly address the relationship between transsexuality and power, respectively the extent to which transition from one gender to another influences the degree of power (economic, social, political – in the sense of M. Weber 1922) of the people involved.

This paper proposes an approach to this issue, aiming to analyse the relationship between gender, work and power in the case of transgender people who have gone through the transition from one gender to another. Specifically, the general objective of the empirical research was to identify to what extent there is a proportionality between the reassignment of gender and the position of power,

respectively how transsexuality and gender reassignment/ transition influence the professional career of the concerned persons.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER AND POWER. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The broader theoretical perspective in which the present research can be included is that opened by Pierre Bourdieu's theory of action, significant being in this context particularly his conceptualizations on "habitus" and "masculine domination". Action is explained by Bourdieu through the concept of *habitus* and it is less seen as a result of goals or purposes (Bourdieu 1998b). Habitus represents "the materializing social behaviour" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1996, 161) and is the result of the *acquired disposition*. It refers to the embedded experience of the individual and his/her attitude in the social world, to his/her habits, his/her lifestyle, behaviours and values (see Fuchs-Heinritz and König 2005, 113). By means of habitus people are able to generate social practices and to participate in social life (ibid. 114). Bourdieu points out that the individual is socialized within himself/herself, being endowed with preformed dispositions of thinking and behaviour that facilitate, but also limit his/her action.

According to Bourdieu (1998b), the reproduction of the social structure results from the habitus of individuals. Habitus represents an exchange between the individual and society, which enables individual to action (Bourdieu 1998b, 21), and reflects the embedment – in the proper sense, as reflection or transposition in the body – of social structures (Hermann and Strunk 2012, 45). It relates to all the mechanisms that guide behaviour (hence not the behaviour itself), featuring an "embedded structure" of which the individual can no longer disembarrass oneself (idem) neither by simple reflection of behaviour, nor by any behavioural changes.

Habitus is continuously constructed and rebuilt not only by social rules and games, but also in terms of gender affiliation. Bourdieu “transposed” his concept of habitus in addressing gender inequality only in the mid-90s (Schölper 2008, 17), by using the term “gendered and gendering habitus” (Bourdieu 1997, 167) to analyse the “antagonistic principles of masculine and feminine identity” (ibid. 185). This means that each of the two genders exists only through the opposite relationship to the other gender (Bourdieu 2005, 46). According to Bourdieu, the dichotomy of genders is a universal principle of perception and classification, a system of categories of thinking and action, which is objectified in social world and incorporated into habitus (ibid. 159). Each gender is produced by an effort of construction, the body being differently shaped and impregnated in a “pre-reflective, normalizing” way (idem).

The division into genders seems to be “in the nature of things”, in other words it fits in the sphere of things to which people refer as “normal, natural, inevitable”. This division can be assessed equally – in an objectified state – in things (e.g. in the division by gender of things in a house), in the whole social world, and – in an incorporated state – in bodies, in the habits of social actors, functioning as systematic schemes of perception, thinking and action (Bourdieu 2005, 19-20).

The symbolic organization of the gender division of labour and, furthermore, the whole natural and social order, is based on an “arbitrary construction of biology and especially of bodies – male and female”, construction that seems to have a natural foundation (ibid. 44). Its special force arises from what Bourdieu calls “the masculine socio-idea”, which simultaneously compresses and performs two operations: legitimizes the relationship of domination, impregnating it a “biological nature”, which, in fact, is itself a naturalized social construction (ibid. 44-5).

This masculine socio-idea (*sociodicee*) objectifies in a special form of relations of domination and power (Schölper 2008, 18), which Bourdieu conceptualizes as “symbolic violence”. This relates to any form of gentle, invisible, subtle violence, which

is imperceptible to its victims and is exerted essentially by the purely symbolic means of communication and knowledge, or, more specifically, through interpretation, recognition and, to the highest degree, emotions and feelings (Bourdieu 2005, 8).

Masculine domination insinuates through the naturalized social order a violent relationship, which at the same time “unites and divides” men and women (Bourdieu 1997, 163). According to this way of relationship, men and women appear as opposite sides of a whole, completing/ fulfilling it together, but with the male as the dominating side and the female as the subdued side.

Both women and men are subjected to the process of socialization; neither feminine nor masculine dispositions are given by nature. But while women assume negative virtues as resignation, silence and devotion, men must permanently claim and exercise domination and, moreover, they have to actively differentiate from the other gender (Bourdieu 2005, 90). The status of men in terms of a *vir* implies a moral obligation to be “masculine”, a *virtus*, which asserts itself in a self-evident, inherent, unquestionable and undisputable way (*idem*). This *virtus* “governs honour” and “conducts (in a two-way manner) the thoughts and behaviours of a man as a power” (*ibid.* 91), “directs its actions following the principle of a logical necessity” (*idem*), but acts also as a trap or as a burden, men being forced “to confirm their masculinity” in any condition and at all costs (*ibid.* 92).

R.W. Connell (1995) emphasizes also the link between the specific habitus and the social existence of gender by defining the gender as the ways in which the “reproductive arena”, which includes the “bodily structures and processes of human reproduction”, organizes practice at all levels of social organization – from identities, to symbolic rituals and to large-scale institutions (Connell 1995, 71). In the gender relations Connell considers masculinity as the central feature, and she defines it as “simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage the place in gender, and the effects of these practices on bodily

experience, personality and culture” (idem). Thus masculinity has, according to Connell, three components: a social position; a set of practices and characteristics understood to be “masculine”; the effects of the collective embodiment and enactment of these practices on individuals, relationships, institutional structures, and global relations of domination (Connell 2000). Furthermore she defines hegemonic masculinity as “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (Connell 1995, 77).

According to Christopher Clark (2013), “power” is not a feature of individuals, groups or organizations, but rather it “articulates a relationship among them” (Clark 2013, 188). Since power is put into practice by means of various ways – from reward, protection and persuasion to threat respectively use of force – it is “neither a substantial entity, nor an institution, let alone something that one possesses, but an attribute of the relationships, within which it is applied” (ibid. 189).

Power and masculinity stand in a special connection, because the social construct of masculinity is inseparably conceived of that of power. As regards gender relations, the symbolic link between masculinity and power applies both to its heterosocial and its homosocial dimension (Meuser 2010, 327).

As Connell (1999, 205) emphasizes, hegemonic masculinity is a phenomenon of the occidental modernity. Following Antonio Gramsci and his theory of cultural hegemony, Connell comprehends the concept of “hegemony” as a form of rule or domination, which is less enforced by means of coercion and violence, than is produced and reproduced by the culturally mediated creation of an (implicit) consent of subordinate groups with their position: by shared values and common interpretive patterns (see Meuser 2010, 327-8). Thus, hegemony refers to the cultural dominance in society as a whole, but does not mean complete control. It is based on the consent

of the subordinates with their social situation and also presupposes a minimal permeability between the social classes (ibid. 329), and these are specific only to modern societies. In other words, hegemony is a form of regulation of social relations, characterized by an “openness of the social” (idem), and this openness is typical of modern societies.

However, the societies in which hegemonic masculinity functions as a highly effective symbolic resource for the reproduction of the power relations between genders are undergoing significant changes (Connell 1998). These changes are designated by terms as globalization, dissolution of boundaries, market radicalization, and casualization of working and living conditions (Meuser 2010, 329). In these circumstances, the question arises whether at the same time with the development of post-Fordist capitalism a revision of the concept of “hegemony” would be necessary. Moreover, as Meuser in the light of the current changes in male living conditions discusses, the question arises to what extent the concept of hegemonic masculinity is still viable to understand masculinity and gender relations in the present.

On the other hand, Meuser (ibid. 333) points out that hegemonic masculinity itself becomes more flexible. For example, a development of the pattern of hegemonic masculinity can be observed, which brings with it an increasing integration of the features and activities that previously have been connoted as “feminine” (ibid. 332). Therefore this concept may require reformulation or new explanations.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

For the objectives and the development of my research questions were highly relevant the already mentioned concepts of “gendered and gendering habitus” (Bourdieu 1997) and “masculinity” and “hegemonic masculinity” (Connell 1995). Following Bourdieu (1997; 1998a), power and domination mechanisms are taken into account not only with regard to the generating of inequality, but also with regard to

the incorporation of the social order and the simultaneously existing processes of self-affirmation. According to Bourdieu, the impacts of the habitus are always gendered and gendering at the same time. In this context, the following question arises: what happens in the case of transgender people after gender reassignment/ gender transition, provided that they are socialized with a habitus and some schemes which are gendered/ gender-specific?

Starting from this theoretical and conceptual framework, the general objective of my empirical study was to investigate the relationship between power and gender in the case of the transgender persons who are experiencing gender reassignment. Consequently, my goal was to find out to what extent transsexuality and gender transition influence the professional career of concerned persons and how gender reassignment affects their power position. Specifically, I examined to what extent the power and leading position is proportional to the gender affiliation and if it changes to the same degree with the transition from one gender to another.

There was used a qualitative methodology, involving a sociological case study, within which I conducted three semi-structured in-depth interviews and a two-week participant observation. I chose these qualitative methods given the exploratory nature of the research on the concerned subject. In the context of my investigation, “exploratory” means that the problem examined has not been often researched, and consequently has not been clearly defined. In this respect, as in other exploratory studies, my aim is to become familiar with the studied phenomenon and to gain new insights into it. In this way, the problem can be better clarified later on and hypotheses can be developed for further researches.

The subject of the case study was a transgender man-to-woman who is the owner and active leader of several companies and has gone through gender reassignment seven years ago. There were interviewed the transgender person herself

¹ In this paper the investigated transgender man-to-women, which was the subject of

and two of her employees², whereas the two-week participant observation took place in one of her companies, in which she was present every day.

For the data analysis of in-depth interviews there was used a qualitative content analysis (see Miles and Huberman 1994), which implies operations of theoretical categorization and codification, contextualization, decodification of significance, conceptualization, discovery of regularities, explanations and causal connections (Miles and Huberman 1994, 10), formulation and verification of the conclusions and preservation of theoretical coherence (ibid. 263). The interpretation of the interviews is based on a hermeneutic approach, which is used to understand the connection and influence between the viewpoint of the interviewed person regarding the world, and himself/ herself, his/her experiences and the social conditions.

The evaluation of the data resulting from the participant observation consisted primarily of the codification of the observation data, which means the exhaustive inventory of the collected data (the notes), their systematic review, the interpretation by means of general categories, the reflection on their pertinence and the insertion into the final research report (see Peretz 2004, 100). The purpose of the exhaustive inventory and analysis was to find meanings in the totality of the information, which are relevant to the general objective and to the specific research questions of the present study.

my case study, will be regarded as the “investigated person” or “Daniela” (a pseudonym – due to the anonymization of the data the name was changed). Quotations in boxes from the interview with her are marked at the end with “I.D.” – from “Interview (with) Daniela”.

² A man and a woman, which – in order to protect their privacy – are named with the pseudonyms “Werner” and “Susanne”. Quotations in boxes from their interviews are marked at the end with “I.W.” [for “Interview (with) Werner”] and “I.S.” [for “Interview (with) Susanne”].

RESULTS

Biographic background

The investigated person (Daniela K.)³ was born 1962 and to the male gender assigned. However, according to her testimony, she has “ascertained for the first time already at the age of 6 years” that she is “slightly different” than her male peers. She was raised (as a boy) in a strict Catholic family, in which she was denied any “feminine manifestations”.

When she was 18 years old, she met her present wife, Anna⁴, whom Daniela disclosed her situation – namely, that “inside” she is a woman. Anna understood and accepted it, so they moved together and later married. Over the years Daniela lived as a man outside (in society), but as a woman at home. However, the gender reassignment was made only after a long time, beginning with 2009, after a bodily as well as a psychic burnout and a period of time in which she had to stay home.

Professionally, she was an employee of a big company in Germany until 1990, when she launched her own business by setting up her first company. Subsequently she founded alone or as business associate other four companies, mainly conducted by herself. Currently she owns and leads successfully three companies.

Professional career

Regarding the work and career of the investigated person – the transgender man-to-woman entrepreneur –, the interview with her revealed that transsexuality had an ambivalent impact on them before gender reassignment.

On one hand she thinks that during childhood and adolescence the fact of being transsexual had negative effects by not being concerned with a career (or building a career) but with her body and with the wish to change her body, as well as to obscure or disguise all this to other people. On the other hand, this dissimulation

³ See the note 1.

⁴ For the reasons mentioned in notes 1 and 2, this is also a pseudonym.

furthered her, because she always tried and strove to prove that “nothing was wrong” with her (him at that time) and that she (he) was “a real man”.

I always had to show that I am a man. A man must have success. A man has to work, he has to have a family, he has to build a house, I got all of this from home. Of course I behaved well and did everything nicely (I.D.).

As can be seen in the above quote, Daniela was “functional” (in the sense of the concept of hegemonic masculinity defined by Connell 1995), married, had a wife, built a house, ultimately she has succeeded by becoming owner of several companies, all this to show that she is “a man”, adjusting herself to the image of hegemonic masculinity in which she was socialized.

However, the investigated person declares at present to be satisfied with her own professional career and perceives herself as a successful businesswoman. Both interviewed employees see Daniela as well as a competent and capable entrepreneur, although they acknowledge that they have no great knowledge about running a company. But the success of her companies over a long period of time, as well as her hard work, shows in their view competency and effectiveness.

Leadership and power position

It can be noticed from the above remarks, on one hand, the great significance of the “gendered and gendering habitus” and of the acquired dispositions, and on the other hand, the power of the “*Hastobe*” or the *virtus* (Bourdieu 2005), which governs the honour of men, directs their thoughts and practices, and conducts their actions “in the manner of a logical necessity”.

This masculine *virtus* did cost the investigated person, according to her statement, “very much strength”. For this reason, the substantiation of her “true, real gender” was a relief both for her and – in her opinion – also for the people involved in

her business. She believes that the employees regard her gender reassignment as a positive, not a negative factor, because not only the state of her companies remained consistent, but also her leadership style changed positively. However there should be mentioned here that the investigated person does not regard this change as a result of a deliberate, targeted adaptation to a “feminine style of leadership”, but as a consequence of the physical/ bodily hormonal changes and the psychic/ mental relaxation, due to the fact that her whole attitude towards life improved. Thus, she no longer has to conceal her “woman-being”, she may show her feelings and weakness, i.e. she does not have to fight “with herself” anymore.

Overall, I became much more calm, more balanced, I don't have to hide anymore. [...] With me, the psyche has also acted on the organs, that is now gone, so in this respect I have actually done myself a favor that I have now made the step [the gender reassignment]. [...]

When in the past something was wrong, I immediately made an insurrection, and showed how great I am, these are typical things. [...] Through the hormones not only does the body change, but also overall the feeling of life changes, one becomes more relaxed, quieter... In the past I used to be so frenzied, this is no longer the case today. But I don't think this is explained by the womanhood as such, this may be the case, but it is so rather because now I can express my feelings freely, I am also allowed to be anxious or something else, I do not have to bring out the “masculine”, it is something completely different (I.D.).

The collected data reveal however a contradiction when the results of the interviews with the employees and the participant observation are compared with the information obtained from the interview with the examined person.

The interviewed employees perceive indeed the continuity that took place in the company after their employers gender reassignment as something positive, since their jobs have remained the same, the company activities have continued as before, and even the behaviours and activities of their boss have remained unchanged. In this respect the viewpoints of the employees agree with those of the transgender entrepreneur. But the self-perception of the subject of the case study according to which she became “quieter, more relaxed, more balanced, more agreeable” as a result of showing her feelings (including weaknesses) and her general improvement of the attitude towards life, was not confirmed by her interviewed employees. On the contrary, they say that their employer’s style of leadership has remained constant after the gender transition, and that she is rather an authoritarian (female) leader, as it was once an authoritarian male leader. Moreover, one of the two interviewed employees mentions that in her opinion Daniela appears to have even become more dominant and harder at the moment, which means she is even more “masculine”.

For me personally, nothing has changed since she lives as a woman. On the contrary, sometimes I had the feeling that she now has to prove even more in the company that “she is wearing the pants” and to some extent she reacts to us employees even more severely (I.S.).

From this it can be concluded, that, with respect to her leadership and power position, the investigated person continues to prove her “hegemonic masculinity”. Thus, one can notice that authority and power are associated with masculinity (more precisely, with hegemonic masculinity). In this regard, the examined transgender entrepreneur strives even more, at least in the perception of one of her employees, to confirm her affiliation to hegemonic masculinity, especially since she now physically no longer belongs to the “appropriate” gender – “man”. It can be assumed that, in the

researched case, these perceived rather “male” power-related behaviors outweigh the efforts of the investigated person towards “femininity”. This conclusion was confirmed also by the results of the participant observation.

This could be interpreted to the effect that, for the investigated transgender businesswoman, beyond her gender transition, her leadership and power position are the most important.

Furthermore, on the basis of findings from the participant observation, it can be concluded, that Daniela practices rather a domineering leadership style and proves to be a determined, goal-oriented person. She maintains social distance to all her employees and lets them feel her position of power. In the theoretical terms of Connell (1987; 1995) one can say, that the investigated man-to-woman transgender person cannot be assigned to any form of femininity, but to “hegemonic masculinity”, given that her social practices – behaviours, attitudes, relationship management, etc. , her style of leadership, and her way of exercising power can be viewed as characteristics of hegemonic masculinity.

The findings from the interviews with the employees endorse these conclusions. Werner and Susanne perceive, that their boss behaves rather patriarchal than democratic. Paradoxically they consider that convenient, because this leadership style of Daniela would show the continuity in the company, including, in their view, the security of their jobs.

We are employees and do what we are told and what the work requires. And within the person Daniela there is nothing democratic. She is not taking suggestions at all, she rules her companies absolutely authoritarian (I.S.).

For me, Daniela behaves more like a man in women's clothes (do not tell her that!), but that is only my personal view. [...] She performs specific “bossish” activities, as I

said, Daniela is Daniela as a person, woman or man does not matter, she behaves the same. But I am totally OK with this situation, I wouldn't want big changes in the company, a leadership style suddenly "feminine", or, God forbid, substantial changes that would have included layoffs or something like that (I.W.).

From the interview with the investigated person results that the gender reassignment and the act of "outing" have not proved to be disruptive factors for her power position and power maintenance. Several times during the interview, she mentions that after the outing nothing changed with regard to her work, leadership and power position. She narrated, that she had explanatory conversations – when she was still a "man" – with her friends and acquaintances, as well as with her employees, customers and business partners, in which she expounded her situation and the forthcoming process of outing and gender reassignment. In her view, all of them reacted "consistently positive" to this information. She states that – especially since she did not try to set herself up particularly "feminine" after the gender transition, that is, to "adopt any exaggerated feminine" movements or behaviors, or to avoid male-considered activities –, her employees and business associates felt probably a sense of continuity, which for her own sake ultimately meant an unproblematic preservation of her power position.

However, if the discussion regarding her power and authority is approached more in-depth, it can be seen, that gender – namely "being a man" back then – plays a decisive role even in the present, now that she is a woman. All companies of the interviewee were founded as "man" and led so for many years. She is aware that as such (as a man) she gained the trust of the people involved and built up an authority ("man authority").

For all these people, the reassignment of her gender should not be important, given that Daniela had already the knowledge and the business capabilities of a "man".

Furthermore, she concedes that she could never, as a woman, have established the companies and reached her position of power.

Certainly, at the beginning, so when I started, I could have never started as a woman, definitely, because back then that would have not worked at all. I first ordered machines, rented the facility, and then went to a bank and said, now finance me please. As a woman they would have called me crazy and I would have been thrown out, definitely, so that would not have been possible as woman at that time (I.D.).

Likewise, after a few less positive experiences, as a woman, she became aware of how difficult it is now to build a new authority, “as a woman”, with regard to new acquaintances, and, moreover, how difficult it would be for her at present if she did not already have an authority “as a man”.

I find it to some extent frightening, how women are hoaxed... [...] One is underestimated as a woman, which is “normal”. This is how I learned it. There are many small things in life, where men simply say, so, that’s just the way, that could not be otherwise, and that’s it. And that’s just what you have to accept... [...] Unfortunately I notice again and again, let’s say that, that men like to rip women off, not all of them, certainly not, but there are many. Well, with me they have now bad luck, but with many [women] they get through with it (I.D.).

It has thus become apparent, that the gender stereotypes still exist and produce different assessments concerning men and women. In this way, women’s competences are questioned solely on the basis of their gender, whereas under equal conditions, men are attributed greater knowledge and higher professional, business and executive capabilities.

They [people/ men] mean then, I find it hard to believe, that because I'm a woman, they just look at me: check it out, that was a guy, now he's running around as a woman, come on, we just ride roughshod over her. [...] I mean, they think, I am suddenly dumb and stupid (I.D.).

Such observations underline the existence of gender stereotypes, according to which women and men are different because of their sex/ gender, they behave different, and they have different characteristics. Furthermore, it can be noted that this stereotypical categorization is not neutral, but it comes along with hierarchization. In pursuance of still common gender stereotypes, the male gender would be superior to the female one as regards to intellect, knowledge, abilities, competences and so on.

Discussion and conclusions

This paper presents some of the findings of a research which approached the relationship between power and gender in the case of the transgender persons who are experiencing gender reassignment, and aimed to find out to what extent transsexuality and gender reassignment impact professional career and power position of the concerned persons.

As regards to the influence on the professional career, the results of the present research pointed out that transsexuality can have potentially ambivalent effects. On one hand, due to the special concern with own body, which does not correspond to the mental gender affiliation, as well as the concerns of hiding these contradictions towards other people, transsexuality may prove to be an obstacle to a smooth professional development and, eventually, can negatively affect the career and professional path of the concerned persons. On the other hand, as a result of all the strivings these persons undergo in order to adjust to the social norms, expectations and

demands – e.g. to embody “proper” the social assigned gender (proving that “nothing is wrong with them”) and to fit themselves into the image of hegemonic masculinity or femininity in which they have been primary socialized – some of them turn out to be strong-willed and persevering individuals, which eventually can concretize as accomplishments and success.

As concerns power, leadership and authority, the findings of this study highlight the essential role of gender for the road to power, and point out that male gender facilitates the attainment of a higher power position and the building of a strong authority. In addition, it has been revealed, that power is an attribute of relations (see Clark 2013), and that it is (or can be) preserved and strengthened through these relationships, even if a gender reassignment took place. All this signifies, that gender is of great importance for the ascent to power positions and for the legitimation of success, but when one has accomplished to attain a power position, it can be preserved by power relations, regardless of gender.

Moreover, the interviews with the two employees suggest that the position of power of their transgender employer is more important than her gender affiliation. During the interviews, when referring to their superior, they primarily refer to her power-related position (they designated her mainly as “boss”) and not to her gender (male/ female). This shows, that they are subordinate to a position and a status, not to a person, even if that person undertook a gender reassignment and thus experienced a transition from one gender (in the sense of Connell’s “social place”) to the other.

Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that, at least in the case study presented here, the power and leadership position is not proportional to the gender transition and affiliation, in that it does not change to the same degree as the reassignment of gender.

In this context, the questions arise as to whether power transcends gender, whether, in an intersectional view, class membership exceeds gender, and to what

extent these occur. Such issues need further research and in-depth approaches, both theoretical and empirical.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1997. "Die männliche Herrschaft". In Irene Dölling and Beate Kraus (Eds.). *Ein alltägliches Spiel. Geschlechterkonstruktionen in der sozialen Praxis*, p. 153-217. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998a. *La domination masculine*. Paris: Seuil.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998b. *Praktische Vernunft. Zur Theorie des Handelns*. Neue Folge Band 985. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *Die männliche Herrschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 1996. *Reflexive Anthropologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Clark, Christopher. 2013. "Macht". In Ulinka Rublack (Eds.). *Die Neue Geschichte. Eine Einführung in 16 Kapiteln*, p. 188-215. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin; Cambridge: Polity Press; Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R.W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press; Sydney: Allen & Unwin; Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. 1998. "Männer in der Welt: Männlichkeiten und Globalisierung". In *Widersprüche. Zeitschrift für sozialistische Politik im Bildungs-, Gesundheits- und Sozialbereich*, Heft 67, 18. Jg. 1998, Nr. 1, p. 91-105.

Connell, R. W. 1999. *Der gemachte Mann. Männlichkeitskonstruktionen und Krise der Männlichkeit*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Connell, R.W. 2000. *The men and the boys*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fuchs-Heinritz, Werner and Alexandra König. 2005. *Pierre Bourdieu. Eine Einführung*. Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft mbH.

Hermann, Anett and Guido Strunk. 2012. "Wichtig? Unwichtig? Welche Rolle spielt Geschlecht in der Karriere?". In Gertraude Krell, Daniela Rastetter, and Karin Reichel (Eds.). *Geschlecht macht Karriere in Organisationen. Analysen zur Chancengleichheit in Fach- und Führungspositionen*, p. 41-58. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Meuser, Michael. 2010. "Geschlecht, Macht, Männlichkeit – Strukturwandel von Erwerbsarbeit und hegemoniale Männlichkeit". In *Erwägen Wissen Ethik*. Jg. 21, Heft 3, p. 325-336.

Miles, Matthew B. and Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. 2nd Edition. London, New York: Sage Publications.

Peretz, Henri. 2004. *Les méthodes en sociologie. L'observation*. Nouvelle Édition. Paris: La Découverte [Collection Repères, No. 234].

Pratt, Minnie Bruce. 1995. *S/He*. Ithaca, NY: Firebrand.

Schölper, Dag. 2008. "Männer- und Männlichkeitsforschung – ein Überblick". In *gender... politik...online*. September.

<http://www.gender-politik-online.de/> (accessed: 23.03.2017). Available at:

[http://www.fu-](http://www.fu-berlin.de/sites/gpo/soz_eth/Geschlecht_als_Kategorie/M_nner_und_M_nnlichkeitsforschung/dag_schoelper.pdf?1361541054)

[berlin.de/sites/gpo/soz_eth/Geschlecht_als_Kategorie/M_nner_und](http://www.fu-berlin.de/sites/gpo/soz_eth/Geschlecht_als_Kategorie/M_nner_und_M_nnlichkeitsforschung/dag_schoelper.pdf?1361541054)

[M_nnlichkeitsforschung/dag_schoelper.pdf?1361541054](http://www.fu-berlin.de/sites/gpo/soz_eth/Geschlecht_als_Kategorie/M_nner_und_M_nnlichkeitsforschung/dag_schoelper.pdf?1361541054) (accessed: 23.03.2017).

Weber, Max. 1922. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.